

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fifth Session — Tenth Legislature**  
**Day 4**

**Tuesday, February 10, 1948**

**SPEECH FROM THE THRONE**

**Continuation of Debate on Motion  
For Address in Reply**

The House resumed from Monday, February 9, the Debate on the Motion of Mr. Feeley (Canora) for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. The House met at three o'clock.

**Mr. W.J. Patterson** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, the Motion before the House calls for an humble address to be presented to His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor, giving him thanks for the gracious speech which His Honour delivered to us at the Opening of this Legislature. That speech, Mr. Speaker, occupied almost thirty minutes in delivery, contains somewhat more than three thousand words, but is without a single important, constructive idea. Its main characteristics are to find fault with everything that is being done outside of the province of Saskatchewan, in the Dominion of Canada, within the world, and a glorification of the provincial government in what it has done or what it is claimed to have done, and its various accomplishments. It might very well have been prepared (and I would not be surprised if it had been prepared) by the Editor of the Saskatchewan News. This thing is very clear and very definite, that it offers no policy or no legislation for the people of the province of Saskatchewan to meet the problems which the speech itself claims to exist. In other words, Sir, the mountain has laboured and brought forth a mouse.

The hon. member from Canora moved the Address and it was seconded by the hon. member from Hanley. We understand that they are not to be candidates in any coming election, and consequently this probably is what might be referred to as their 'swan-song'.

**Mr. Feeley:** — It might be yours too.

**Mr. Patterson:** — Well, at least I am going to take a chance. I am going back to my constituents in the election which may be held this year or next, and ask for their re-endorsement. But it is rather unfortunate, and particularly for an old warhorse like the member from Canora, that the Speech from the Throne was not more inspirational and did not give him a greater opportunity to express his capitalistic-socialistic theories. He was more optimistic on this occasion than perhaps on any previous occasion in this House. He is one of those socialists who has profited fairly well under a capitalistic system, and who has some difficulty in promoting his socialistic theories in relation to his capitalistic propensities.

The hon. member from Hanley was in a rather more difficult position, and I agree with him that perhaps his section of the country is one which has suffered rather more seriously than many others from crop failure, drought and those other things which affect the agricultural production of this province. But perhaps his pessimism was somewhat affected by the fact that in his particular constituency the Liberal candidate is the Reeve of the Municipality of Warman, and in the last municipal elections, purely on a political basis, a candidate was put up against our Liberal candidate, with the result that the C.C.F. candidate in the municipal election in Warman got, I think, 18 votes, while the Reeve (who also happens to be the Liberal candidate got some 370 or 380 – something of that kind. Now, that may have affected the pessimistic attitude

(cont'd on P.2)

**February 10, 1948**

of the hon. member from Hanley in his speech on the Address.

Let me repeat, Sir, the Liberal candidate in the constituency of Hanley is the Reeve of the Rural Municipality of Warman. There was no particular complaint or criticism of his administration but, because he had dared to accept the Liberal nomination for that constituency, a certain little group of C.C.F.'rs in that area nominated a candidate against him, and the result was three hundred and seventy-nine or three hundred and eighty-seven to seventeen or eighteen. Now that, I say, may account for the pessimism expressed by the hon. member from Hanley in replying to the Speech from the Throne.

In many respects, the year 1947 was a year of discouragements and disappointments insofar as those who take some recognition of what is developing in Canada, in the United States, in Great Britain and throughout the world generally, is concerned; but there was one right spot, and that is referred to in the Speech from the Throne, and that was the occasion of the wedding of the heiress to the Crown and the Throne of the British Empire and the British Commonwealth. It was gratifying to all of us who have some respect and some regard for the Royal Family, for their traditions and all that they stand for, that throughout the length and breadth of this commonwealth that happy and auspicious occasion was so generally recognized and so generally observed.

In Saskatchewan, the representatives of His Majesty have not always, during recent years, been treated with the respect to which they are properly entitled, but on this happy occasion, Sir, the people of this province, many of whom are not of British stock, were happy to join with those who were in observing and celebrating this particularly happy occasion. It has some effect or some regard to the future. It appears, probably, that from this union will descend those who are to be the Crown in the future, and I say that it was very, very pleasant to those of us who have a very high regard for the Royal Family and for all it stands for, and who are somewhat disconcerted when representatives of His Majesty are greeted with a measure of disrespect in this province. I say it was very pleasant for us to know and to believe that the great mass of the people of the province of Saskatchewan were interested in this particularly happy event, and we certainly join with the sentiment expressed in the Speech from the Throne, in extending goodwill and good wishes to the Royal Couple. I think the Minister of Natural Resources might very properly have sent the Royal Couple a pair of his Saskatchewan blankets. Whether he did so or not I do not know.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson** (Arm River): — What about a pair of shoes?

**Mr. Patterson:** — But outside of this, I think we could all agree, Sir, that perhaps the international developments of 1947 have not been what we might call encouraging or inspirational, but we can say this at least – that during that year the representatives of practically all of the nations of the world have met in open assembly, have discussed and debated the various problems which have come before them, and that in itself is a considerable advance on anything that we have known in this world before. The progress may appear to have been small, but still it is worth something, Sir, for all the various nations, large and small, to meet in an assembly and discuss national and international problems. There will be differences of opinion – that is inevitable; there will be conflicts – that cannot be avoided; but surely it is worth something, Sir, to have reached a stage when the representatives of the United States, Great Britain, China, France, Russia, and all the greater and lesser nations of the world meet in an assembly where there is discussion and debate and consideration of the problems that affect them all.

The second paragraph of the Speech from the Throne states that the work of the United Nations in striving to realize one world is being seriously impaired by maladministration of the world's wealth. I would say that the work of the United Nations, in striving to realize one world is being seriously impaired by maladministration of the veto power. We have today in this world a situation unique in world history. Nations which have recently won a war are offering their services and their wealth to re-establish the nations they defeated. That, Sir, is absolutely unique in the world's history. They are not asking for trade or territorial advantages. They are offering to contribute from their surplus – maybe they have not so much of a surplus to offer – but they are offering to contribute from their wealth to re-establish the very nations that they have recently been in conflict with; and that effort is being blocked by the country which has, out of this war, secured the largest territorial aggrandizement, added the greatest territory to its control, brought under its direction and control a great many countries that now accept its theories, and which, in its efforts, has secured the greatest reparations from the defeated nations and the greatest territory, and yet we are told in the Speech from the Throne that world recovery is handicapped by maladministration of the world's wealth.

The Premier of this province told a gathering in Weyburn not very long ago that Russia was bluffing. I hope he is correct, but I wonder what is the responsibility of one of the greatest powers in the world today, comparable to Great Britain or the United States, which, in a period of (according to the Speech from the Throne) international and world difficulties, utilizes its position to bluff? Now, the Premier may have some access to information which is not available to us – that may be – but if he has access to that information, which warrants him making that statement, could we not properly ask him to request this great world power to discontinue their bluffing and make some sound and fundamental contribution to the restoration of world peace and world welfare?

**February 10, 1948**

I said, Sir, I think, that we had a unique situation. Here is the United States, admittedly under present-day conditions, the wealthiest and most powerful nation in the world, willing to make magnificent contributions to the restoration of world peace and world welfare. Canada is prepared to do her part; Great Britain is prepared to do her part. It is unfortunate that under these conditions we should have our Coldwells and our Carlyle Kings and our Sturdys and our Nolleys and our Lloyds criticizing and finding fault with the contribution that the United States is prepared to make toward world recovery.

Not very long ago the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the foreign Secretary of Great Britain expressed their opinions about the world situation, and the attempt on the part of Russia to interrupt and interfere with world rehabilitation; and I say it is very, very unfortunate that in this province we should have responsible ministers of the Crown, officials of the official Government Party, finding fault with and criticizing, and laying blame on our friends and neighbours, who, Mr. Caldwell says he wishes we were separated from them by an ocean, in their sincere and definite and practical attempts to meet the very problems which the Speech from the Throne tells us the world faces today.

Of very considerable interest to us in Saskatchewan is the agreement which was arrived at, at Geneva last summer in connection with world trade. Every citizen of this province realizes that in Saskatchewan world trade and the removal of all the barriers and embargoes possible in free trading between one nation and another is of very profound importance to us in Saskatchewan, and we are delighted to think that in that conference held at Geneva, representatives of some thirty or forty nations found it possible to arrive at some form of agreement which will at least mean an increase and extension of the trade of the natural products of the various countries concerned.

