

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Thirteenth Legislature**  
**19th Day**

**Tuesday, March 10, 1959**

The house met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.  
On the Orders of the Day.

**TRIBUTE TO CURLERS**

**Hon. J. H. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I want to bring to the attention of the House the fact that the Richardson Rink from the Civil Service Curling Club, took the Scottish team by 12 to 6 yesterday, and I hear that they took them, this morning, by 11 to 9. That means they have pretty good prospects of getting the Scotch Cup over here. I wish you would look a little happier about this, Mr. Speaker.

There is another matter I wish to mention to the House and it is that the officers and executive of the Civil Service Community Co-operative Curling Club have asked me to invite members of the Legislature to curl. The Club will supply the ice, rocks and brooms. All the members will have to do is supply the skill and the muscle, on a Saturday evening. We actually could have three sheets of ice on Saturday, March 21, at either 5 o'clock in the afternoon, or 7:00 o'clock or 9:00 o'clock. I would suggest that any members who wish to curl on that occasion (and this includes the ladies, too — lots of ladies curl over at the Civil Service Club), if they would make known their intentions to me, and also let me know what position they curl on a rink, whether they are skip, third, second or lead and if we can get a number of members who wish to curl, arrangements can be completed.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I think it would be of interest to the House to know that the Richardsons are playing tomorrow in Falkirk, which is my birthplace. Yesterday, I cabled the Lord Provost of Falkirk and told them that I expected them to put on a real display of Scottish hospitality for the Richardson rink. Despite the fact that I am a Falkirk 'bairn', I am certainly pulling for the Richardsons to win both their games in Falkirk tomorrow.

I may also say that it is hoped the Richardsons will be back in Saskatchewan on the 19th or 20th, although those dates are tentative, and it is hoped, if those dates hold, that we may have a reception here in the Chamber to extend a welcome to the rink in much the same manner as we did for the Campbell rink, when they won the Dominion Briar in 1955. I mention that in order that the hon. members might keep that date clear for the afternoon of March 20th.

## ADJOURNMENT ON WEDNESDAY

**Premier Douglas:** – Mr. Speaker, I think it was agreed by all members of the house yesterday, that it would be advisable to adjourn the House so that members who wanted to attend the funeral of the late Mr. Henry Bégard, the former member for Kinistino, might be able to do so. Therefore, if that is the general wish of the Assembly, I would like to ask leave to move, seconded by Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition):

“That the Assembly, when it adjourns today, will stand adjourned until Thursday next at 2:30 p.m.”

## WELCOME TO STUDENTS

**Mr. A T. Stone (Saskatoon City):** – Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to draw the attention of the members to a group of students from the Princess Alexandria School in Saskatoon, and I am sure all members will join me in welcoming them here, and hope their stay will be a profitable and enjoyable one.

## BUDGET DEBATE

The Assembly resumed from Monday, March 9, 1959, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Fines: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (The Assembly to go into the Committee of Supply).

**Hon. T.J. Bentley (Minister of Social Welfare):** – Mr. Speaker, when the debate was adjourned last night, I was dealing with some of the programs the Department of Social Welfare operates, pointing out the newness of many of them, the very extensive expansion of those that had been tentatively started by previous Governments, and I also dealt to some extent with the remarks made by the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Lopton) when he, with a very vivid imagination and in a very circuitous route, and in a long and rather boring discourse, finally got around to the point of proving to his own satisfaction (and I hope only his own) that the late leader of the C.C.F. Party in Canada, Mr. Woodsworth, was a Communist. That was the implication of his talk. Then of course, a further implication was that Mr. Woodsworth had been the founder of the C.C.F., and, therefore, all C.C.F.'ers were branded, according to him, with the same brush as their founder. I have tried to point out, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Lopton:** – Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I did not brand all C.C.F.'ers in this province. There are not very many of them that are Communists, but there might be some of the leaders . . .

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** – If that is a point of privilege, I accept it, and I am glad to hear the hon. member say that he did not brand all C.C.F.'ers as Communists. I trust he means it as sincerely as he said it, but from listening to what he said last night, he pointed out that many of the so-called followers of the leaders in the C.C.F. were misled, and I could only assume that he meant they were misled in the same direction, and to the same place and same destination as he claimed their leader had already achieved, If I am in error about that, I regret that is the way I understood it.

I pointed out at the time that the C.C.F. is not, and was not, founded by any one person. I indicated a few of my own personal experiences of my younger life to show the process that had brought me into the C.C.F., and had directed my thinking along the lines of social justice, long before I had known of Mr. Woodsworth, whom I had highly revered and respected after I did come to know him. I pointed out all the decisions from the choosing of the leader to the adoption of a policy, the administration and the execution of C.C.F. policy, are made in open convention, and Mr. Woodsworth, as leader, was chosen because of the high regard in which he was held by all the people who were in the movement, once it was formed in 1932-33.

I might say that the implication of the hon. member for Saltcoats that the leader of our Party, Mr. Woodsworth, had brought discredit unto his church and unto the Christian religion because of his beliefs was, in my opinion, most unfair. As a matter of fact, the leader of the member's own Party, or a past leader – Mr. Mackenzie King – expressed publicly, on more than one occasion, his very high regard and respect for the integrity and goodness of Christianity of Mr. Woodsworth.

**Mr. Loftson:** – Mr. Speaker, I never mentioned Christianity; I mentioned his integrity and his honesty . . .

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** – Mr. Speaker, the record will speak for itself. Again, if I have taken something that he said wrongly, I'm sorry; but that is the way it sounded to me – that Mr. Woodsworth (and he coupled our own Premier in the same way because he is a churchman, a clergyman) as having brought discredit on the Christian religion through their attitudes in public life in support of C.C.F. policy.

Again let me point out that none of these men founded anything. They were with the rest of us when the movement was founded. They had exhibited tremendous ability, tremendous understanding, tremendous human sympathy for suffering of other people, and a tremendous desire to help bring about some measure of the reform in those social conditions which they had seen, and which they deplored in the results in great sections of our population. Those of us in the rank and file recognized their tremendous ability and capacity, and we chose Mr. Woodsworth, Mr. Coldwell, the Premier of this province at the present time, and others who have led, or have been the lieutenants of the leaders, down through the years since we have been a Party, and so far, as I am

March 10, 1959

concerned, I am very proud of my humble part in it.

In dealing with some of the programs as I did last night, Mr. Speaker, I said I tried to point out not only have the people of Saskatchewan benefited from these programs, but many of the things that were initiated in Saskatchewan have been emulated by other provinces, and particularly in one field, the field of universal hospitalization. A great many people in Canada are now able to enjoy the security that is offered through the National Hospitalization plan, which is the direct growth of its initiation here in Saskatchewan. I made one little error last night, Mr. Speaker – I should have thought of it at the time, but I will correct it now. When I mentioned that last night, I said even the people of Gaspé, whom my friend from Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) mentioned quite a lot in his talk, will enjoy it. I forgot for the moment that they live in the province of Quebec, and therefore, do not enjoy a national hospital benefit like the other people in Canada. But it is available to them, so they have that security.

Contrary to what some people have said from the other side, Mr. Speaker, the C.C.F. Government has not forgotten its basic philosophy of 'humanity first', nor has it become old and disinterested in the original intention to banish destitution insofar as it is possible to do so by a provincial Government. It is constantly subjecting its policies, its practices, its execution of those policies to critical examination, and changes are obviously the result. I want to deal with housing. I think I have possibly been remiss since I have been Minister of the Department of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation, in not having given more attention to housing in the House before, in order to acquaint the members and any of the public, who may be listening, with the housing program that we have, I propose now to spend a bit of time on our housing activities, this afternoon.

One of the first things this Government recognized was that there was a desperate shortage of housing when it came into office in 1944, and if there is anything that can contribute to the misery of human beings, it is to live in deplorable, depressed, slums and otherwise undesirable housing. One of the first activities of the Government was to see what steps should be taken to start in to alleviate the worst aspects of housing in this province. At that time the war was nearly over and veterans were coming back. As there had been no housing programs ever before of any kind in this province, the Government naturally considered that this was one of the first fields to tackle – housing for low-income groups, housing for veterans returning, particularly those who had indicated their intention to proceed with their interrupted educational activities.

The former Minister of this Department who prior to that was Minister of Reconstruction (Hon. Mr. Sturdy), with all the energy he has and all the compassion he has for people, went to work and acquired a great number of the old army or military huts to provide emergency housing for people in the groups that I have just mentioned. We found them at Regina, Saskatoon, North Battleford, Prince Albert, Humboldt, Melfort, Yorkton, Estevan, Weyburn and Swift Current, and arrangements were made to utilize these huts,

and to house these people who otherwise would have been crowded in with already overcrowded families, or would have been left to sleep on park benches, or wherever they could find a place.

As soon as that was done, it was followed by the very next phase, which was the need for something for elderly people, and again I call attention to my friends opposite, who have lived here as long as I have and are as old as I am, and even some of the younger ones, to remember that there were, prior to those days, because of the lack of housing, many elderly people living in conditions that no person should be expected to live in a civilized country that has anything like consideration for human values. That was the next step to be tackled. Again the former Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Valteau) and the Hon Mr. Sturdy (Minister of Reconstruction) got their heads together and acquired places to alleviate the worst of these conditions, by establishing a nursing home on the grounds at the Exhibition here in Regina, and community apartments in Saskatoon.

**Mr. Lopton:** – That program was suggested by the Liberal Opposition back in 1948.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** – Mr. Speaker, I would not mind dealing with questions raised by my hon. friend for Saltcoats, if I had more time, but I must finish in my half-hour because the balance of the radio time belongs to the Opposition, and I shall certainly try to be courteous enough not to deprive them of one second of the time they have. So I would appreciate it if he would reserve his comments for some later time, and I will be happy to engage in a rough-and-tumble across the House in Committee (where it is possible) with him on any matters he wishes to raise. As I said last night, I still like him – outside the House. Inside the House, I am prepared to do battle like a pair of old gladiators any old time he wants to!

These nursing homes were set up, and immediately following that, under the impetus of the same Minister of Social Welfare, with the backing of the Government, arrangements were made to start to build permanent places for elderly people who required nursing care. So we saw the advent of a new nursing home at Melfort, which has done great service since its inception and opening in 1955, Jubilee Year. Then, following that, was the erection of the new one at Regina, which is now described, along with the others, as a Geriatric Centre, where a great many elderly people have found a haven and comfort in their old age who otherwise might have been left to whatever was possible for them to receive from already hard-pressed families, and in some cases, where there was no family at all, whatever they could hope to get from the community in which they live – and which already has plenty of problems of its own, in many cases.

These are things that must not be forgotten. These places are landmarks. Everybody knows about them in Saskatchewan. They are a living testimony, I think, a living statue, of the basic philosophy of the C.C.F. ‘humanity first’.