Of some interest to us, too, in this province, are the elections which have been held during the past year in various parts of the world; the municipal elections in Great Britain; the provincial elections in the province of Prince Edward Island; the municipal elections in France; all of which would indicate that the people concerned are not prepared to accept Government regimentation, Government regulation and Government control.

**Mr. H. Gibbs** (Swift Current): — What about the by-elections?

**Mr. Patterson**: — Where? In York-Sunbury? Prince Edward Island?

**Mr. Gibbs** (Swift Current): — No, in Great Britain.

**Mr. Patterson:** — No, the elections, municipal and otherwise, that have been held during the last year, in Canada, in Great Britain and in France do not bring very much consolation to those who believe in a planned economy and in regimentation and control by the state.

The year 1947, insofar as the province of Saskatchewan was concerned, was not a particularly good year. I have not the final crop reports, but I believe or understand that the results were probably second only to the unfortunate year of 1937 insofar as the general crop production was concerned. Fortunately for the government and for the people, the operations of the P.F.A.A. are in full swing, and a very, very large percentage of municipalities and townships in this province are receiving or have received the bonuses payable under that Act.

In addition to that, the price for grains, for livestock and for other agricultural products are at a high level. In addition to that, very substantial participation payments in regard to previous grain crops have been or will be paid to the people, the farmers of this province; and as a net result, the farm income over all of Saskatchewan in 1947 is as high, or practically as high as in any previous year.

What has the provincial government contributed to the agricultural welfare of the province? Well, they have appointed more agricultural representatives, but I did hear of a meeting in the western part of the province where there were forty people in attendance, seventeen of whom were employed in the government, all of whom were driving new government cars. The other twenty-three were local farmers and the experts representing the government. They are going to pay the freight, Mr. Speaker, on seed and feed into the drought areas. Isn't that a marvellous contribution?

(continued on P.6)

**February 10, 1948**

Paragraph two of the Speech from the Throne says, that the economy of the Province is being strained by a national policy of decontrol.

Unfortunately, Sir, as I have already indicated, a very considerable area of the province suffered a severe crop failure last year. Where there is a crop, where they are producing livestock, there is no economic strain because the price for grains and livestock and other agricultural products is at a high level. What this government had done or intends to do, to meet crop failures I do not know. They tell us they are going to have more agricultural representatives and they are going to do this and that. No one has yet invented or developed a condition for the farmer who has suffered a crop failure, possible to what would have been his return if he had enjoyed a decent crop. This paragraph in the Speech from the Throne is not in accordance with the actual facts, as a matter of fact in the Province of Saskatchewan in those areas where the crop was moderate or fair or good, they are enjoying higher standards of return and a higher standard of living than ever before in the Province of Saskatchewan. Where there was a crop failure, and unfortunately it applied to too large an area of the Province of Saskatchewan, there is some difficulty, met in part by the P.F.A.A. payments, participation payments and other things. But for a government for our Province of Saskatchewan to say that a result, the health of our people will be impaired, the economy of Saskatchewan may suffer severe consequences, is just purely political eyewasy, Mr. Speaker,

The Speech from the Throne tells us that they, in the Department of Agriculture, which took over from the Department of Natural Resources, have finally decided upon a final policy with respect to grazing leases. That will be welcome news to those in the Province of Saskatchewan who operate ranching operations in connection with Government grazing leases. For three years they have been wondering where they were at. What is the new policy? The very indefinite reference to it in the Speech from the Throne would indicate that perhaps even as yet it is – as many other statements in the Speech from the Throne – very indefinite and what they actually mean, no one yet knows.

In the Speech from the Throne we were told that this Government has finally reached an agreement with the Government of Canada with respect to water rights. You will remember, Sir, the argument and the debate in this House last Session, when every cause and every criticism was levelled on the Dominion of Canada, but finally they agreed they have come to an arrangement and reached an agreement with respect to provincial responsibility for the development of water rights.

In the last Session of the Legislature, Sir, the Minister of Reconstruction told us we should have a Silkins Bill in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now the Silkins Bill, Mr. Speaker, is that Act called officially the Crown and Country Planning Act, and with it there is an agricultural act put through by the Government of Great Britain. The two together give the government and the ministers concerned, absolute and complete control of farming operations in Great Britain. If you want to build a pig pen or a hen house or a dog house in Great Britain you must go to the Silkins Planning Committee and get permission. Before you seed your farm you have to get approval of The Country Agricultural Planning Committee, and that is not all. Mr. Hugh Dalton who was then Minister of the Exchequer in the Government of Great Britain stated on February 15, 1947, 'In support of the Silkins Bill, 'The Government is moving toward the nationalization of the land and not by slow steps', and our CCF's in Saskatchewan tell us that their plans are predicted upon the plans of the Attlee Government in Great Britain.

In September last, a farmer in Great Britain, Mr. Dennis, who operates a thousand acre farm in Suffolk, county looked out and saw a tractor drive into one of his fields and start to plow down his crop. He went out to find out what was going on and the driver of the tractor said, "I have my orders, the County Agricultural committee have ordered me to plow in this crop." Mr. Dennis went to the representative of the Farmer' Union and got in touch with the County Agricultural Committee, and got in touch finally with the Minister of Labour and finally sometime that afternoon the plowing under of this crop was discontinued.

It is so very typical of what happens, Mr. Speaker, when theorists and planners are put in control. Mr. Dennis said he feels he knows better how to run his farm than the County Agricultural experts. But is it not typical of the theorists? Here is a crop of 20 acres of buckwheat which has a very, very large monetary value in the markets of Great Britain today, why did they not sue the farmer? why not fine him? or put him in jailor if necessary why not shoot him? But why destroy a valuable agricultural commodity that is already in the process of growing in order to preserve the rights and privileges of the Agricultural plans?

Many of our people do not realize and do not fully appreciate that we have socialized our timber industry, and our fur industry. We have also socialized our fish industry, more recently we have de-socialized our mineral activities for reasons which we will deal

**February 10, 1948**

with later on, and if the program of socialization and control is to be continued, the next group that it must be applied to – there cannot be any argument about this, Sir – are those who produce the grains and the livestock of the Province of Saskatchewan. I wonder how our agricultural community would like to wake up some morning and find a tractor plowing up a field which the County agricultural experts had designated had to be sown to a certain particular grain or not sown to that province grain. Last Session, I told about the case of the farmer who had been fined four thousand pounds for sowing twenty acres to barley contrary to the decision of the County Agricultural Committee. There was some criticism of Canadian newspapers for publishing that information, and they said that this fellow resisted. I think that probably a great many farmers in Saskatchewan would resist arrest if emissaries of the County Agricultural committee and representatives of the planning commission came to them to arrest them for having seeded twenty or thirty or forty acres more to barley or oats or as the case may be, than they had felt advisable in conditions on their farms.

Now, Mr. Speaker,, I am going to move a vote of want of confidence in connection with the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. and in that connection I want to outline or delineate some ten or twelve reasons why the present government of Saskatchewan does not enjoy the confidence of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. I am not going to incorporate them in the actual resolution, it is just going to be a general resolution.

In the first place, the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan has adopted a policy of centralization, regimentation and control which are entirely foreign to the ideals and the ideas of the democratic state, and entirely different to anything this province or any part of this dominion has ever before experienced. As a part of this program of centralization it has taken from this Legislature, Mr. Speaker,, certain rights, responsibilities and powers which probably belong to this Legislature and no other body. Now, they can put the boys in the back room and give them authority to do this and to do that. It is not properly theirs; it is properly ours, and every member of this Legislature who is truly and properly conscious of his duties and his responsibilities to his constituents and to the constitution under which we operate, should object and should reject any movement of that kind. The cost of governmental expenditures in the Province has grown, politically 100 per cent in three years. That means that the taxes and the charges that the people of this province have to pay to carry on their government, have been tremendously increased. As a part of this policy of centralization, rights, duties, responsibilities and freedoms, which formerly and properly belong to our local governing bodies, have been withdrawn from them.

Larger School Units have been established without any regard to the wishes of the people concerned. Similarly in respect to certain municipal activities and certain health services. The



Department of Agriculture has a problem which is of primary importance to the Province of Saskatchewan because that is our primary industry. What is their contribution? To appoint more agricultural representatives, more people to go around and tell the people how they should manage their farms. No serious policy to increase production; no serious constructive policy to improve the conditions of agriculture in this province.

The Minister of Agriculture finds himself busy finding fault with the Federal Government and with the United States and with the packing industry and all the rest of it; but so far as contributing anything to the agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan, he is too busy on these other matters. This province now received an annual subsidy from the Government of Canada practically twice that that was received prior to its coming into office. What has it been used for? Has it been used to utilize and reduce the burdens of the municipalities, of the schools, or of the health units? No, it has been utilized to increase the civil servants, to employ the planners and the economists that are going to do such wonderful things for us.

Has the promise to remove the Education Tax been implemented? Not at all; it is still in effect. The provincial treasurer tells us it cannot be removed.

The Speech from the Throne refers to highways, the wonderful and the tremendous expenditures made on highways in 1947. I do not think anybody who drove the highways in 1947, would not agree with me when I say that they were in absolutely the worst condition and the least passable they had ever been in the history of the province.

Civil Servants – why they are so busy writing letters to the press and canvassing for CCF memberships they hardly have time to do the jobs that they are appointed, and paid, to do.

We have 700 veterans in this province, settled in 1946, and our representative of the government goes into the court and argues that no minister of the Crown had the right to give them the lease under which they are established. Is that not an amazing thing, an amazing admission? After settling some 700 veterans, then a representative of the government goes into the courts and argues that those leases are not worth the paper they are written on.

Then we have a labour policy, which, in the statements of the Premier and his subsidiary is the most marvellous. How many labour disputes did we have in Saskatchewan last year, and how were they settled? That, Sir, is why I am moving the amendment that this government does not possess the confidence of the province. but, I am not going to stop there because there are certain other comments I wish to make in respect to the Speech

**February 10, 1948**

from the throne.

We have heard over the years this repeated cry about “Humanity First”. You cannot find any Humanity First, in this Speech from the Throne, you can find CCF first, but I am reminded of the famous editorial which appeared in the Manitoba Commonwealth and the B.C. CCF paper – I forget its name at the moment – during the first weeks of the last Great War. Which said at the outset, “the first concern of the CCF is to its own well-being”, and that policy is still in existence; the first concern of the CCF is to its own well-being; not “Humanity First”, but of the CCF and that policy is being continued.

Not very long ago, the Premier of this province made a radio broadcast. After giving his government a clean bill of health – wonderful fellows, no slush fund and all the rest of it – little ‘Sir Galahad’ came through with an attack on a very respectable and very long established part of our government system. I am not going to elaborate on that. I hope and pray my hon. Friend here who is a lawyer and has to. but, as I say, ‘Sir Galahad’ came through with a measly attack on the integrity and the fairness of the men who comprise the courts of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Getting back to the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, what does the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan offer the people of the province as a solution of the very serious problems that are outlined. We are told in one place that the economy of the province is being strained, the health of our people will be impaired, and the economy of the Saskatchewan will suffer. Well, they are going to amend the Election Act. No doubt that will meet many of the problems and correct them. Then they are going to amend the boundaries of some forest reserves up in the North, and are going to appoint a new dictator to control and regulate the lives and activities of the people in the North. They are also going to build a bridge at Saskatchewan Landing providing the people in that area subscribe the necessary funds.

**Mr. H. Gibbs** (Swift Current): — They will.

**Mr. W.J. Patterson:** — Well, I think probably they will, but that is their solution for these major problems at a time when insecurity and fear are springing up in the wake of the devastation of the late war, these are the solutions they submit to us.

Then they are going to extend the application or the operation of the compulsory insurance act. And, Mr. Speaker,, they are going to help the people in the drought areas with the freight on their seed. This Premier who told us about how he battled in the parliament of Canada to get seed for the people of Saskatchewan, he is now content – as I said – to give them their freight, if they have not the money to buy the seed that is just too bad for them, and they are gong to tax the railway rightaways.

Now, these are the major policies in the Speech from the Throne, those are the solutions for these world problems, these terrible difficulties, and this strain that Saskatchewan is existing under. A great deal was made in the Speech from the Throne about the labour legislation of this government.

For the first time, I think, in the history of Great Britain and Canada, and probably most nations, a solicitor representing the Crown goes into the courts and pleads that the Legislature passed an Act which was loaded or biased in favour of one party. I do not know how this Legislature accepts that representation. To me it is very objectionable. I always felt, Sir, that this Legislature and every other legislature attempted to pass legislation that was fair and just and honourable; but as I say, we have a labour relations case in court and the representative of the government, the Crown solicitor, believes that the Legislature intended that the legislation should be loaded in favour of one party.

Then we have a compulsory automobile Insurance Act. In the first year of operations, under that Act, almost twice as much money was collected over and above what was expended – a surplus of \$767,000.00; and another thing in connection with it, the administration costs were almost as great as the claims that were paid. Last year, the provisions under the Act were extended, and we learned of cars being taken from Yorkton to Battleford to be repaired (to the Government Garage), cars being brought from Canora or Kamsack to Regina to be repaired, and all of these things are added to the cost of the administration of this particular Act. all of the people of Saskatchewan, if they are going to be compelled to insure with the Government, if they are going to be compelled to pay a certain premium for automobile insurance, let them at least have some fair and reasonable and moderate method of adjustment in satisfaction of the claims that may exist. Cars taken here and there from all parts of the province, and dragged up to these government garages, where the cost finally, in most cases, is greater than if the repairs were done at home. but we are gong to have an extension. Whatever that extension may be, I hope and pray, for the benefit of those who operate motor cars in the province of Saskatchewan, that there will be some reasonable and moderate method arrived at of dealing with these claims, so that men will not have their cars tied up for weeks and months while the adjustment of the claim is being dealt with.

As I have suggested, Sir, the Speech from the Throne was lengthy, more than three thousand words, less than two ideas; but there were a surprising number of things that were not included in the Speech from the Throne. There was no reference, for instance, to the packing plant strike. Well, last fall that was a very important item in the minds and in the discussions of the people of the province of Saskatchewan and the Minister of Labour – we had the Minister of Labour down in Hamilton – he was setting limit dates and calling special sessions of the legislature. We had the Premier up in Meadow lake, I think it was, and he was setting limit dates and calling special sessions of the legislature; and the Provincial Treasurer – he was at Prince Albert, and he was setting dates, and if it was not settled by that time they were going to have special sessions of the legislature. It is an amazing thing, Sir, that

**February 10, 1948**

in a province where, according to their own story, we have the most modern, the most enlightened and the most up to date legislation, a strike which probably did not affect more than a thousand people at the outside, dragged along and dragged along and no settlement could be arrived at.

Then we had a bakery strike in Regina. I do not suppose it affected more than seventy or eighty people, and all this modernistic labour legislation that this government takes such pride in could not settle that strike.

Then there was a strike at Melville in the Egg and Poultry Packing Plant, and I do not suppose that affected more than fifty or sixty people, but it dragged along for three months.

Then we had the most amazing thing of all – a Minister of the Crown, speaking to the employees of a government corporation at Prince Albert, said to them – “If you don’t get to work and put this Plant on a paying basis it will be closed up.” Dr. Shumiatcher says that is not a violation. If any private employer said that he would be in gaol. If the operators of the Bakery, if the operators of the Poultry and Egg Plant at Melville, had said that to their employees they would have been up before the Labour Relations Board, but the Minister of Natural Resources can get up and say what the law itself says is an improper labour practice, and Dr. Shumiatcher says it is all right, it does not matter, he can do that.

Now, at the moment there is a coal strike in Alberta and in British Columbia. So far it hasn’t spread to Saskatchewan; but we in Saskatchewan are very much concerned as to what steps this Government has taken to prevent a coal strike developing in the province of Saskatchewan. There is nothing in the Speech from the Throne to tell us, there is nothing in their record over the past year to indicate that they are anything more than totally ineffectual when it comes to dealing with labour difficulties. We had a coal strike in Saskatchewan some years ago and it was settled by the employers and the employees and the Government sitting around a table...

**Hon. Mr. Williams** (Regina City): — And the Mounted Police!

**Mr. Patterson:** — No, not the Mounted Police. Probably you are using the Mounted Police, I do not know. We never used the Mounted Police!

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — They were there.

**Mr. Patterson:** — That strike was settled – it took a long time, but this Government depends on legislation going to the courts and all that sort of thing; and what settlement have they made of any of the strikes that have developed in this province during the last year?

At the last Session of this Legislature, Sir, The Public Service Act was amended to allow civil servants, paid by the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan out of the taxpayers' money of the Province of Saskatchewan, to take part in political activities. It was not very long after that before letters began to appear in the Press. A Deputy-Minister admitted publicly that he had been soliciting for C.C.F. memberships – I do not know whether that is a desirable condition or not – personally, I do not think it is. If this Government thinks it is, they are welcome to that idea.