This did not complete the program by any means, nor was the Government unaware of the gaps in the program. There were still many

things needed to be done. There were many elderly people who did not require the constant nursing care and attention that is given in the Geriatric Centres, but who did require some kind of housing; people – married couples who had quarters which, as I say, no one should be expected to live in, who had a right to expect some decent place in which to live, even though they did not need any care, were perfectly able to care for themselves. Again, under the energy and the forethought of the former Minister of Social Welfare, the Hon. Mr. Sturdy, arrangements were made through the National Housing Act with the Federal authorities, to arrange for loans to be applied to the building of housing projects, both for married couples and for single people, and having made that arrangement this Government's consent was given gladly for him to make the necessary capital grants to these construction programs, and for operation grants when they were finished. The only conditions that were attached to those grants were these: that they were made to groups of people who are doing it on a non-profit basis; they were not for commercial enterprises, but they were done on a non-profit basis; and the other condition was that, by making these construction and operation grants, those grants would be reflected in a lower rental cost for the occupants of the places, to make it possible for them to enjoy these places.

These two programs I have mentioned – the Geriatric Centres used to be called Nursing Homes and Housing for the Aged – are presently housing 4,000 elderly people who otherwise would not have been housed in these kinds of quarters, and I think it is to the everlasting credit of the people in this Government on this side of the house, and those who support it in the country, that this has been made possible.

This isn't all. This program is still proceeding. Many construction programs are presently underway under the same conditions. Others are in the planning stage, and I anticipate, from the figures given by my advisers as to the interest in this, that within two or three years will have 6,000 people under cover in these kinds of modern housing places at rents they will be able to pay.

I would like to draw to the attention of the House (and I do this in all sincerity) that not one other Government of Canada, Liberal, Tory, Social Credit, or Union Nationale has envisaged and gone into a project of this kind to the same extent. I will go along now and say that the Government of Alberta is waking up to the need and making very good provisions to start now, and I think credit is right where credit is due; but no Liberal, Tory or Social Credit Government has done it before, and only one Government that we know of, apart from a C.C.F., has even indicated its interest up till now, and that is the province to the west.

That does not cover the housing field; taking care of the elderly people and emergency housing for returning veterans and for lower income groups is not enough. The Government was concerned in giving some kind of leadership which had never been given before in the field of housing. The consequence was that, the Government felt that vigorous efforts must be made in order to interest communities, cities and so on, to take advantage of the

National Housing Act and to provide rental housing for people who could not find the money for the down payment required to purchase a home, and possibly were not in the income brackets which would permit them to obtain a mortgage for the balance of the payment even though they could make an initial payment. The Government said a number of things to cities and did a number of things; for instance this is one little example, and not a little example – a big example.

I would call your attention to the city of Regina where, some years ago, the Government owned some very valuable property on what was then the southeast edge of the city of Regina, along Wascana Creek just west of the power house. The government said: “We will make this land available at a very low price – much lower than could have been acquired for that land on a real estate sale today – for housing for families, if the low cost of the land is reflected in the rents charged for those families.” It was from that that the Gladmar Project was formed. I don’t know how many people remember that. I hope the press up above you, Mr. Speaker, will remember that, if it had not been for this Government making that land available, the Gladmar project and the 300 odd families living there in good comfortable quarters at low rental, would not have been possible at the rents they are paying. Again, I pass a credit on to my hon. friend who is just taking his seat, the former Minister of Social Welfare, the Hon. J.H. Sturdy. That’s how the project was born.

There are other things that are necessary, and the Government has been trying to get cities interested in economic rental housing; subsidized rental housing and land assembly projects with not nearly the marked success that the worth-whileness of the project should have indicated.

It is true that the City of Moose Jaw and the City of Prince Albert did engage in a tri-partite agreement in the field of subsidized rental housing, and again, I would suggest that there are people because of that now in comfortable housing in those cities who would not have been in such comfortable housing if it had not been for these.

Later on, the City of Weyburn entered into an economic rental housing of 50 units, and people are living in modern housing there that would have not been available otherwise. These were promoted, interest was promoted in this, and inducements given, in order to get cities to undertake housing programs but it still hasn’t done enough.

I should point out that, originally, the Federal Government through the C.M.H.C. said: “We will pay, that is make available loans of 75 per cent, and the Province, through whatever arrangement it likes, will find the other 25 per cent.” The first provision this Government made with the municipalities was: “We will divide the 25 per cent equally in two; you pay 12½, the Government pay 12½,” and we had some housing projects go forward on that. Apparently that didn’t meet the wishes of the municipalities concerned, because very little happened except what I said about Weyburn, Moose Jaw, and Prince Albert. The Government then said: “Well, if that isn’t inducement enough, we will go further. We will take up 15 per cent – that is three-fifths of the 25 per cent provincial share or the Province’s share – and the cities take up two-fifths or 40 per cent of the 25%,” and that didn’t produce the results.

You will have noticed that, in the budget Speech, provision is made now that the Provincial Government will assume four-fifths of the provincial load and the cities will be asked to provide one-fifth or five per cent of 25%. This should not prevent any city from engaging in projects of this kind, because it will involve no cash in most cases, simply the land on which the housing projects will have to go, and possibly some of the ordinary services. We are hoping that this is going to assist cities in this province to engage in housing schemes under the National Housing Act.

I would like to mention, at this point, that hitherto there has been no provision in Saskatchewan for National Housing Act loans through C.M.H.C. for rural housing. However, I have recently written to C.M.H.C. to find out why, and I found that C.M.H.C. has issued instructions through its manual to the lending agents saying that they must not make loans for rural housing in Saskatchewan. When I discovered that, I wrote to the hon. Howard Green, Minister of Public Works for Canada, and asked him why, and he wrote and told me why, and I wrote back and said: "What would you suggest that we do in Saskatchewan in order to remove that restriction from rural housing in Saskatchewan?" I am anticipating a reply in the very near future, and I want to assure you that anything this Government can do that is within its power, and by policy can be deemed to be correct, will be done in order to assist in rural housing also.

Another matter in connection with housing that I think the Government has wisely announced is in connection with housing survey. Hitherto housing surveys in the city were shared 75 per cent by the C.M.H.C. and 25 per cent by the city concerned that wanted one. The Provincial Government had to approve of the survey, and then the C.M.H.C. and the city joined forces on those divisions of the costs and made the survey. This Government has now announced that it will relieve the cities of the full 25 per cent of the costs of these surveys, with the result that there will be no good reason for any city now, first not asking for a survey to see what its needs are, and second engaging in a housing project. I should, I think, give a word of caution here, at this moment with regard to that though. It will not be done for frivolous applications. I mean there is no use of a city coming in and asking for a survey to see if they need two or three houses. We want a complete survey of that city to know what its housing is, what its needs are in the way of new construction, urban renewal or (in the slang phrase) slum clearance and so on, but we will be very happy to undertake the full provincial share and relieve the cities of the 25 per cent.

One other thing I want to mention, Mr. Speaker. I ought to have mentioned our Civil Defence Program, and briefly, I can only say that in our Civil Defence Program we have co-operated fully with the Government of Canada: In my visits to Arnprior and to Ottawa, where we have met and seen Civil Defence officials, I am told that they regard our programs as extremely well run here, and they think that we are doing a magnificent job for an area that is deemed to be a "reception area" in time of war. We think our Civil Defence Branch is doing an excellent job not only in that field but in caring for local disasters, giving direction and assistance to people who suffer in that



particular way. I haven't got time to go into all the aspects of Civil Defence.

I want to deal with something that has been mentioned here by one or two other speakers, in fact by a number of speakers, in fact by every speaker on either side of the House, I think (if I remember correctly), and that is the field of alcohol, alcoholic beverages, and alcoholism as a disease.

Almost everybody who has spoken, I think, has either said or implied that the over-use of alcohol leads to sin, and we are all against sin. Well, I am along with you – I am agin' sin too; and if alcohol drinking leads to sin, I am against drinking alcohol. I join with the Premier in wishing that nobody wanted alcohol or wanted to drink alcoholic beverages. I wish it wasn't necessary, and I don't know why, and I don't think anybody in this room knows why people drink alcoholic beverages. Ask anybody that you know why he drinks, he will give you a variety of reasons, but none of them will be basic – he doesn't know himself because there is a variety of reasons. I wish it wasn't necessary, but what everybody has said is this. If we are going to have new liquor outlets, we have got to have more comprehensive education on alcohol. What I would like to know is what people mean by more comprehensive education.

The Minister of Education, the other day, dealt very extensively with the matter and told what is being done in the field of education on the matters of the evil of the demon rum. I don't believe there is one solitary adult or 'teenage person who has passed Grade XII who doesn't know now that alcohol is not good for the human body. I don't think any amount taught or argument or education is going to convince that 'teenager any more than he or she is now convinced through the teachings in the school, and in Sunday Schools and in their homes in some cases, possibly all too few cases, that alcohol is bad.

I will tell you the field of alcoholic education needs to take place somewhere else in society. I have here a page I took out of 'Saturday Night' of February 28th, and I find in this that in 1957, in Canada, according to them, we spent \$1,700,000,000 on defence; \$1,900,000,000 on cars and \$1,300,000,000 on tobacco and alcoholic beverages. How in the world could a little province like Saskatchewan possibly compete in the financial field against people who are out for the profits that there are to be gained in that \$1,300,000,000 of spending power in alcohol and tobacco? Every magazine you pick up from outside here (and a great many other periodicals) is full of the advertisements for alcohol, coaxing people to drink. A lineman can't even climb up and fix wire on a power pole or a telephone pole over a canyon in the mountains but what he has to come down and have a bottle of Molson's or Labatt's ale; a young woman getting married picks up a magazine and can't help but find out that to be a gracious hostess she must serve Bright's wine or some other kind of wine – all that advertising in order for the people who manufacture these things to get a hold of the profit-dollars that there are in the \$1,300,000,000 for these things.

I am all for education, too, Mr. Speaker, but I am

unconvinced that it is possible to carry on the kind of an educational program that will produce the results that the proponents of it here say, I am all for that education; but somebody must get down and do some good hard digging to find out why people drink, what makes it necessary to have alcohol, and how you are going to combat the education that tells them they must have alcohol if they are going to be distinguished gentlemen or gracious hostesses or the rugged, hardboiled linemen on the power poles of our Rocky Mountains.