Prior to the 1944 Election, the present Premier of the province told us that promotion in the Civil Service and appointments in the Civil Service would be on the basis of merit and service. On July 3, 1944, nine days before he became Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan, he announced an appointment to the Civil Service, and that appointment, Sir, was the man who had withdrawn from the C.C.F. nomination in Weyburn so that he might accept it. That is all right – I am not going to criticize that particularly.

The next major appointment to the Civil Service was the man who moved from his seat – about there – in the last Session of the former Legislature – over into this corner in support of the C.C.F. In a broadcast recently, the Premier told us that civil servants were appointed on the basis of what they knew instead of who they knew. It would be more correct to say that they have been appointed on the basis of what they did. The Civil Service of Saskatchewan is filled with men who have been C.C.F. candidates, active C.C.F. workers, in Ontario; in Manitoba; in Alberta; and in British Columbia, who have been brought in here, not because of what they did. But I think that the most outstanding (and I think the most outrageous) appointment...I think that the great majority of the people of Saskatchewan are sincerely desirous that the Department of Education should be as far as possible kept completely free from political affiliations or political influence. Over the years, the men who have been Deputy Ministers of that Department, first of all Mr. D.P. McColl, Mr. Ball, Mr. Ross, all of them outstanding educationalists, and all of them (I am not going to say they were not Liberals, because I think probably they were, their educational, their intellectual experience and qualifications would tend to make them that), but so far as being political heelers, political candidates, or politically active, no one can point a finger at any one of them and say that at any time or on any occasion were they ever active politically in relation to any political party organization.

**February 10, 1948**

But recently, when a vacancy occurred in connection with the Deputy Minister of that Department, who was appointed? Mr. Allan McCallum, who had been less than two years in the employ of the Department, and whose major qualification was that he had been C.C.F. candidate in Swift Current in 1938. His major qualification!

We have complained and criticized, Mr. Speaker, the utilization of the Department of Education for the spreading and the propagandizing of socialistic ideas in this province, and this is the final and culminating proof of our charge and of our complaint. In that Department, there are dozens of men who have been Inspectors of Schools, Superintendents of Schools, for five years, for ten years, for fifteen years, or for twenty years, and they are all passed up for Mr. Allan McCallum, whose major qualification after less than two years' service in the Department, for appointment as Deputy Minister, was that he was the C.C.F. candidate in the provincial constituency of Swift Current some six or eight years ago. If there is one Department of Government, Sir, that should be free from political interference, where there should be no suspicion, it is the Department of Education. We know that some attempt has been made to use the schools and the Department to propagate socialistic ideas in the province of Saskatchewan, but the rank and file – the people of the province of Saskatchewan – do not accept that, do not confirm or agree with that, and I think it is unfortunate that the Minister of Education and the Government saw fit to pass over well-trying, experienced, long-service employees who have not any particular political affiliation, who are not regarded as members of this Party or that Party or the other Party, but as conscientious and sincere believers in education and all it stands for. As I say, this appointment can only confirm our criticism and our complaint that it is the intention of this Government to utilize the Department of Education – the one Department in all of the public service of this province that should be entirely free of political taint – to propagate and publicize their political activities.

The Speech from the Throne has some reference to the record of the Department of Highways, and I do not know that any one could have written such a glowing account of the progress of the Department of Highways in relation to the actual conditions in the Province of Saskatchewan last year unless it was somebody who was not in the Province of Saskatchewan. They have spent more money – that is true – and got less for it. They spent a great deal of money on duplicating roads and making corrections and all that sort of thing. I think it would be generally agreed by everyone who travelled the highways of Saskatchewan last year, that they were actually in the worst condition in the history of the province. In fact, the commercial travellers developed a little song – “Keep right On to the end of the Road, the Worst is Yet to Come.”

The Premier tells us the contracts are let by tender. I wonder if the butcher down in East Regina who got the gravelling contract, who did not own a truck, or gravelling equipment of any kind – I wonder if he got that by tender? I wonder if the contract from Flin Flon South was let by tender? and one or two others that we will ask him about during the course of this Session.

The Speech from the Throne tells us that the municipalities – that the province has assumed some of their responsibility. Well, I understand that in the City of Regina, the Bureau of Child Protection has grabbed the Childrens' Aid Society and one or two other organizations of that kind because these organizations were not prepared to submit to the dictatorial directions and controls that the bureaucrats in the Department wished to impose upon them; but I do not find in the Speech from the Throne, or in any knowledge that I have of government activities, first of all, where the government has restored and given to the municipalities that were entitled to an adjustment under the public revenue levy, the million odd that was available for that purpose – there is no record of that having been done — \$1,260,000.00.

We have still to receive the report of the committee that was appointed to investigate the consolidation of rural municipalities. Surely after two years we should have some word from that particular committee? Is it still the government's policy, as announced by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, to consolidate our rural municipalities? Is he going to come out, at this Session, or at the Municipal Convention, and tell them frankly what he told the rural municipal gathering in Estevan in the fall of 1944 – that they were going to consolidate the rural municipalities?

In the matter of education, we have twelve or fifteen proposed larger school units that asked for a vote, some of them more than two years ago – almost three years ago – and that democratic right has still been withheld from them. There is no apparent intention to meet that request. It is quite apparent that in the event of an election, and the return of the C.C.F., than they will say that these people approved of our policy and we will impose larger school units on them.

The Speech from the Throne recognizes that there are tremendously increased costs in the administration of our educational organizations, but that the grants this government has been granting to them does not begin to meet those increased costs, and as a result the local taxation is growing and growing and growing.

**February 10, 1948**

There is some concern throughout the province in the thirty-four or thirty-five larger schools that have been established. the local school district in which I happened to reside when I lived down in the country turned in some – I think — \$2,000 in cash to the Larger School Unit.

We had a balance owing to us from one of the municipalities of approximately \$400 and the other municipality in which the local school district was located happened to owe the municipality \$400. The local School Board found, much to their surprise, that first of all the Larger School Unit took the \$2,000 odd dollars of cash, saying “The \$400 that is owing to you from this particular municipality is an asset which must come to us but the \$400 which you have been overpaid by the other municipality is a liability of your local School Board.”

Now we know perfectly well that the \$2,000 of cash and the \$400 of credit in the case of the one school district has been used by the Larger School Unit to maintain their operations. What we are interested in knowing is whether, at the end of five years, when a vote is taken, if the Larger School Unit is disbanded, whether we are going to get our cash assets back. Our local School Board cannot get anything for local improvements because the money is being used to operate the larger school unit and, as I say, the \$400 debit in relation to one municipality is charged up against the cash assets of our local School district.

Those are some of the local problems that the people of this province are considering and discussing and debating at the present time; and the Minister might tell us – and probably he will tell us during the course of his debate – what protection the local School Board that turned in \$500 — \$1,000 — \$1,500 — \$2,000 – in cash, bank bonds, etc., what protection or what guarantee that Local School District is going to have that when a vote is taken and the Larger Unit is disbanded, that money will be available and returned to the people to whom it properly belongs.



what protection or what guarantee will that local school district have that when a vote is taken and the Large Unit is disbanded, that money will be available and returned to the people to whom it properly belongs.

The Speech from the Throne reports the purchase by the power commission of the assets or the lines of the Canadian Utilities in the Saskatchewan. I hope, Sir, that when we have an opportunity to go into this deal we will find it was a more provident one than the purchase of the Dominion Electric. When the government paid \$60 a share for control of the company, whose shares were offered for sale and were marketable, for approximately half that amount, we hope they will find that when the thing is investigated, that the inventories and the stocks and the goods on hand that were part of the sale were really theirs. We hope we will find that instead of accepting the company's officials' certificates as to the stocks and inventories, that the Power commission made some serious effort to check what actually was on hand and what they were taking over.

It would be interesting to know, Sir, whether the mutual release which the Minister of Natural Resources and the firm in St. Louis that sold him the Dominion Electric at \$60 a share, whether that mutual release has as yet been signed, or each one of them signs off no claim against each other. It would be interesting to know whether the Minister has made, since that sale, a check on the inventories, stock and supplies he though he was buying or that he was supposed to be buying. It would be interesting to know, Sir, why assets, plants formerly belonging to the Dominion Electric which brought in approximately 25 per cent of their total revenue – these were outside of the Province of Saskatchewan – were sold for approximately 12 per cent of the total purchase price. Time will enable us to come around to those.

**Hon. T.C. Douglas** (Premier): — I assume that my friend is prepared to substantiate the statements he is making at some other time.