However, in the field of alcoholism, I want to point out what this Government has done. It has tried to approach the matter sensibly step by step. A few years ago the Bureau of Alcoholism was established, and a director was appointed, the director was told to study all that he could about this matter from people who had already made a study and had had some experience, and he has done so. He was told that when his studies were completed he was to compile a report and present that report to the Government. He has done so. The Government now in its wisdom – in our opinion it is wisdom over here; I suppose it isn't wisdom according to our friends on the other side – have felt that the next step to take was to enlarge that Bureau to the point where there will be a referral centre in Regina, and that will be done this summer, followed later by the next steps as are indicated, because this whole field of alcohol beverages and alcoholism as a disease is one that cannot be approached with gay and carefree abandon by everybody who thinks that he or she has the answer. It can only be done by a careful study and careful steps so that eventually you lead into the place where you might hope to have some effect on the people who are presently addicted to it, and also a great deal of effect on the people who might (if they follow the advertisements you see in the magazines that I mentioned a while ago) become affected if they follow those and become alcoholics in turn.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a whole lot more, but, as I said, I must not encroach on the time of my very good friend opposite. You can gather that I am proud of the budget our Treasurer submitted, and I will support it most enthusiastically.

**Mr. Ross McCarthy (Cannington):** – Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the budget debate at this late date, I am going to dispense with the formalities. I do want to say, however, that I enjoyed the Provincial Treasurer's presentation of the budget. It seemed to me that as time goes on, he gets a little more mellow. I remember the time of the first budgets he presented, they were the best budgets in the world, and it was the greatest government in the world. I think time is probably mellowing him now, and he presented (in his own words) a very ordinary budget.

However, he is still able to do some great gymnastics with figures, and one of the great gymnastics he did with figures in this budget was to say there was no increase in taxes. I have here 'The Leader-Post' of February 27th, and up on the top it says, "No Increase in Taxes." Then down just below that, "the Government is going to tax the oil under the road allowances." That's the greatest joke I have heard since I was a boy – taxing the oil under the road allowance. What it is doing actually is putting a one per cent tax on the

oil production of this province, so that we can't have it both ways. We can't say we have no increase in taxes, and still place a tax on oil. Now, I am not in a position to argue whether a cent on that oil is enough, or too much. We can argue that it brings in half a million while others bring in millions, and I don't know the theory. I am quite sure the theory of taxing oil under the road allowance is not sound, but I'm going to leave it to my friend the Provincial Treasurer and the oil companies to find out for themselves.

I might just say, in passing, that probably that system of taxation of oil is much more fair than some others that we have, for instance, it is a much more fair system, in my opinion, than this three-cent tax which we have, the acre-tax we have on mineral rights. That is, as I have said before, and will repeat again, a vicious tax. We are attempting to tax something that may or may not exist. I don't know if there is any law of taxation where you go to work and tax something that may or may not be there. My idea of taxation is that you must tax something tangible, and certainly that is not tangible. After all, this three-cents per acre is a misnomer, too, because it could run up to a great deal more, and in some cases it does run up to more than that. I know of instances where it has. A few years ago, when I was talking about this, they said, "Oh, you've got to tax the C.P.R., the Hudson's Bay; you've got to tax the large owners." but some of these things have been split, and they are already collecting the three-cent tax from the C.P.R., then they turn around and bill the farmer for another three and go right back – the farmer didn't know he had any minerals and the Government didn't know if he had minerals – and that made it six cents. The C.P.R. had already paid the three-cent tax and this three-cent tax is applied to the farmer. That, in my opinion, is a vicious tax. That's all I'm going to say about that.

I'm sorry the hon. Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Bentley) isn't in his seat, as I wanted to pass a few remarks on what he said; but I guess I'd better do it, anyway.

**Mr. Cameron:** – He may never be back!

**Mr. McCarthy:** – I want to say that, in my opinion, last night – (not today, but last night) the Minister of Social Welfare gave a very distorted picture of the history of this province. I have lived in this province for 56 years, and my recollection of the early days is that we were a happy bunch, contented people, hard-working, with great visions of the future. We never heard of mental health in those days; we were too busy. I do hope the young people won't take too seriously the distorted history he gave of this province, last night, I like to see their shining faces, and I'm afraid, if they take it too seriously, when they get to the age of my friend, the Minister of Social Welfare, they may have a similar view on life to which he has now!

Mr. Speaker, since this House has been in session, there have been a lot of people reading from the 'Monetary Times' and they got a lot of satisfaction about what this chap has said about Saskatchewan; but they only tell half the story. There is a whole column here on the western

provinces, but they only tell half the story. They read the first paragraph, so I'm going to read the last paragraph and so we will get the whole picture. He is talking about British Columbia, and I will quote:

"The C.C.F. are ready and confident, and have a lot of socialist plans. Despite the fact that the Socreds have a lot of screwball ideas and screwier candidates, business, as well as the man on the street, may be obliged to vote for the Social Credit, which they do not like, to keep out of power a party which they like less, the pink-infiltrated C.C.F."

**Opposition Members:** – Hear! Hear!

**Mr. McCarthy:** – If those people over there think as much of that man's opinion as they made out they did, then they must be very doubtful about the results in British Columbia, and, after all, British Columbia is the only province, outside of Saskatchewan, where they have any C.C.F. at all. They haven't for too many there and, if this fellow's opinion is right, they'll have less.

**Mr. A.L.S. Brown:** – Nice going, Ross!

**Mr. McCarthy:** – Mr. Speaker, – gee whiz, the powers that be have used up half the time before I got started! I wanted to discuss with you, just for a few minutes, some of the positions in which our municipalities find themselves at this time. I had the opportunity last week of attending the Municipal convention in Saskatoon, and I found the municipal men in this province greatly disturbed. There are a great many reasons for this, but most of them can be laid at the doorstep of this Government. They started this so-called 'Conference' in this city in 1956, when most of the Ministers got up and expounded the theory that the rural municipalities were not any good, probably never were any good, and certainly at this time had outlived their usefulness. In my opinion, the quickest way to destroy democracy is to destroy our local governments, and that is just what this Government is doing.

**Mr. Cameron:** – That's right.

**Mr. McCarthy:** – Through speakers, and through their so-called conferences, through reports of the conferences, and by propaganda carried on by the local newspaper, they haven't a good word to say for our municipalities in any respect. I just went to read, or show you, an item that appeared in 'The Leader-Post' here since we have been in Session. On the top of this item is, "More Councils in the Red Than Last" and they go on down (I'm not going to read it all) but they went on to say that the municipalities – here is one of the statements – I don't think you ever pick up a 'Leader-Post' but what this Government has some sort of a release from some department of government. Sometimes there are two, and they are all slanted in either of two directions.

One is slanted towards what a wonderful little wagon their Government is, and the other is slanted at some individual or institution, and this one was slanted at the municipalities. It was very unfair, in my opinion. It went on to talk about financing, and it reads:

“The report termed the increase ‘disappointing’. Possibly there is an administrative weakness in those municipalities incurring deficits in that budgets, after being prepared, are not reviewed during the year with a few curtailing expenditures where it is indicated that a deficit might result.”

That’s all right; nobody likes deficits, and I think whether it is individually, municipally, or provincially or Dominion-wide, if we continue to have deficits we are asking for trouble. I took the trouble to look up this record as to deficits, and I found, what I expected to find, that some of the deficits were very, very minor. I would like just to run over two or three of them: Municipality No. 108, Bone Creek, had a deficit of \$553 out of an expenditure of \$208,000. Another one, No. 224, Maple Bush, had a deficit of \$400 out an expenditure of \$7,900. No. 401, Hoodoo, had a deficit of \$600 out of an expenditure of \$183,000. Medstead, No. 497 had a deficit of \$900 out of \$790, . . . I am going to admit those were the lower ones; but the whole picture doesn’t warrant a heading like that in the paper. The whole picture does not warrant that sort of a heading.

There are cases, Mr. Speaker, as you well know, when it is probably good business for a municipality to have a few deficits, and probably some quite large ones. I have in mind a municipality down in my district where they are building the grid road, and there are two miles of very, very low wet ground. A year or so ago, after they finished the program, that place dried up and there was a contractor there ready to go to work, and they made a very favourable deal with him. They finished the road. That probably ran them into deficit of \$6,000 or \$7,000, but that was a good business deficit, and the fact that we have this deficit indicates there’s a place for them. Anybody or any outfit, either municipal or provincial, that continues to have deficits is then looking for trouble, but the municipalities certainly are not entitled to that sort of abuse from this department of government. If you look at the over all surpluses in our municipalities for the year which we have a last record, you will find the over all picture shows they have a one-third of a million dollars of a surplus. So I say again they are not entitled to that sort of treatment.

A little later on in this same report, it said:

“The villages and rural municipal debenture borrowing was insignificant.”

That’s more than this Government or the Dominion Government can say. That is, they were looking after their business, paying their way, which I think they should do. Now, neither this Government nor the Tory Government at Ottawa are

in the happy position financially that our municipalities are today.

Mr. Speaker, I have run out of time. There are a lot of things I would like to have carried on with, but I do not intend to encroach on the time of my good friend from Arm River (Mr. Danielson), and I will have to tell you about this at some future time. I am sure you will know, that I will not support the budget.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River):** – Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I can assure you that anyone who has been sitting here for the last three weeks listening to this debate has lots of topics upon which he can talk.

One thing that is evident to me is that we must be approaching another election because we have had here, this Session, at least half, and in some cases two-thirds, of the time taken up by every Minister of this House in rehearsing the dirty ‘thirties’ – in the time before 1944. Anyone who has listened to them must come to the conclusion that we had nothing in Saskatchewan – there wasn’t even a province – before 1944. As far as most of their statements are concerned they are just about like the wind. I have sat here day after day and listened to tall statements that are absolutely untrue, and they know they are untrue.

**Mr. Loftson (Saltcoats):** – That’s their long suit!

**Mr. Danielson:** – First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to finish a little business which I started last year. I was speaking, last year, on March 20th, on a Resolution which reads as follows:

“That this Assembly recommend to the Provincial Government that, before any basic change is made in the organization of Municipal Government in Saskatchewan, consideration be given to the report of the Continuing Committee on Local Government, and consultation be held with local government organizations regarding the best method of ascertaining the wishes of their ratepayers.”

That simply means that this Government should give the ratepayers a chance to vote on whether they want any change in their municipal governments or anything else before anything of that kind of could be put into operation. It was just as simple as that.

I made a certain statement about that. I said this, to my mind, was the same proceeding that was followed in regard to the larger School Units in this province. Now I have nothing with me to prove that statement and evidently the Minister of Education, together with the Premier and a few of his other Ministers, resented it, and they all pounced on me like a bunch of wolves and they were going to prove that I was wrong in making that statement. Well now, I am going to give this House the facts. I made that

statement, and here is what the Minister of Education said:

“Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege again, I assure the members of the House that in every instance where the petition was that which was prescribed in the Act, a vote was taken. Mr. Speaker, I am making this statement. It is correct; but I don’t expect the member for Arm River to accept it. He isn’t that kind of person.