**Mr. W.J. Patterson**: — I am not substantiating...

**Hon. T.C. Douglas** (Premier): — I know that.

**Mr. W.J. Patterson**: — I am making a statement.

**Hon. T.C. Douglas** (Premier): — I will say you are, a very erroneous one.

**Mr. W.J. Patterson**: — If you do not like them, maybe it would be better if you just kept quiet.

**February 10, 1948**

Paying \$60 a share for shares of Dominion Electric that were bought in, two months prior to that, for \$20 or \$30. If that was a provident deal, my hon. Friends can substantiate it. Last year we were told that the government was going to proceed with the manufacture of rock wool. This year we are told that it is going to be 'researched'. A couple of weeks ago the Deputy Minister of Natural Resources announced in a statement to the paper that the manufacture of rock wool was not feasible. Well I do not know, it does not seem to make very much difference but there is one thing certain, and that is this, that in this province, three major industries, the fish, fur and timber industries are totally and completely tied up under government domination and control, the complete application of socialism.

If you are going to produce timber you must sell it to the timber Board, if you are going to catch fish you must sell it to the Fish Board and the same if you are going to catch fur. Well our friends may agree and they may favour that sort of thing, that is their privilege. That is the remedy that the government offers for the meeting of all our problems; economic planning of a national and international character, a sounder basis will be established in form. Well that is what our timber men, that is what our fishermen and our fur trappers are experiencing; a planned economy applying to their particular operation. And if the government thinks that they prefer it, that is their privilege. There is very definite and concrete evidence that that is not the case. The very best indication of that is the recent announcement of the change in the governmental policy with regard to mineral development. Comrade Bichin has been up to Flin Flon and made a deal with the mining company and they are going to remove all these government controls and restrictions, they are going to promote private development.

The oil field, a few years ago, the Minister was bound and determined he was going to keep under his own control. but the farmer has apparently realized that the Province of Saskatchewan is suffering in relation to other provinces in industrial development. Why have we not got any worth while oil development in Saskatchewan? Oil companies came in here and spent \$3,000,000 testing and investigating and drilling and all the rest of it. The Premier of Saskatchewan said to them "if you find any oil we are going to take it from you", and the whole thing collapsed.

**Hon. T.C. Douglas** (Premier): — He, I am sure, did not say anything of the sort.

**Mr. W.J. Patterson**: — What did he say?

**Hon. T.C. Douglas** (Premier): — You are making the speech.

**Mr. W.J. Patterson**: — Well, what did you say? The Premier told — I think it was at the CCF Convention at Saskatoon — that if

any oil company found any oil in Saskatchewan then the government would take it over. I think that was the idea of it — maybe a distorted gist.

**Hon. T.C. Douglas** (Premier): — A very distorted gist.

**Mr. W.J. Patterson:** —Well maybe a little distorted, but it will read as correct as most of my hon. Friend's statements. But that was the idea of it, if the oil companies found something. The result is that to all intents and purposes any worth while development in Saskatchewan has discontinued. If that is what our friends want, that is alright with them.

Now, Mr. Speaker,, I move an amendment or want a confidence vote, and that will be presented to the House in due course. I have given twelve different reasons why that vote should be sustained, but I think maybe I should not close my address without some reference to the very remarkable radio broadcast made by the Premier of Saskatchewan on the fourteenth of January, 1948.

First of all, typically CCF, he assumed the attitude of the — was it the Pharisee or Scribe who said — “we are all perfect” — the CCF did not do this or that or the other thing. Then he proceeded to attack the integrity and the fairness of the courts of the Saskatchewan. I am not going to deal with this at any great length. I think that this matter is one that could be handled much better by my hon. Friend from the Mediterranean Area who is a lawyer, and has a better appreciation of the position of the courts in British jurisdiction.

I do, however, feel that the Premier's broadcast was very unfortunate, and coming on top of a succession of evidence of disrespect to the Crown and the Crown's representatives, and the traditions on which our jurisdiction is established, that it was, to say the least, rather unfortunate. He may have his personal opinions about the gentlemen who comprise the superior courts of the Saskatchewan, or the methods by which they are appointed and all that sort of thing, I imagine that in a final analysis it comes down much to the same reason — that some of the planners and theorists that we have employed in the Saskatchewan are appointed, because of certain ideas and theories they have held.

**February 10, 1948**

But that is not what I want to say. The rank and file of the people of this province, as in all Canadian and British provinces, feel that in the courts they have a final safeguard against unfairness in legislation and in administration, and it is unfortunate indeed, Sir, that one occupying a position such as the Premier of this province occupies should, in a radio broadcast, or in any other way, for that matter, attempt to create disrespect and create doubts and fears as to the fairness of our judicial bodies. I do not think anyone, even the members of the courts themselves, would claim to be perfect or to not have human frailties and weaknesses, but I do think that by and large we can congratulate ourselves in this province and in Canada on the high calibre of the men who have been appointed to our Superior Courts, and to the distinguished and fair and judicial service they have given in those capacities.

If the idea of the Premier is that the courts should just be bodies which would comply with anything which this Legislature happens to pass or decide – that they should always agree with his opinions – that of course is very, very far distant from the general idea that is held by the rank and file of the people of this province and of Canada, of the position and the responsibility and the duties of our courts.

I think it is rather amazing that in view of the developments of the past years, this government should come before the Legislature at this time and present a Speech from the Throne which, in point of words and in point of length, of course exceeds anything that has ever before been presented; but insofar as presenting any practical, definite, constructive or worthwhile policies or legislation to meet the very difficulties that the Speech itself outlines, it is a total loss. for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I shall not support the Motion.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Moved by Mr. Patterson, seconded by Mr. Proctor (Moosomin):

That the following words be added to the Address:

“We respectfully submit to Your Honour that Your Honour’s present advisers do not possess the confidence of the citizens of Saskatchewan.”

Is the House ready for the Question?

**Mr. G.H. Danielson** (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker ...

**Mr. Speaker:** — The debate is now on the amendment.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I think this is the Fifth Session since this socialistic government took control of the affairs of this province, and as I was sitting here on Opening Day and during the last two days, looking across at the Members on your right, Mr. Speaker, no one who will think back can help but see a tremendous change in the attitude on the part of the government members of this House. Never have I seen a group of men, coming in here as they did in the fall of 1944, confident – absolutely – that they had the solution in their minds and in their program to solve the ills of Saskatchewan. Not only did they know what was wrong with the world, but everywhere. That was the impression that I gathered from them.

They offered to the people of the province, previous to that election, Mr. Speaker, a panacea, a program which was going to make out of this province – if they could only get control of the business of this province – a Utopia, a socialistic heaven here on earth, and it was going to be done in a very short time; and so they set to work to bring that very desirable condition about. I think that today at least the more reasonable among the members themselves will admit that they are a long, long way from having accomplished even part of what they promised the people they were going to do.

Well do I remember the election campaign, when the spokesman for the C.C.F. socialistic party in this province censored the old government for many things, and one of the things that they were very loud in criticism about was that this former government had too many Boards and too many Commissions; too many bodies set up to take the responsibility off the shoulders of the members of the government and load it on to commissions at the expense of the people of the province of Saskatchewan who were paying the salaries of the members.

And I remember how the Provincial Treasurer came into this House, Mr. Speaker, and immediately one of the first things he did was to disband the Saskatchewan Farm Loan Board, and he told us all what he was going to do. He was going to place the responsibility on the ministers of the Crown where it belonged and not permit such responsibility to be unloaded onto Boards and Commissions. In order to accomplish that purpose they immediately selected a twelve-man cabinet – a twelve-man cabinet!

Look at the tremendous increase in expenditures and overhead in carrying on the government of the province over the past three and a half years up to the present time. What has taken place? I say

**February 10, 1948**

without fear of contradiction, there is no other provincial government in Canada that has loaded up on the people's payroll so many commissions, so many boards, so many of this and that, all of which are feeding like grasshoppers on a dried-out crop, on the taxpayers of the province of Saskatchewan – and they are multiplying day by day as time goes by; and the farmers of this province, who have experienced (in many parts of the province) a fourth year of poor crops, are paying to keep these planners in their easy chairs, taking the responsibility off these cabinet ministers – twelve of them – who are supposed to do that work. That is one of the reasons why I think this amendment to this Motion is justified at this time.

Again, we find another situation – that today, the Civil Service of this province has practically been doubled since this Government came into power. Who is paying the shot? Well, the taxpayers of the province who are now in the unenviable position of paying the highest per capita taxation the Dominion of Canada, so far as provincial taxation is concerned. That is the situation. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker,, that is another reason why the amendment to the Motion now before the House is fully justified.