I said this:

“Mr. Speaker, I can ask your permission to bring the proof into this House. I haven’t got it with me, but I think we can find it in the Journals of this House.”

Mr. Fines said this:

“Go ahead and search them!”

I said this:

“And you can find it in the public press.”

Then Mr. Nollet chipped in a little bit, and I said: “That’s all right. Here is what they did, Mr. Speaker. They didn’t let them vote then, but they did say ‘you can vote five years from now!’”

That is from the records of the last Session. Then the Premier steps in and he said:

“They could have voted then.”

The Minister of Education said this:

“I assure the members of the House that in every instance where the petition was that which was prescribed in the Act, a vote was taken.”

So you can draw your own conclusions as to how these two statements corresponded and fit into each other.

The Larger School Unit Act was passed in the special Session of 1944. It is in the Journals of the House, on Page 69. There was no vote taken on The Larger School Unit Act; it was passed unanimously by the House. There was no vote taken regardless of what anyone says on the other side of the House. Now what was that? Well, it was nothing compared with what they promised to the people of Saskatchewan previous to the 1944 election they were going to put into effect. They said then: “We are

going to put into operation the legislation that is now on the Statute books.” That is the legislation which provided for certain experimental Units to be set up at the request of the people concerned.

During the first Session of the Legislature under this Government, The School Divisions Act was repealed and replaced by the Larger School Unit Act – Chapter 41, Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1944, Special Session. This new Act made some very important changes from the previous Act. Its permissive feature was replaced by a provision for compulsion. It took out of the Act the provision guaranteeing the ratepayers the right to vote and replaced it with a provision giving the Government power to enforce Larger Units on the people. Section 3 reads as follows:

“3. – (1) Subject to subsections (2) and (3) where it appears to the Minister advisable in the interest of education so to do, the Minister with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council may from time to time by order, notice of which shall be published in The Saskatchewan Gazette, establish school units consisting in each case of such number of rural or rural and village public school districts as employ approximately eighty teachers.”

Subsection (2) reads as follows:

“(2) The minister may before the establishment of a school unit recommend to the Lieutenant Governor in Council that the question of establishment of the unit be submitted to a vote of the resident ratepayers of the school districts comprising the proposed unit, and upon such recommendation the Lieutenant Governor in Council may order that a vote be taken.”

Note that it says: “may order that a vote be taken.” Now that was the legislation as it stood at the end of the 1944 Special Session, or the Second Session as it was called.

At the following Session in 1945, the regular Session of 1945, there was an amendment made; and I have here a copy of the amendment and a copy of the letter which was sent to the school districts by the Deputy Minister of Education, Mr. Ross. That amendment reads as follows:

“2. – Subsection (2) of section 3 is amended by adding thereto the following proviso:

“Provided that the Minister shall order that a vote be taken if a petition for such a vote, signed by at least twenty per cent of the resident ratepayers in the proposed unit, is



presented to the Minister within thirty days after notice has been given by the Minister to the Secretary Treasurers of the school districts concerned of his intention to establish a school unit consisting of these districts, and if the petition bears the signatures of residents ratepayers in a majority of the school districts within the proposed unit.”

That was the Act as it was left at the end of the 1945 Session. It is on the statutes, and no one can argue that it isn't correct.

Now let us see what happened. The Premier, in the 1944 Session when this matter was before the House – that was the Special Session, October 14, 1944 – said this:

“There is another theory being suggested frequently and that is that we should run around the country counting noses and holding plebiscites before we launch new measures. There is only one country that I know of that take plebiscites and that is in Nazi Germany. In Saskatchewan we believe in the British parliamentary system and responsible government. The members of the Legislature have been given certain mandates; the people have spoken; they are sick and tired of vacillations and delays.”

But the mandate given in the 1944 election, Mr. Speaker, was that the permissive legislation then on the statutes books would be implemented by this Government – nothing else.

Time goes along, and it is remarkable how these promises accumulate and how they return to plague those who made them. There were certain actions and certain promises made. There was a School Trustee Convention held in the city of Regina on February 12 – not 1944 or 1945 – but 1946, and here is what the Minister of Education said to that convention:

“Units have been established (16) to date. At present it appears that areas have petitioned under the requirements of the Act, for a vote in those areas. This vote will be taken in some areas this summer; it is improbable that arrangements will be made for a vote in all the areas.”

Now I want you to bear in mind that date – February 12, 1946.

This is from the Journals of the House – you laugh, but you follow this thing, and you shall see who is right and who isn't. On February 19, 1946, Mr. Hooge, the member for Rosthern, ask the

March 10, 1959

Government the following Question which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Lloyd:

“(1) From what proposed Larger School Units were petitions received asking for a vote to be taken before the Unit was established?”

And here is the answer of the Minister:

“Petitions for a vote were received from one or more school districts in every one of the sixty proposed Larger School Units, but in only fifteen proposed Units did the number of petitions approach or reach a majority as required by Section 3 of the Act.”

There is no question about what he said, I think that is right. But, here comes a reply from the Minister of Education to a question by Mr. Hooze for a list of the names of the proposed Larger School Units where a petition had been received asking for a vote before the establishment of the proposed Larger Unit. These were:

“Willowbunch, Moosomin, Regina, Melville south, Canora, Wakaw, Tisdale, Yorkton, Indian Head, Gull Lake, Watrous. Elrose, Rosetown, Rosthern, Lloydminster.”

And there you have the 15, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Hooze also inquired what proposed Larger School Units had submitted a petition which complied (get this. Mr. Speaker) with the requirements of The Larger School Units Act, and Mr. Lloyd replied that all but Rosetown and Willowbunch had complied. These two Units did not bear the signatures of the majority of those school districts. But that left 13 – and none of them had been granted a vote at that time. That was in February 1947 – not 1944 or 1946, but 1947; and no vote had been taken.

Now I want to leave it to the House as to who was right last year, when this question came up, the Minister or myself.

**Opposition Members:** – Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** – You can laugh now, but you know you were lying when you said that.

**Hon Mr. Lloyd:** – Might I ask the hon. member a question? Has the vote been taken since that time?

**Mr. Danielson:** – You can try to talk around it or confuse the issue all you like, but that is typical of the whole group over there. Every one of them does that consistently and persistently.

While I am on the subject of education I am going to say a little more, Mr. Speaker. Before 1944, the C.C.F. had a platform,

or a program, for education and it said this:

“The first thing that a C.C.F. government would do would be to recognize education as the responsibility of the Provincial Government. There has been a tendency on the part of provincial governments to pass the buck to the municipalities and local school boards to provide educational facilities.

The time has come when we must recognize that Canada’s Constitution places the responsibility for the teaching of our children squarely upon the Provincial Government and it cannot be passed to any other body.”

That is the C.C.F.! That was part of their program in 1943, February 16th. Then we go to the ‘Commonwealth’ and there is a heading: “KNOW WHAT YOU ARE VOTING FOR.” You know that is pretty hard, Mr. Speaker, because they don’t tell the same story twice in one day even. They contradict themselves all the time. But what they said here was this:

“The British North America Act, which is Canada’s Constitution, makes education a provincial, not a municipal or local responsibility. All along the Provincial Government has been evading its duty. It has made grants to schools, outlines courses of study, and provided for inspection of schools, but it has left the main burden of maintaining school services upon the municipalities and the local school boards. The main burden does not belong there. A C.C.F. Government will accept the responsibility laid on it by our Constitution.”

That was in 1944. The first one I read was in 1943.

Now we come to 1945, and the big man in Education in this province speaks for himself, and here is what he said in 1945:

“The ideal way of financing education in Canada would be to secure the money from wherever Canada’s wealth exists and spend it where there is need for that money.”

That is what the Hon. Woodrow S. Lloyd, Minister of Education, told a gathering of teachers and parents in the Legion Hall in Estevan. Then Mr. Lloyd continued:

March 10, 1959

“We cannot go that far in Saskatchewan, of course, but we hope to make education a provincial responsibility because it is quite important to each individual that somebody else’s child be educated as well as his own.”

There you have three statements – one in the platform of the C.C.F. party; the other originated with the political organ of the C.C.F. Party. One was 1943, the other was 1944; and then in 1945, the Minister himself comes out and says that education is provincial responsibility.

So there you have it. But last year – you know it is wonderful how these things clarify themselves. This thing was brought up on the floor of the House last year, and the Premier was sweating it out, and the Minister of Education, just to let him off the hook, got up and said this:

“No responsible person would take the Premier at his word.”

“Let me tell you what he means.”

And what he said was this:

“No intelligent person could interpret the Premier’s promise to mean that the Province would pay the entire cost of education.”

What he said amounts to this – that anyone who believes the Premier is a darned fool. That is that it means: “No intelligent person would believe him.”

**Mr. Loptson:** – I guess he was right, too.

**Mr. Danielson:** – The only one I know of who believed him was the Minister of Education, and he only did that to try and get him off the hook last year. Now that is your record with regard to education. Here is a clear demonstration, without any questions whatever, of what they consistently do.

We hear a lot in this House of the great concern the C.C.F. has for the farm population of this province, particularly. One would think that previous to the advent of this Government there was no provision made for the farmers, or any institution set up in this province to assist the farmers, in building up their farms, or in building up their holdings in this new Province of Saskatchewan. Now we have tried for the

last 10 years at least – and I think we can go back to 1944, when the revenues of this province began to increase by leaps and bounds due to doubling of taxation by this Government. The gasoline tax was 7 cents a gallon and now it is 12. When we saw that the revenue was coming in to this government, we consistently urged them to set up a loaning board, or a financing board which could enable the young people of this province, who lacked money and, owing to the socialistic legislation placed on the statute books of this province could not finance any other way. We asked them to set up a body which could loan money to the young people so that they could get settled and begin operating their own farms. They laughed at us and they put themselves on record very clearly establishing that they didn't give a hang for the farmers of this province.

On February 19, 1958, the Premier said this:

“The suggestion by the Leader of the Opposition that the Government should institute a method of farm credit in Saskatchewan is ridiculous.”

He said it was “ridiculous!” On February 23, 1951, Mr. Nollet said:

“The Farm Loan Board was the most foolhardy venture that was ever undertaken by anyone.”

Now that was a form of credit for the farmers, Mr. Speaker. And then we have more of the members of the House; we have the member for Kelvington (Mr. Howe) and he said this:

“Anyone who has done anything to help set up any young man on the farm was doing that man a disservice.”

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** – Why don't you quote the rest of it?

**Mr. Danielson:** – Have you ever heard a more convincing or convicting statement?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** – Quote the rest of it.

**Mr. Danielson:** – What are they doing now? After all these years, when they were supposed to be going forward and showing something – all this sentiment that they speak about so much – their promises have never been executed. Alberta and Manitoba and several other provinces have come forward – and, by the way, they don't pretend to be all for the poor man, but they have done things. But at this Session this Government is coming forward and what are they doing? They haven't got the courage to set up their own body and do their own work, but they are going to hand the problem to the Co-operative Credit Union to do it for them.

**Mr. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** – And charging 7 per cent.

**Mr. Danielson:** – At 7 per cent, yes. And the Provincial Treasurer told us in Crown Corporations, a few years ago, when we suggested that the \$75,000 loan to the outdoor picture show over here on No. 1 Highway, could have been used to finance some young farmers to settle on farms, that that was unthinkable, because they would have to charge from 11 to 12 per cent interest to do that; it was too risky a business. Well, of course, this outdoor theatre was more safe, in his mind, than the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan, or the young people of the province.

These are things, Mr. Speaker, that I just want to remind you about. But now, after our arguing and picking at them every year to do this thing, they have finally come forward and they think that they are going to escape the penalty for their sins when an election comes up. That is as sure as I am standing here, but they are not going to escape.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they are going to try to build up a new C.C.F. Party. I was rather amused to read all these expressions for and against and all that sort of thing, and then listening to the Premier on the floor of this House when he told us the Liberal Party was dead, that it was passing out and his party was the one that was coming in. Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, a few years ago, he went down to New York and addressed a Communist organization and he said there were only two ideologies in this world . . .

**Premier Douglas:** – Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I don't want to interrupt my friend, but I never, at any time, went to New York to address a Communist organization. My hon. friend is making is making a statement which he knows is not true. I am telling him that I have never in my life addressed a Communist organization and I ask my hon. friend to withdraw that statement.

**Mr. Danielson:** – Well, I know there were plenty of good Communists at that meeting, but all right, I'll withdraw it. But it wasn't his fault that it wasn't called that. It is a United States Law that didn't permit them to call it that.

The Premier, of course, has done everything that he could possibly do to discredit and belittle anything that has ever been done by the Liberal Party in Ottawa and the Liberal Party in this province. According to him there is only one organization that has done anything here, and that is the C.C.F. Well, as I said, when the Premier goes away from home sometimes he tells the truth. He went down to Montreal not long ago, on July 24, 1958, and he was speaking to C.C.F. delegates at their national convention in support of the pending merger with the C.L.C. He says this:

“C.C.F. delegates in nation convention Thursday morning insisted the party basic principle of Socialism be retained in the pending merger with the C.L.C., but expressed forthright support for that merger.”

“For the C.C.F. it was evident from what various Speakers said, that the affiliation must take place.”

“Saskatchewan Premier T.C. Douglas declared that if the C.C.F. missed this opportunity ‘we will wander in the wilderness for many years’.”

You see! He is shaking his fist, right now. He knows that his days are numbered.

And they went on to say this:

“The present step was a culmination of the principles and policies enunciated since earliest C.C.F. foundation days.

“Premier Douglas left little doubt that in his view the prime enemy of the C.C.F. organization was now the Liberal Party . . .”

The Liberal Party! That is what the Premier of this province said.

“. . . and that the Socialist movement was out to supplant it.”

But it hasn’t yet – the Liberal Party was the one he had to get rid of first:

“The C.C.F. could remain a small successful splinter group but in such circumstances, there would never be a planned economy in Canada and there would never be a new deal for the ordinary citizen.”

I must commend the Premier for being honest just for once.

**Premier Douglas:** – The puts me one up on you.

**Mr. Danielson:** – That is a wisdom he very seldom exhibits in Saskatchewan. Now what do the farmers get out of this C.C.F. Party? Well, I have several articles. There was Mr. Phelps – ‘Joe’ Phelps – the fellow who said on the floor of this House that nobody would pay the mineral tax that they put on to the farmers of this province – the wouldn’t pay it and the minerals under the farmers’ land would revert back to the Crown. That was one way of expropriating the farmers’ minerals.

He said, also, in regard to oil: “we will watch the proceedings and when the right time comes we’ll take it.” Of course they had to get rid of Phelps, because he didn’t keep his mouth shut long enough.

March 10, 1959

But Mr. Phelps said this:

“Politics should be left outside the door of a Farm Union Convention. He said the original resolution would lead the union down the ‘garden path’ to oblivion.

“Mr. Phelps said he considered labour union partners of doubtful value. He said labour unions would lose prestige unless their selfish attitude was changed.”

Mr. Phelps said that, and he is a fine fellow. We also have the member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies), a member of the C.C.F. – I like him and he is a fine fellow. But Mr. Phelps wasn’t always in agreement with labour. He said the labour unions would lose prestige unless their selfish attitude was changed. Mr. Hansen, of the SFU, defended the resolution. He wanted to line up with labour, but Mr. Phelps did not.

Mr. Coldwell said this, on Wednesday, April 26, 1958, that he never liked the name ‘Co-operative Commonwealth Federation’, and it should be changed within the next year. I quote:

“Mr. Coldwell commented in an interview on the decision of the Canadian Labour Congress to set up a new political movement with the C.C.F. as a core.

“When the C.C.F. was being formed he suggested the name ‘Social Democrats’. It may be that the name of the new party will be changed from C.C.F. However, I think I can assure you that it will not be known as the ‘Labour Party’.”

What is this? This must be a secret society! Something like the Ku Klux Klan, because they are afraid to come out and say “we are so-and-so, or we are so-and-so.” They say, in effect, “we want to join up with the labour party, but at least in the title ‘labour’ must be entirely eliminated.”

I was very much interested in Mr. Argue – you know he is the lone wolf from western Canada. Western Canada has no spokesman in the Councils of the nation at Ottawa; but Mr. Argue has a very big opinion about himself, and he said this, when he came home after the Session, I think it was. Anyway, I think it was on June 30th, he said this:

“He was glad to be away from the House to come back here and look ‘at some intelligent people’.”

That’s what he said. I’ll tell you what I think he did; he went out to get some lollipops and a rattle. He came back here to look at some intelligent people! And it says more:



“The member for Assiniboia was main speaker at a banquet in the Elks hall, following the annual meeting of the Weyburn C.C.F. Constituency Association. Premier T.C. Douglas also addressed the meeting.

“Mr. Argue told his listeners that on March 31 a lot of people voted for a vision and for John.”

Honest John, the man who is just a vision! The man who loves his fellow Canadians.

**Mr. Cameron:** – Until after the next election.

**Mr. Danielson:** – By that time the C.C.F. will be gone. Lots of people voted for a vision that was ‘John.’ Mr. Argue continued:

“As a result, Progressive Conservative Candidates no matter whether they were qualified or not were elected. He admitted the PC’s had some able members in the House, but there are a ‘lot I’m sure will take four years to learn where to hang their hats and coats’.”

That was Mr. Argue, a C.C.F. member of the House of Commons.

Let us take a look at the result of some of these elections in Canada. I think someone said there are 2,000,000 labour men in Canada altogether; and, of course, I guess this C.C.F. Party has hopes of roping in all 2,000,000 of them. Mr. Stanley Knowles said:

“There is growing anxiety in C.C.F. ranks about the attitude of organized labour. It is by no means certain that the new left-wing party which the Trade Union Congress plans to set up will be on the lines of the C.C.F. This uncertainty found expression in a speech by Mr. Stanley Knowles to a meeting of trade unionists held recently in Winnipeg. Mr. Knowles is a devout C.C.F. supporter and also an official of the T.U.C. In his speech Mr. Knowles pointed out that there are about two million voters in the ranks of organized labour, yet the C.C.F. polled only 700,000 votes on March 31st. And then Mr. Knowles declared – ‘Since the C.C.F. is the only party that supports the legislative programme of organized labour, it ought to have done better in the election. It ought to become the Government. It should be the Government.’”

March 10, 1959

That is what Stanley Knowles said. But what would happen? You fellows would get their money and they would have nothing to say about it. But why don't they vote for you? I can't understand that. Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** – I can't understand why the vote for you.

**Mr. Danielson:** – When Mr. Premier came back from the Montreal Convention last summer, he gave an interview to the 'Leader-Post' and he pointed out that some of the problems of the past for the C.C.F. Party had vanished, as indicated by the C.C.F. vote in the last election. The western-born Party polled nearly half its vote in the East, he said – 270,000 in Ontario, and about 100,000 in Quebec and the Maritimes. "This could be significant, or it could amount to nothing," he said, "but it is what we have been talking about for a long time and hoping for, for a long time."

That indicates that the Premier must be crazy – he doesn't know where he is at, at all. But there is one thing, Mr. Speaker, the day will never come when the majority of the labour vote in Canada will go to the C.C.F. It never will. It has been tried in the United States and it has been tried in other countries of the world.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** – What are you worried about then?

**Mr. Danielson:** – I'm not worried.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** – You look worried!

**Mr. Danielson:** – You are the one who is worrying.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** – Why talk about it then?

**Mr. Danielson:** – Well, I am going to talk about it because one of the things that the Premier goes up and down this province trying to make the people believe is that there is no Party that is even in competition with him, because the other fellows are all gone; they are all dead.

This gentleman from Saskatoon, Carlyle King, said that the "hucksters" and so on had elected a government in Canada which was something like a medicine show – or something to that effect. The Leader of the Tory Party went up and down the land and the people flocked to him, he said. Mr. Speaker, that not only happened in Saskatchewan in particular at this time. It is only 12 or 14 years ago, up until 1944 and previous to that time, that we also had one of these Moses that was going to lead us into the promised land – I call him a 'mountebank'. A mountebank is a person who goes out and makes all kinds of promises that he knows he can't fulfil – and he did, and when he got through promising everything he could think of on the face of the earth that his people might enjoy, he said: "Vote C.C.F.; vote for me and the C.C.F. Party and these things shall be yours 'without money and without price.'"

In 1957-58, there was another man, another Moses, and he said this: "You farmers and every labour man and everybody else just follow me and I shall give you not charity but parity." So you see, these two are in the same path. There is something to be said for the latter one. He was a Federal member of the House of Commons and was moving in an atmosphere different entirely from the local atmosphere in one of the provinces. He thought that the receipts going into the federal treasury were not millions and hundreds of millions, but billions every year; and I think perhaps I am going to withhold judgement for a little while yet; because I think he honestly believed that he could, by manipulating the finances of this country, do the things he promised to do. But I think by today – and by the way, it is today that the farmer's delegation talks to the Government in Ottawa – that he has sobered up, and I think he will now take a more planned and sane attitude, a more reasonable and realistic attitude, to the problems of Canada than what has been taken by the present Government so far.

Both of these fellows – the one who is now sitting in this house and the one who is sitting in the 'seat of the mighty' at Ottawa – can be classes in the same category, when they spread their propaganda over the length and breadth of this land in order to get into political power and be able to put over these deeds.