We had information – shall I say – on the radio a few nights ago, the very day that the Saskatchewan Legislature opened, when the Provincial Treasurer went on the air, to tell the people of the Education Tax. Well, Mr. Speaker,, I do not know whether he thought that was showing proper respect for this Assembly or not. I think perhaps it might have been more in keeping with the dignity of this House, which I am sure you are keen to maintain, Mr. Speaker, if this announcement had been made to the Legislature before broadcasting over the radio.

**Hon. C.M. Fines:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: The hon. gentleman has stated that I have made a certain statement over the radio to the effect that we were not going to abolish the Education Tax perfectly clear that I made no statement whatsoever of that kind. He is just reading something into it. There was no definite statement of any sort whatever along that line given.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Then, Mr. Speaker,, the Press of the province doesn't know what they are talking about.

**A Voice:** — There is nothing wrong with the Press – the Press is all right.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker,, to be corrected, because I am one of those who has been hoping that that blasted Tax, that stinking tax, would be abolished,

(continued on Page 23)

and I sympathize with him – I really do. but, after all, the taxation of the people of the province of Saskatchewan has increased by leaps and bounds and most all of these increases, except perhaps some of them due to increased salaries, the school teachers and so on, is brought about by the action of this Government. It has reached the stage now – you will find if you go out among the farmers in the province of Saskatchewan, out in the local school districts – and discuss this thing with the people who pay the taxes, that the time is coming – and coming very rapidly – when there is going to be a strike, so far as paying taxes is concerned.

Every department – everything this Government has done, has been done with the effect of removing the control of the taxpayers' money further and further away from the control of the people themselves. that is what has been done in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I say again that the situation is entirely not what was expected two or three years ago by the men who were planning to make a Utopia of this province. They promised that education was going to be entirely the responsibility of the Province of Saskatchewan. We were told we were going to have everything – free hospitals and free medical attention and free everything we could think of – and you know the people liked that because we had a man in the province, who is now the Premier, who came out and said they were going to have all these things without money and without price. What sweet words to the taxpayers of the province at that time! All these things were going to come without any effort and we were going to have the blessings of these services without money and without price; the good fairies of the Province were going to render them these blessings they were unable to get for themselves, without effort. He has a solution for the problem, he was going to pay it to them but not from the people — the 'big shot' was going to pay, — he was going to take it from the mortgage companies and the business men of this province, and the banks. He said there was 40 million dollars every year going to Eastern Canada from these institutions, and he was going to keep it here and take part of it, and that was going to pay for the free hospitals, free doctors, free educational services, everything was to be free. Oh! what a fake. The people of the province, today, realize how badly they were fooled; How deceptive these promises were! How untrue they were! How false they were from the very beginning! There is nothing that the people of the province get today without paying through the nose for it, like they always did. They are paying the shot. Yes, you can laugh but you won't laugh so much when the next election comes on. You are paying twice today what you should be paying for the services you are getting.

That is the difference. You have kept up a bureaucracy of civil servants and planners and inspectors; and inspectors to inspect inspectors. We have a little hospital at Davidson and there are two or three men every few days come in there to inspect and check up on that hospital. By the way, we had an Education Tax inspector up there a few days ago, I must

**February 10, 1948**

tell the House about that. He came in there and he was the fourth one in a week; not only Education Tax inspectors but there were other inspectors, came into the same office. He said he had come to inspect their income taxes, as far as their hospital accounts were concerned.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — It was the Federal Government.

**Mr. Danielson** (Davidson): — No. That statement might go in a schoolhouse where no one will challenge you but it does not go down here.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — They are smarter in the schoolhouse than they are down here.

**Mr. Danielson:** — We know more about this than you do. He came in there and he stayed for two days and dug back in those old hospital accounts, invoices and so on, and he soaked the Hospital Board \$109. for Education Tax, going back four or five years. that is the handout the hospital at Davidson received – it as cancelled, over ten thousand dollars worth of accounts that the people could not pay. But it kept going over the hard years. That is what we get! That was the Provincial Treasurer's present for the Davidson hospital for 1948.

He must be getting hard up because he comes along and wants some money. but I do not wonder he is hard up because if he is going to pay all these salaries – big salaries – and keep all these friends who are snowballing up like the grasshopper in the dry season, he needs more money; and they are just as destructive to the farmers of the province as the grasshoppers are.

but, after all, the promises of everything for nothing – the promise of services, that was made to the people before the last election – what do they amount to? Well it just comes down to this: you can have anything you like if you can pay for it, and that is what the farmers are doing. That is what the taxpayers are doing. More than that, by having a socialistic bureaucracy taking the control and the administration of local affairs away from the men who pay the taxes, and handing it in to a socialistic bureaucracy, the taxes have been unnecessarily increased, in many cases doubled; and, therefore, I submit again, Mr. Speaker, that the Amendment to this Resolution should be supported by this House.

The Resolution was introduced in this House by the Leader of the Opposition in regard to the Public Revenue Reserve Account Fund of \$1,260,000 – that is a thing that is familiar to every Member of this House.



It was a fund which had been placed into 'suspense' with the intention, and with the understanding of the municipalities who had paid the money in there, in proportion to the amount of money which had been paid in. When the reassessment of this province took place it was impossible to do all in the one year and the change in assessment was, I think, in every case, downwards; thereby bringing a reduction in the public revenue tax. It means that one municipality that received more than their assessment in the first year, received a reduction in the revenue tax that first year. A municipality that did not get an assessment until the sixth year, had it paid in for five years – five full years – but the higher rate of taxation which prevailed before the assessment was made, was paid into this fund – the agreement was arrived at and, through the understanding with the municipalities, the former Government took this money and set it up in a special account for the purpose for which it was originally intended.

Last year, this thing came to a head and a resolution was introduced here and, of course, the Government in power today, and which was in power last year, did not pay it; they had other plans – they had other designs, so to speak, to spend this money in a different way, and they were quite indignant when we had the temerity and the courage to hint that this money should be paid back to the people who had paid it in. I know he made a speech, on the Floor of this House, which showed clearly what he demanded when he made this statement, that the money did not belong to the municipalities at all, it belonged to the Government and the municipalities had no right to even look at it. That was the situation. However, after one resolution was thrown out, on account of not being in order, it was brought in by the Leader of the Opposition and it went on the Floor as being in order and debate took place.

As I said, this Government had a definite plan to use this money in a different way and the Resolution was amended and what did they do? They took this \$1,260,000 – and, by the way, the Resolution and the Regulations, which had been sent out to the municipalities, said only \$250,000 was going to be distributed for four years, that means \$1,000,000. There was \$1,260,000 in that fund but the resolution was amended to the effect that this was going to be an equalization fund and that it was going to be paid out to the municipalities according to some formula or plan that this 'all wise' Government devised, and thought out. I do not know what is going to be done with the other \$260,000, but instructions to the municipalities were that \$250,000 for four years was going to be divided, not \$250,000 for five years, and then have some money left.

**February 10, 1948**

Some sort of a Board – I think a ‘dummy’ Board – taking instructions from ‘the powers that be’, was set up to divide up this money. They devised certain plans – certain tests, so to speak – whereby a municipality could pass a certain test to get some of that money. However, if there has ever been anything that should be criticized by the people of the province of Saskatchewan, it is the distribution of this money.

I had in my seat a municipality that has paid in \$18,000 into this fund and has never got a nickel. That is the situation, and that municipality had passed through eight or ten years of the worst drought condition that has ever been experienced in this country, and we hope ever will be. There were municipalities who could not pay their hospital accounts during the drought years. I know one of these municipalities, with the Hospital Board, knowing what was going on there being a member of the Board, that we cancelled thousands of dollars of hospital accounts owing to us by that municipality. During part of that time, at least, — I think most of that time – the public revenue taxes were paid in, and there is part of your money. It is taken by this Government and distributed here and there over the province for the political expedience of the Government. That is not an equalization fund today, it is a ‘slush’ fund. It is a C.C.F. ‘slush’ fund, for political purposes.

**Mr. Howell** (Meadow Lake): — What is a ‘slush’ fund.

**Mr. Danielson** (Davidson): — If you want to know it is a fund of \$1,260,000 – and I hope you will get your share of it because I am sure you will need it.

My friend over here, asked the Government for a generous road grant, so I am sure he gets some into his ‘Garden of Eden’, which was contributed by the drought stricken farmers of the prairies along the Saskatchewan River, in the past few years. He will get it and he will need it – he will need more than that in the north to get the C.C.F. memberships and representatives from that district.