I might say something more about that before I get through, and when I get through with you you won't like it. I have a file here – if I could find it, I think I could do it right now.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** – I've got a basket here you can have.

**Mr. Danielson:** – You know, I've got a file here, Mr. Speaker, and I wrote on the cover of it 'The Evolution of a Socialist'.

**Premier Douglas:** – Is this an autobiography

**Mr. Danielson:** – You know he has been telling me many times in this House that I'm no authority, that he knows better. He doesn't always say what he knows; he says what he thinks he wants to say. But this is what he was going to bring to the people of Saskatchewan – just what Stephen Leacock talked about a few years ago:

"Here in the dreamland of Socialism there are no rainy days. It is sunshine all the time. And for the future let the 'State' provide; while we live it shall feed us, when we fall ill it shall tend us and when we die it shall bury us. Meantime let us eat, drink and be merry and work as little as we can. Let us sit among the flowers. It is too hot to labour. Let us warm ourselves beside the public stove, it is too cold to work."

March 10, 1959

That is the promise that was made to the people of this province over and over again. Everything wonderful was going to come with the C.C.F.

But you know, talking about this thing many times across the floor of the House doesn't bother me, but it is something that bothers the Premier. Every time I say something he doesn't like he jumps up on the floor and says I am not telling the truth and he blames the C.C.F. supporters in my constituency for electing me. He says, "That man Dickson –

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** – An awful burden to bear!

**Mr. Danielson:** – who was the President of the Lake Centre Constituency and the Provincial constituency of Arm River is to blame." Now that is a peculiar thing; but after all, Mr. Speaker, his mind works in a peculiar way. He is the last man on the face of the earth to pick on anyone else and accuse them of being something they are not supposed to be, because his record shows that he has been all things to all men. When he ran for election to the Federal House he was a Social Creditor and a C.C.F.'er both. Here we are – Mr. Speaker, I have something else to show the House. Here is an election pamphlet or folder used by the C.C.F. candidate, who was none other than T.C. Douglas, the present Premier of Saskatchewan, in the Federal Election of 1935. On one side it says:

**SOCIAL CREDIT**

Will Increase the Purchasing  
Power of Everybody

-----

**SOCIAL CREDIT**

Will Mean More Business for  
The Storekeepers

-----

**SOCIAL CREDIT**

Will Mean More Traffic On  
The Railroads

-----

**VOTE**

C.C.F. – SOCIAL CREDIT

on the other side of the pamphlet it reads:

**DOUGLAS**

Has been a Student of  
Social Credit for Many years

-----

**DOUGLAS**

Has Endorsed SOCIAL CREDIT

-----

**THE C.C.F.**  
Will Make the SOCIAL CREDIT  
Scheme Possible  
-----

**VOTE DOUGLAS**

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** – It's a forgery!

**Mr. Danielson:** – Douglas endorsed the Social Credit. What do you think about that?

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** – You made it up.

**Mr. Danielson:** – Well, I'll tell you. This was issued by the C.C.F. – Social Credit, Weyburn Federal Constituency, Herald Printing Co., Weyburn, Sask.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** – Oh, you must have made it up.

**Mr. Danielson:** – That's where it came from. And I have a letter here printed in the Regina 'Leader-Post'. I can read it to this House. This fellow has signed his name to it, and it was written when the Premier was a candidate for the Federal House for the constituency of Weyburn. This fellow said, when the Premier called at his home: "My old granddaddy always asked everybody to stay for supper, but he evidently didn't like the looks of this candidate because he didn't ask him to stay for supper." but he went on to tell about the card with printing on both sides – one side Social Credit and the other C.C.F. What do you think of that?

He is the last man on the face of the earth to try and throw suspicion or insults on anyone else, because they may have come from a Conservative home or a Liberal home. I hope the Premier can remember these things, and I have a lot more here that I could read to you if I wanted to.

I am going to say a few words about labour. I know very well, Mr. Speaker, that any person on this side of the House who mentions labour is going to be ostracized and blackballed all over the province, because he is going to be smeared by the C.C.F., and they are experts at handling a smearing campaign.

A week ago last Monday, I was listening to a reporter's broadcast immediately after the CBC news; and here was a man – a British member of Parliament – speaking. I am going to read you just part of what he said. Anyone can get a copy of this, and I think every one of them over there should have a copy. This is a talk by Mr. Ted Leather, British M.P. for North Somerset, England, broadcasting over CBW Winnipeg, 9:20 to 9:30 pm Central Standard Time, Sunday, February 15, 1959. I listened to him speak and I made up my mind I was going to try and get a copy and I did get one. He said this:

“I’m a Canadian, just like you. Indeed, I possibly have more right to call myself a Canadian than most of you listening, because my family were pioneers. But it does happen that I have lived abroad for a good many years, in Britain, to be precise, which is, after all, the country where most of the pioneers who built Canada came from. And it also happened that I have spent a great deal of that time engaged in the field of management-labour relations. I’ve been an official of a trade union branch. I’ve also been right through the rungs of industry from the bottom to the top, and I’ve taken an active part in these matters in British politics.

“I’ve come home this time at the invitation of a great organization in Vancouver, where I now am, to talk to them on the subject. Not to try and say how I think things ought to be done, but merely to point out the differences of how these matters are handled between here and Britain.

“This is indeed, a great and prosperous country, but, you know, the rest of the world does not owe us a living. And our prosperity is not some great gift from The Almighty bestowed only on those who were clever enough to get themselves born on the North American continent.

“In fact, I’m sure that history will record that the basic reason why North America, that is both Canada and the United States, have for the last 13 years appeared to be so much better off than the rest of the world, really was because of the fact that the end of the Second World War found the economics of our countries vastly strengthened while that of Western Europe, including Britain, were in devastation and in ruins. The result is that for a good many years now we have got accustomed to having the rest of the world at our feet. Believe me, that is very far from being true in 1959.

“One of the great miracles of the last 14 years has been the resurgence of European in general, and the British economy in particular, economy and industry from the devastation of 1945. There could be no more eloquent proof of this than the way in which American exports have crashed in the last 12 months. I know that for a long time my friends in the trade unions have got a bit sick of hearing employers say that another round of wage increases would price them out of their export markets. But the fact of the matter is that it has now happened.

“The students of world economic facts of life at this moment would be forced to record that the British pound sterling has suddenly once again become one of the strongest currencies in the world. Holders of American dollars to the extent of many

millions in the last 12 months have transferred their money into sterling. Britain will this year have a record budgetary surplus. It looks as though Canada is likely to have a record budgetary deficit. Britain will undoubtedly have a record balance of payments surplus. Canada's balance of payments deficits is of an enormous order. But it is, of course, financed year after year by American investments into Canada. Canada and the United States have now got themselves onto a price level which is just completely out of line with the rest of the world. Now if I were an American that wouldn't worry me very much, because America is a vast country with a widely diversified economy and exports, to Americans, are just the bit that drops over the end. Exports, to Canada, are a very different matter indeed.

"It is in this context, then, that I see the immense importance of wage matters and relationships in industry and particularly the problem of industrial strikes. Here, too, it unfortunately happens that there is a wide difference of experience on the two sides of the Atlantic. Year after year, Britain, with all her complications, is amongst those countries which loses the fewest man-hours production from strikes. The comparable figures for Canada, that is to say, man-hours, lost per worker through strikes and lock-outs, usually runs anything between three and seven times as much. In fact, in British Columbia; their local figure in the last 12 months has been the worst in the world – even worse than our friends in the United States who have consistently had the world's worst record for time lost through strikes, and of course – alas – a unique record for corruption, gangsterism, intimidation and so on, in the trade union field.

"British trade union leaders, too, have long since accepted that though the right to strike is vitally important – and we do, of course, still have some strikes – that the strike is a blunt and outmoded weapon which does very little good for the workers and harm to the national economy. In an age of large public companies, after all, where all the management continue to draw their salaries whether the company is on strike or not, the strike has very little effect on the direct employers. British trade union leaders have also long since learned and accepted the logic of the fact that continually increased money wages without any relation whatever to increased production of real wealth, produce in the end nothing but inflation.

"I think those principles are possibly worthy of your study. Sorry to end on a sombre note, but I am absolutely certain that unless you can bring about a better spirit within Canadian industry, and unless you can get some stability in wages – which, after all, are the most important factor in the national economy – then Canadian exports will have a tough time against a revitalized, streamlined and efficient European industry. And that spells nothing but unemployment for Canadian workers."

March 10, 1959

He explained the different methods of settling strikes in the United Kingdom and in Canada. He showed that Canada and the United States, in 1958, were the worst places in the world for strikes and the province of British Columbia was the worst in the world for labour strikes.

He said that we have priced ourselves out of the markets of the world. That is not a very flattering thing to hear, Mr. Speaker, but after all it is the truth. And when we look at these things and consider, we find that we have nearly all the worst strikes in the best paid industries. I would not say this if it wasn't true; I am just stating the facts. We had the steel strike, and the average wage in this industry was \$2.30 per hour. This is the average. We had the nickel strike and the average wage there was \$2.39 per hour, or \$92 per week. Then we had the seamen's strike for six weeks during harvest time, during heavy movement of wheat and other materials, and there was only one place in Canada where you could unload a cartload of wheat. Why was that? Well, Mr. Speaker, most of the strikes are in the highest paid industries in the country. As far as the seamen's strike in British Columbia was concerned, the wages there were \$2.57 per hour; at Montreal they were \$2.02 per hour. The fact remains that we, as farmers, were on the spot, and this excerpt from the speech which I just read should be taken seriously, because there is no politics in it. It just contained facts.

Let me say this to you, We, as farmers, know one thing and it is that, looking back over the years (and the Minister of Agriculture should be here now), looking back at the packing house strikes, the Great Lakes strikes, the terminal strikes and all the strikes that have been taking place affecting agriculture, have all happened at the very time of the year when they have been able to cripple us financially and stop all movement of our products. They can talk all they like and pass all the resolutions they like, but actions speak louder than words, and you will have some difficulty to convince the farmers of Saskatchewan and the farmers of western Canada that they have anything in common with labour, because their actions completely show, without contradiction, that they have (at least it would appear to us) taken action when it would do the most harm to us in western Canada.

That is one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I decided to speak on labour. I have no fault to find with labour, but very few of you gentlemen with your white collars are any more concerned than I am, but you go and talk to the farmers about labour and see what they say. Sure, we have price control during the war; but we also had wage control, and anybody who talks about price control without control of wages just doesn't know what he is talking about. He is either lying or else he doesn't understand what he is talking about. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, a few years after the war the cost of living went up and labour demanded that wage control be taken off. The price control and wage control were put on together and they were taken off together, which had to be done. Since that time, year after year, more and more strikes. First of all, they said they had to get their wages up to meet the cost of living, and that was true; they did that in about two years time. Then they could not stop and the labour



demands kept growing and growing and what did the industries do? I don't think they put up very much protest. They went along giving it to them, but they added it to the price of the products. As long as we got a good crop and something for our wheat, and had a place to sell it, we went along with them; but the last three years we have come to a dead end. They have got us at the end of the line and we cannot meet the prices we have to pay for the things that we have to have to produce our wheat.