It is the first time in the province of Saskatchewan that any Government has stooped to the position where they have deliberately done that. And I have a list which shows the division of that fund in my constituency, and if it is not rank discrimination, so bald and so clear that nobody can doubt what it means. That is one of the reasons why this Government has forfeited the confidence of the people. They are not worthy of the confidence of the people when they will do a thing like that. For that reason, I submit to you again, that the Amendment to that Resolution is in order.

I want to talk to the ‘Grand Mufti’ of Northern Saskatchewan, the Minister of Natural Resources. He was sitting on this side of the House for years and years and he was always talking about the ‘big fellows’ –The Hudson Bay, the C.N.R. and the C.P.R. – and what he wasn’t going to do to those ‘big guys’ when he got into power and got a chance at it.

Now he is the king of the North. they call him 'The Colossus of the North'. There are two Premiers in the province of Saskatchewan now – we have one for Northern Saskatchewan and one for the South. that is what we have; the people tell me so. He was also telling us how he was gong to protect the 'little fellow' – the 'little fellow' who was catching fur; the poor fellow who was catching fish, and the fellow who was trying to cut a few logs and saw some lumber – oh! he wept over these little fellows when he was here. What has happened? He has driven every last one of them out of business and the only ones that are left are the 'big fellows'. The 'big shots' are all alive in the North yet, and evidently he is getting along and has very cordial relations with these 'big fellows'. But the 'little fellows' that he had so much concern for are gone; or if he is there, he has to work for the Government. He gets three meals a day, maybe, if he worked for the Government. That is socialization for you.

We have today in Saskatchewan the planned economy, this utilization of everything, in full swing in Northern Saskatchewan. I just wonder how long it is going to be until the farmers in Southern and Central Saskatchewan will be told the same thing. There is no reason why they should not say to me – you have some wheat and barley and oats, and all that sort of thing – you go out there and take their lumber, fur and fish – there is no difference. The principle there is just the same. In the only land in the world where socialism has reached its full and complete effect and is practised in all its power and is doing all it is supposed to do – as a matter of fact, one of the Ministers of the socialistic Government in Great Britain, when he came to Ottawa last year, they asked him would you say that socialism is in full effect in Russia. This gentleman was Mr. Strachey, and in 1932 he wrote a book on Socialism which is very widely read and when the reporter asked him if he would say that Socialism was in full effect in Russia, the report says that one of the gentlemen who was with him tried to stop him from answering – but he answered the question. He said they were trying to but Russia today is practicing socialism. Socialism! Well there is only one kind of Socialism.

I have been trying for fifteen years, since Mr. George Williams sat in this seat here and my friend over here – I don't know what to call him, I know what he is but I am not going to tell – I have been asking, every chance I had, for the last 15 years, why does not one of the defenders of the Kremlin over here tell me the difference between what they are trying to do, when they get this Regina Manifesto and all the plans in full effect – I have been asking them what is the difference between what they are trying to do and what they are doing in Russia today. I have never yet been able to get that answer. I ask them now – I am open to conviction and I would be glad to have these men get up and deny that they sympathize and support the plan that is in effect in Russia today. I would have them get up and tell me, and the people of Saskatchewan, the difference between the application of the full plan of socialism that they are implementing, and the full plan of socialism that is being employed by the people of Russia today. Do that for the people of Saskatchewan, never mind me. Tell the people and let them know what is the difference. You cannot do it! You know you cannot do it!

**February 10, 1948**

I would say to my friend, the 'King of the North', he should go back and read some of the speeches he made on the Floor of this House a few years ago and read some of the resolutions he introduced here and then look at his program, and go and take a good look at the people to whom he has applied the principles he advocated in those days. That is not the 'big fellow', it is the 'little fellow', and he seems to be on very good terms – peculiarly enough – with all the 'big shots' left in the North country today.

We had a Mineral Taxation Act applied to the people of this province – no! I am wrong there, it was not to the people of the province, it was to a few big 'big shots' – the few 'big shots' who are going to pay those taxes; the Hudson Bay, the C.P.R. and C.N.R. and two or three other fellows. He came in here and said they were going to pay 5 cents an acre tax. One day, just about lunch time, they walked in on my friend, the Minister of Natural Resources, and he came right back into this House and said "I made a mistake about that, we are only going to make it 3 cents". That was the first time I saw that he could be dictated to by the big interests, and you know it is not nice for a C.C.F. – a Socialist – to be like that. And that is what happened, and he was honest too because he told us who the fellows were who told him to cut it down to 3 cents. He was honest to the House because he told us quite frankly that these fellows had been in to talk to him and told him to bring it down to 3 cents – he told us who they were, he said I think they are right, and I will cut it down to 3. That is the first example I had that he was human, despite the fact that he was a Socialist. He is a Socialist but still he was human. That was the first experience with the 'big shots'.

He told us that these mineral rights were all held by the 'big fellows', and there was nobody going to suffer from anything here – no harm or injustice was going to be done to the ordinary farmer in this Province. It takes a long time before the facts of these things become visible, so the people can see them for themselves. I have in mind – if I had brought them down I think I would have had two dozen – letters sent by the hon. gentleman's department to farmers all around my district telling them if they did not come through with \$19.20 plus certain collection costs, making twenty dollars and something – I haven't one here – on April 1, 1948, their mineral rights are forfeit to the Crown. Where could you find a more slick way of confiscating property rights than that? Outright confiscation! They have nothing on the Silkins Bill or anybody else. They can do all these things – they have done it and don't think they can't do it again. They did it in another way in Province of Saskatchewan when they took the Box Factory. They did not expropriate the Box Factory, they seized it.

**Mr. Brockelbank** (Tisdale): — And paid for it – too much.

**Mr. Danielson** (Davidson): — You had to, you could not help yourselves. If you could have handled the courts you would not have paid for it either, but you could not do that and I hope that the day will never come when you can.

That is what we have today, thousands of farmers, not hundreds but thousands of farmer all over the province of Saskatchewan – getting letters from the Minister of Natural Resources telling them that if you do not pay \$20.20 on the 1<sup>st</sup> of April 1948, it is too bad but your property rights are confiscated by the Crown. That is a very painless way of doing things you know – and that is the socialistic policy for you. Now, what is the difference between doing that and to say to a fellow I am sorry but you did not farm this land the way we told you to and we are going to take that land over.

It is the same thing with everything. You cannot buy a piece of land from this Government today. You cannot buy an acre of land the get title to it from this Government, no matter what price you pay for it.

**Hon. T.C. Douglas** (Premier): — There is land being sold every day of the week by the Government and sold outright. The statement is absolutely untrue and the hon. gentleman ought to know it if he doesn't.

**Mr. Danielson** (Davidson): — I hope the Minister of Agriculture will explain this when he gets up to speak, in view of the statement he gave in the estimates before the House in the last Session. I asked him six times before and had an absolute statement from him that they would lease a farm but would not sell it. That is his statement. If I am wrong it is because he gave that statement.

**Hon. T.C. Douglas** (Premier): — You said the Government was selling no land but the Government is selling land every week and every month.

**Mr. Danielson** (Davidson): — I am sure that if that is the case, I will be glad to go home now and tell the people – at least four or five people in my district — who would be glad to buy a half-section or even a whole section. There is a whole section up there that would be sold as quick as that, if it was at a price that he could possibly afford to pay. I am sure the information will be very welcome to many of the people in the province of Saskatchewan who would like to get a quarter or half-section to add to the farm they now have.

If they could come in and say what is the price – here is your money – give me the title to it that would be all right. I have not seen one, but I hope I shall.

If that is the case and the Premier is correct, why in the name of common sense can't we extend the same privilege to the returned men. A returned man, he may have the price to pay for a piece of land or he can get it, in many cases, maybe not on his own but from his parents and friends – I know there are men in my district can get it – why can't he buy the land and get the title and be all through.

**February 10, 1948**

He can say to himself now this is mine and I can make a home out of it and provide for myself and my family the comforts of life, without being a renter for 10 years. He has a very slim chance of ever getting title to that land if this Government stays in power.

That is the situation – can you answer that question? Why is the returned man left out on a limb, if you sell land to the people of Saskatchewan and give them title. I would like to tell my people at home why that condition exists. Now is the time to tell them.

**Hon. T.C. Douglas** (Premier): — Do you want an explanation now?

**Mr. Danielson** (Davidson): — We certainly want it before this Debate is over.

**Hon. T.C. Douglas** (Premier): — You will get it.

**Mr. Danielson** (Davidson): — We would also like to have an explanation why the returned men are placed in that position – they may be willing to sell to someone else but why has the returned man not had that privilege?