I was in Davidson, the other day, and the International Harvester agent there was sitting talking about strikes and so on, and I asked him if he knew how much the 17 per cent increase in freight rates was going to mean on the price of a new tractor. He said he wasn't sure, but it wouldn't be less than \$27.50. And then you fellows try to tell us that an increase in wages doesn't increase prices! I heard the Premier talk about that and he said: "Anybody who thinks an increase in wages means an increase in prices is crazy." Then he started in to quote on industry which, in 1956, had a total output of such-and-such a dollar value. Then he came to 1957 and the value of the goods manufactured was away up and I went over the figures afterwards and I found that this very firm had increased their wages twice during that time and, of course, that increase in wages was reflected back into the value of the product they were manufacturing. That accounted for the jump in the figures.

Let me say to the labour men and all the others that in no country in the world has labour enjoyed prosperity and contentment with a depressed agricultural economy. We in western Canada are more susceptible to the fluctuation of prices in the world markets because we have to export practically all our goods, and, therefore, we cannot pass the increases on to anybody else. We have a delegation in Ottawa today with a strong case for the farmers. The Minister of Agriculture made a very strong case for the farmers in Saskatoon, as strong a case as I have ever heard, and yet, three or four days afterward he made a radio broadcast, and if you read the two together you will wonder, Mr. Speaker, where their consistency is in this thing, if there is such a thing as consistency in the group. The farmer has to make enough money to take care of his family, the same as any other labourer, if he is going to survive. There is no question about that at all. That is my view as far as labour is concerned.

I have something else here in my file. Here is one – "Premier T.C. Douglas said at a meeting on May 24, 1956, that the Liberals voted against The Farm Security Act." That is another one of your tales.

**Premier Douglas:** – And you denied it.

**Mr. Danielson:** – Yes, and I am going to deny it now.

**Premier Douglas:** – You can't, it is on the records of the House.

**Mr. Danielson:** – I think everybody in this House knows. The Journals of this House, Saskatchewan Legislature, Second Session 1944, Bill No. 50 – An Act respecting the Protection of Certain

March 10, 1959

Mortgagors, Purchasers and Lessees of Farm Land, amended in the 1945 Session. See the Journals of the House, 1945, where it was unanimously agreed to.

**Premier Douglas:** – That is the amendment to the Act, not the original Act.

**Mr. Danielson:** – But you transferred the title from the “Protection of Certain Mortgagors, Purchasers and Lessees of Farm Land” to “The Farm Security Act.” I am going to say to you that you won’t find anything in the Journals or in the records of this House, in any shape or form, to substantiate your statement that we voted against the Farm Security Act.

**Premier Douglas:** – Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. If my hon. friend wants it I will give it to him. The Act is chapter 30, Second Session 1944, called “An Act respecting the Protection of Certain Mortgagors, Purchasers and Lessees of Farm Land.” “This Act should be cited as The Farm Security Act, 1944.” It was introduced in the Legislature on second reading, Wednesday, November 1, 1944, and adjourned by Mr. Procter. The debate was resumed November 2, page 48, The vote was taken and recorded on page 50. The persons voting against the Farm Security Act – Patterson, Procter, Danielson, and Hooge.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** – We caught you red-handed that time, Herman.

**Mr. Danielson:** – No, they didn’t; and here is why. Every word except one clause in that Act was our legislation!

**Premier Douglas:** – Why did you vote against it then?

**Mr. McDonald:** – You just sit and listen a minute.

**Mr. Danielson:** – We haven’t had him this mad for a long time. He is not telling the truth.

**Premier Douglas:** – On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. No person can say that I am not telling the truth when I am quoting from the Journals of the House. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I did not rise on a question of privilege before, during the Speech from the Throne debate, when I said that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues in 1944, had voted against The Farm Security Act, he interjected to say: “That’s a lie.” I did not take time, not because I was on the radio, to ask him to apologize, but let the matter go. But when the hon. gentleman says against that I am not telling the truth, the records are here and he must either say that the records are falsified, or he must admit that this is the Record of the House.

**Mr. Danielson:** – He said the same thing about the Hospitalization Act for years.

**Premier Douglas:** – Never mind the Hospitalization Act.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** – Stop rambling now, and stay on the point!

**Mr. Speaker:** – Order! The hon. member has stated that . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** – I have also read the Act, and the Journals of the House, not once, but twice.

**Mr. Speaker:** – The hon. Minister read from Journals of the House, and he is saying this is the truth.

**Premier Douglas:** – Mr. Speaker says I said I was reading from the Journals of the House. Mr. Speaker, I shall insist, on a point of privilege, that you read it to the House; that you read this record of the House.

**Mr. Danielson:** – Mr. Speaker . . .

**Premier Douglas:** – Mr. Speaker, I must ask the hon. member to sit down. It has been inferred that I am not quoting accurately from the Journals of the House.

**Mr. Danielson:** – I said that you said you were quoting from the Journals, and you can't deny it.

**Premier Douglas:** – The hon. member said, 'He said he was quoting from the Journals of the House.' I was quoting from the Journals of the House, and I am asking you, Mr. Speaker, to say whether or not I quoted accurately.

**Mr. Danielson:** – I must dispute the action, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** – Order! Order! The hon. Premier has handed to me the Journals of the Saskatchewan Legislature, Second Session, 1944. Is it the desire of the House that I read what the member was referring to?

**Govt. Members:** – Yes, read it!

**Mr. Danielson:** – Mr. Speaker, I believe . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** – Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** – Order! Mr. Speaker is on his feet.

**Mr. Speaker:** – I must ask the hon. member to take his seat. It is the will of the House that I read what the Premier has read, and I'm going to read it now:

March 10, 1959

“That Bill No. 50 – an Act respecting the Protection of Certain Mortgagors, Purchasers and Lessees of Farm Land, be now read the second time.”

The debate resuming, and the question being put (this is on page 50 – I’m just following Hansard here), it was agreed to on the following division: Nays were: Messrs. Patterson, Proctor, Danielson, and Hooge.”

I think that is what the Premier read.

**Mr. Danielson:** – Yes. Now then, am I permitted to go ahead?

**Mr. Speaker:** – Yes.

**Mr. Danielson:** – That was in 1944, Mr. Speaker. That was during the Session of 1944. That was not The Farm Security Act

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** – Of course it was.

**Mr. Danielson:** – That was an Act – now he does it again. What would you do with a man like this?

**Premier Douglas:** – Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I just quoted the hon. member the Act which was passed – Bill No. 50 and Section (1) says:

“This Act shall be cited as The Farm Security Act, 1944.”

How can my hon. friend say this is not The Farm Security Act? My hon. friend is caught, and he might just as well admit it.

**Mr. McDonald:** – Admit nothing!

**Mr. Danielson:** – Mr. Speaker, the part of this Act that was put on the statute books in 1944 was “protection of Certain Mortgagors, Purchasers and Lessees of Farm Land.”

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** – It’s still called that.

**Premier Douglas:** – Section (1) is The Farm Security Act.

**Mr. Danielson:** – Then there was a new Act put in in 1945 . . .

**Premier Douglas:** – No, no.

**Mr. Danielson:** – That’s when you picked up all the Liberal legislation, and put it in there.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** – No, no, The Farm Security Act . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** – I'll show you what you did, and I have it before me, Mr. Speaker. You took the section you put into the Land Contracts (Actions) Act, 1943, you took part of an Act and inserted it into this Act to amend The Provincial Mediation Board Act, 1943 – you took sections out of all these Acts, and put them into what you call The Farm Security Act.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** – And you voted against it.

**Mr. Danielson:** – It was our legislation, Mr. Speaker. That was 1945 – you've been talking about 1944.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** – It was 1944, and you know it.

**Premier Douglas:** – How could it be in the statutes of 1944 if it was passed in 1945? Don't be silly.

**Mr. Danielson:** – I'm not going to say that what he said is right, because it isn't right – that bill did not go through in 1944. I mentioned 1944 merely for the purpose of indicating when this legislation first started. But The Farm Security Act was completed practically the same as the present one except for minor changes in it, this year. They have simply taken section for section of our legislation, and put it all into one.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** – That's not true.

**Mr. Danielson:** – By the way, Mr. Speaker, I have been in the Debt Adjustment office down there on Scarth Street; Herman Warren was Chairman of that Board. I remember sitting in there talking, and he introduced this card – I'm sorry I haven't got it with me; it would probably be just half the size of this booklet – and in here was set out exactly what The Farm Security Act was. He handed me one of these, and he said, 'This is your own legislation.' That was Herman Warren; he was sitting in the House . . .

**Premier Douglas:** – And you voted against it.

**Mr. Danielson:** – No, sir. And when you say that, you're not telling the truth, and you know it.

**Premier Douglas:** – Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is referring to the amendments which were passed in 1945, which they voted for on the third reading; and then the second reading in 1944 – he voted against it!

**Mr. Danielson:** – Mr. Speaker, he cannot confuse this thing any more. He can't do it any more. The Farm Security Act was not on the statute books until 1945.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** – That's not true.

March 10, 1959

**Premier Douglas:** – Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. Here is the Statute Books for 1944 – not the Journals, but the Statute Book, Saskatchewan, 1944.

**Mr. Danielson:** – You go back and look that up.

**Mr. Speaker:** – Order! Order!

**Premier Douglas:** – The hon. gentleman is now trying to say the Act to which we are referring was not passed in 1944. Here it is, in the Statutes of the province, Second Session, 1944, which was assented to on November 10, 1944. It is the same Bill which appeared in the Journals of the House, and was passed in 1944. There were amendments to it, true, in 1945; but the Act itself was passed in 1944, and here is the Journals of the House. Mr. Speaker, he knows better.

**Mr. Danielson:** – I’ve got the thing here. I got it from the Librarian: ‘Saskatchewan Legislative Session, 1944.’ I’ll just read this:

“Bill No. 50 – An Act respecting the Protection of Certain Mortgagors, Purchasers and Lessees of Farm Land.”

**Premier Douglas:** – That’s right.

**Mr. Danielson:** – Then not until 1945 did you have what you call ‘The Farm Security Act.’

**Premier Douglas:** – Mr. Speaker, again on a question of privilege. The Act was called – I’ve read it already . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** – I’ve worked on this for weeks.

**Mr. Speaker:** – Order! Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** – I’ve gone to the Journals of the House and got them from the Library!

**Mr. Speaker:** – Order! The Premier has the floor.

**Mr. Danielson:** – I’ve been in this House longer than he has; I know what I’m talking about!

**Mr. Speaker:** – Order! Order!

**Mrs. Batten:** – Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . .

**Premier Douglas:** – Mr. Speaker, I had a point of privilege, so I would like the floor, if the hon. lady will permit me. Chapter 30 . . .

**Mrs. Batten:** – What is the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker?

**Premier Douglas:** – The privilege is that the hon. gentleman has questioned my veracity with reference to this legislation.

**Mrs. Batten:** – Half an hour ago!

**Premier Douglas:** – He's still doing it; it still applies. It still is just as important to me whether it was half an hour ago or ten minutes ago.

**Mr. Speaker:** – Order! Order!

**Premier Douglas:** – Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy and gallantry of the hon. lady. Chapter 30, Second Session, 1944 – “An Act for the Protection of Certain Mortgagors, Purchasers and Lessees of Farm Land.” That is exactly what my hon. friend quoted from the Librarian – Bill No. 50; and Section No. 1 of this Bill, page 88, Chapter 30, of the Statutes of the Second Session, 1944, says: “This Act may be cited as The Farm Security Act, 1944.” It is as simple as that. Now the hon. gentleman says it wasn't called “The Farm Security Act” until 1945.

**Mr. Danielson:** – Mr. Speaker, we don't need to hassle over that. Here I have the whole thing. You have the same Journals of the House as I have. I don't deny that Bill No. 50 was 1944 legislation, but it wasn't called ‘The Farm Security Act.’ It wasn't until 1945 that they gave that name to this Bill.

**Premier Douglas:** – That's not right. It says so right here.

**Mr. Speaker:** – Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Brown:** – Let's be sensible for a while.

**Mr. Danielson:** – The Journals of the House for 1945 . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** – What are you trying to prove?

**Mr. Danielson:** – He doesn't know what he's trying to prove, but he has said ‘The Farm Security Act’ . . .

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** – You don't believe the Journals of the House?

**Mr. Danielson:** – Now those are the facts. This Government has not put any more legislation in the statute books of this province than was ever there before for protection of the farmers. Not a thing – only one thing, and that was . . .

**Premier Douglas:** – That's why you voted against it.

**Mr. Danielson:** – Yes. You don't need to worry. I'm going to get after the Premier again.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** – Some day just take a look at the Journals.

**Premier Douglas:** – Don't get yourself caught, next time.

**Mr. Danielson:** – He is accusing the Federal Government, of course, of taking The Farm Security Act to the Privy Council. Well, Mr. Speaker, they were forcing the Federal Government to take this Act to the Privy Council. Why did they do that? Because the Federal Government tried for six month to negotiate with this government to get them to amend this Act, and exempt the Canadian Farm Loan board, The Mortgage and Housing Corporation and the National Housing Act. They wouldn't do it; so the only thing the Federal Government could do, which everybody – even Mr. Corman, the Attorney General practically admitted in this House that he didn't think this legislation would stand up in court, under which if a crop earned from an acre of land was less than \$6 per acre, even though you can't cancel the interest, and amount equal to the interest rate was going to be cut off the principal; notwithstanding this, the interest is still going to be counted and added to this revenue from the land. He tried to do indirectly what you could not do directly. We objected to this in the first place, and it was the only thing we objected to. We couldn't object to anything else, because it was, after all, our legislation.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** – It was not.

**Mr. Danielson:** – The Chairman of the Debt Adjustment Board stated that point clearly to me.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** – You misunderstood it.

**Mr. Danielson:** – So there you are. The C.C.F. Government forced the Government of Canada to take it to the Privy Council by refusing to exempt a Federal agency which was operating here in Saskatchewan as in every other province of the Dominion. I talked to one of the Ministers of the Federal Government, Mr. Garson, and he said, when I asked him what this meant: "We had to do this; otherwise we were without any security in any shape or form in the province of Saskatchewan, so long as this C.C.T. crop failure clause was in the act, and if we were going to operate under that Act we would have to have some separate set-up in the province of Saskatchewan, and increase the interest rates and carrying charges because our security was taken away."

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** – A likely story! A likely story!

**Mr. Danielson:** – Now, the Premier has tried to extricate himself from this false statement, but he can't do it. We have some members stand up on the floor of this house and prepare statements on amounts of money and revenues collected by this Government during the last two years. In the budget speech you have a chapter set out there, but it doesn't go back any farther than 1949. Why don't you go back to 1944?

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** – You always complain when we do.



**Mr. Danielson:** – I have it here. I am going to read it to the House:

	<u>1943-44</u>		<u>1957-58</u>
Federal Provincial Payments	\$8,389,000		\$36,504,000
Education & Hospitalization Tax	4,228,000	(1)	20,158,000
Gasoline Tax	3,272,000		18,944,000
Motor Vehicle Licences	2,571,000		6,602,000
Oil and Gas Revenues	6,000	(2)	19,226,000
Liquor Profits	3,336,000		11,800,000
Other Revenues	<u>7,003,000</u>		<u>19,596,000</u>
	\$28,805,000	(3)	\$132,830,000

and then they brag about what they have done. What a charge! It's silly and I think they will get the answer when they go out in the country when the next election rolls around!

When we look at the budget we find now that the carrying charges of the public debt of the province at the present time is close to \$16 million. When the Provincial Treasurer appears on T.V., he never mentions these figures. He is very careful to indicate what he wishes by these great big charts; but he has got the public debt down to \$41 million, and doesn't say a thing about the \$300 million-odd which he borrowed. He borrowed in the last fiscal year \$74 million for this Province, and it is all debt which you and I, as taxpayers of the province, will have to pay.

Then they say it won't take long to pay this debt back. I remember back in 1933-34; from then on up to 1944, the C.C.F. covered the whole province, went about giving figures re the carrying charges of this public debt of Saskatchewan, which at that time, they said was \$9 million, and our Provincial Treasurer here was one of the worst offenders. I remember the budget speech of 1942, when we had the C.C.F. sitting on this side of the House, The Provincial Treasurer of that day took pains when he delivered the budget speech to show what constituted the debt, and he figured every dollar's worth of debt or contingent liability that we had in this province at that time. He then got the amount of the carrying charges on the debt which the people had to pay which was less than \$6 million.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer has made quite a number of statements regarding the financial position of the province, and at last, after he had operated for seven years under the old system, he finally switched. What was the reason? The, reason, as anyone can see, is

that he wanted to conceal the increase in the public debt, because it was just at that time that the public debt commenced to rise. Up until that time the public debt had been reduced gradually by a substantial amount – not by this Government. They never paid out a dollar up to 1948 of the public debt. Every dollar of the public debt of \$76 million was paid by agencies other than this Government – the Wheat Pool, the Co-op. Creamery, Farm Loan board, and other organizations in the province; and we have the admission of the Provincial Treasurer that this \$76 million was paid by agencies other than the Government. But in 1948 these payments had already been met, so that until today, he now has this public debt down to \$41 million and the balance is what he calls “self-liquidating debt,” and he brings in the Crown Corporations, because after all, they are the only things that liquidated themselves in this province. They had the box factory up at Prince Albert operating for about 11 years, I think, and according to the published figures in ‘The Leader-Post’, they took a loss, according to the figures and they have never been contradicted, of \$1,163,000.

What do you think about a group of men who call themselves business men? They didn’t have a dollar to borrow. A farmer who was hard up, or a young man who wanted to start in farming, could not get any assistance from these people; but they threw over \$1 million into that old box factory, which was a losing venture in the first place. They paid out more than \$740,000 from the Treasury in advances to run that factory, and the accumulated losses from that factory were \$352,000. Adding these together you have a total loss of \$1,162,000 which went into that ‘dead horse’ up at Prince Albert.

Then there was the Timber Board. This was even a bigger and deader horse, than that when they liquidated this. We could not afford to tax everybody, but this Government took the taxpayers’ money and they spent about \$1 million on the woollen mill, and spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in all these other things. Mr. Speaker, we couldn’t afford to do that, because we couldn’t afford to tax anybody. But this Government did that. They took the tax from one industry and put it on another – just about one million dollars was spent on the woollen mill. So there you see, that is self-liquidating; but today, they have a brain-storm way up in the north country, with the Co-ops. I hope that the Co-ops look at this thing very, very closely. Why did they turn it over to the Co-ops? Why did this Government, who is so friendly with the Co-ops, who call themselves the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation – not one of these organizations was set up as a Co-op. Now when they feel there is no other way to get rid of them, they are now going to hand them over to the Co-ops as a gift, at a high price and I think they should look at this gift very, very closely before they accept it.

If the Provincial Treasurer had continued to show the public debt after he had taken over the position in this Province, on the same basis as the Dominion Bureau of Statistics has revealed it and as it should have been shown up to last year, December 31, 1958, it would have shown the gross public debt to have been \$309,993,000 – almost \$310 million.

But he has not done so. Why did he not do this? He did not do it because he wanted to hide from the public the fact that the public debt has been increasing by leaps and bounds, and Lord help the province of Saskatchewan if they have this \$16 million with carrying charges at the end of this fiscal year and a crop failure with low prices. Money doesn't grow on trees, Mr. Speaker – not here!

The gentlemen across the way might smile – they have never been up against the time that they have had to try to cut down and tried to spread the dollars that the public could give to them, like we have had to do in former years. Good administration is the base of economy – and can probably be too economical in some respects; but the public interest is protected, which it is not at the present time. I am not going to say any more – you don't like it. I will have more for you next year, though, and the year after, because I think you will be here, then, too.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** – We'll be here in 1962, also.

**Mr. Danielson:** – That's all right. I wouldn't say everybody will be, though.

**Premier Douglas:** – We've got a good precedent for it – you did it!

**Mr. Danielson:** – Well, I hope so. Mr. Speaker, I shall not support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** – Hear! Hear!

**Hon. L.F. McIntosh. (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** – Mr. Speaker, we have been treated to rather an interesting discourse, this afternoon, for the past two hours, and I think there is a limit to the patience of members on both sides of the House. I would like at this time to adjourn the debate.

**(Debate adjourned)**

### **PRINCE ALBERT BRIDGE**

**Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways):** – Mr. Speaker, may I have the privilege of making this announcement? I might say that the tenders for the construction of the Prince Albert bridge were opened this afternoon, and the low tenders for the steel were the Bridge & Tank (Western) Ltd., of Winnipeg, and for the construction and erection, the Pool Construction Limited, Regina, were the low bidders. These, of course, must be submitted to Ottawa, but I thought the House might be interested in having this information. I might say the prices were very good.

The Assembly then adjourned at 5:25 o'clock p.m.