So much for the iniquitous legislation dealing with the mineral tax, which has confiscated the rights of thousands and thousands of farmers in the province who came here forty or fifty years ago. They paid for their land and worked it, built their homes and produced – they built the province of Saskatchewan, and today they find these rights, without any excuse or reason, taken away.

If the Minister of Natural Resources – no, this Government – I should not blame him because you are all responsible – wants to play the game; if they are after the ‘big fellow’ why did they not say when they were putting the Bill through the House that the individual’s holding of any one section was exempt? It would have put the farmer in the clear and if you had the mineral rights on more than one section of land, take it away from him then, if you had to do the thing but I do not think you should do it then. but if you had to do it and that was your policy leave every individual at least one section of land in which the mineral rights remains.

That has not been the proper thing to do, no, that to you, Mr. Speaker, is not socialism. Socialism with its principles – its underlying principles – is not to give a title to individuals who are farmers, but to individuals whether they are farmers or not. Their policy is not to distribute property but to take it away then everybody is a tenant and worker to the state. That is the principle of socialism and always has been since 1849 when it was first founded in the old land and is the principle of socialism today.

I was looking through this Speech from the Throne Mr. Speaker, and in knowing as I know, not very far from here, districts – big districts – in the province of Saskatchewan which experienced this last year not a complete crop failure but at least a very small crop – in fact for two years.

There is not a bushel of seed oats or barley in the district for hundreds of miles. And I hope that this government, that is crying so much over the farmer because they do not get big prices, that it will tell the people of the province something. There are people in the province who have no seed oats and no seed wheat in many cases – disastrous is it not. There is not one word to the people in need that they are going to be supplied with the necessary seed and feeding supplies to put in their next crop.

I have here an article, where just a short time ago, when the municipal executive met in the city of Regina and they discussed this matter, the matter concerning the availability of seed oats for the 1948 crop season. The resolution was passed by the same delegates which read, “the provincial government bureau will take immediate action to provide a supply, and where necessary, to finance seed grain for the 1948 crop season, and to make a public announcement of the government policy in this respect”. Not only to have it available, but to pay for it wherever necessary.

Now then, to go back for a while. We sat here for five, six or seven years when we had to provide seed for the province. And I remember, Mr. Speaker, you among the rest of them, getting up day after day, on the Orders of the Day, and demanding from the government to know when we were going to be able to tell the people what we are going to do in the meantime and all that sort of thing. Everyday – I think we are in the right – to tell my friends that here is the answer now. Why, to the people of Saskatchewan who have no money to pay for it, what are you going to do? You are going to take some of the money that you have saved in other respects and buy them some seed. I know that is what you would plan we do if we were sitting on your side of the House. And for

**February 10, 1948**

that reason, I think, we are justified in saying that an amendment to this motion is fully justified in view of that fact.

I am sorry the Attorney-General is not in here because I am going to take about milk, Mr. Speaker. It has been rather a distressing issue with the Government. Whenever they had nothing else to talk about on the radio – such as criticizing the Federal Government – they have talked about milk. I have come to the conviction that when I listened to the Attorney-General on the radio time and time again about this milk, that that is all he lives for – that all the liquid he takes is milk. So I would like to have had his assurance that he does not take anything else.

Now, a while ago – I think it was the fifteenth of December – the Premier made a statement to the press that the Provincial Government had seriously considered payment of a subsidy for milk producers to combat the rising cost of milk, but they rejected the idea of subsidies on the ground that they were a Dominion responsibility. As long as the Federal Government remained in the field we would be asking for trouble if we started paying subsidies.

Everybody knows, Mr. Speaker, the Dominion Government stepped out of that field, not on the fifteenth of December last, but a year ago, and the Premier has not wakened up to that yet. And we have heard time and time again the horrified clamour, that a terrible calamity has come over the province because the milk subsidy was cut off. Fifteen-five cents a hundred pounds I think it was.

In spite of that fact, the Provincial Milk Board, under their own direction and their own chairman, has allowed three increases in milk prices since that time, amounting close to four cents, from 12 cents a quart. Now, Mr. Speaker, do not misunderstand me, I am not criticizing the Chairman of the Milk Board, I have every confidence in that gentleman, and I think he is doing the best he can; but when he...

**Hon. Mr. Nollet** (Cutknife): — did I understand the hon. member to say that we have had an increase of 12 cents a quart in milk since the subsidy went off – the Federal subsidy?

**Mr. Danielson**: — No, I made no such statement. I said that your own chairman has allowed an increase – three increases – in the last year, and the total increase is approximately 4 cents a quart.

Now, as I have said, I am not criticizing the chairman of the Milk Board, he is up against a problem which no one can solve.



because as long as the cost of operating the farm (and the things on the farm is continually going up) there is only one way that can be met, and maintain production, and that is an increased price for the products the farmer is producing. I think if there are any people in the farming communities who merit the price they are getting and probably more, is the one that produces the milk and the dairy products that we use in this country. I am serious in that, Sir. But after all what is the use of this government to use this as a political football, which they have done.

On every occasion we hear the very strongest condemnation of the Federal Government, and that they can do nothing, and even go as far as to say they have no jurisdiction – well they have the jurisdiction – and I remember sitting here a year ago when the Attorney-General brought this bill into the House (Bill No. 109) called “An A to confer certain powers on the Lieutenant Governor in Council,” and what does it say? Section (A) of Section (2) says, “controlling and regulating services performed in the province or any part or parts of the province by residents of the province or any class or classes of such resident, and prices payable for such services”. Well now, there is no lack of jurisdiction, they just have not got the courage to put this bill into effect. That is why they are trying to throw the responsibility onto the Dominion Government.

**Mr. T.C. Douglas** (Premier: — May I ask my hon. Friend if he will consult with the member from Moosomin and express an opinion as to whether or not the Act which he has just quoted from could be made operative in this Province as long as the present Transitional Powers Act is in effect at Ottawa?

**Mr. Danielson:** — I did not get the last name of that Act.

**Mr. T.C. Douglas** (Premier: — I am referring to the Transitional Powers Act which is now operative in Ottawa and has just been extended to the 31 of March, and which in all probability will be extended another year, as notices have already been given in the House of Commons. Does he think that our Act would be operative as long as the Transitional Powers Act is still in effect?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, the Premier knows the answer I am sure.

**Mr. T.C. Douglas** (Premier: — I do.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You inform yourself a little more about what these problems are and see.

**February 10, 1948**

There are certain controls included under this Transitional Powers Act, and milk is not one of them. That was surrendered to the provinces a year ago and there is just a few things left under the control of that Act. The Premier knows that it does not affect his Act at all. You are giving a subsidy on wool; how do you do that? I think it is the last year they will get it.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet** (Cutknife): — Could the hon. member tell us just where he would like the price of milk pegged – downward.

**Mr. Danielson** (Davidson): — I am not going to tell the gentleman that because he is the Minister of Agriculture in the province and he also is the Government. What I am trying to get at is this: the Government do their jockeying back and forth and have made this milk situation a political football. They are pleading that they cannot do it because the Dominion Government did it at one time, during the war. I think the Premier, or some member of the Government made a statement that they did not have the money; there was such a demand for the revenues that the province was not financially able to take on this particular burden. I do not think that statement can be correct because this Government has been in receipt of revenues so tremendous during the past few years that there should not be any shortage of funds. The Provincial Treasurer has told us time and time again that the revenues are buoyant; during the past year he had \$8,104,620 in liquor profits, more than twice – I think I am safe in saying three or four times more than they had in the hard times. I am not surprised at that because he told us one third of that was watered. One third of that profit is \$2,431,380, water at 20 cents an ounce. That is enough to pay the milk subsidy to these poor babies, that the Premier speaks about, for the next ten years, in the province of Saskatchewan.

You cannot plead that you are short of money. If any private individual perpetrated a hoax like that on anyone they would be in gaol (sure they would), because they would be selling adulterated goods. That is what the Government is doing.

**Hon. T.C. Douglas** (Premier): — Are you ready to substantiate that statement that there is that quantity of water in the liquor?

**Mr. Danielson** (Davidson): — I am going by the statement made when the Provincial Conference was held in Eastern Canada last year. I had it from several places in the press. I had it, from the Dominion Government instituting that dodge during the war.

But that is no reason why you should continue it in times of peace. There is your answer – take the 2,431,380 dollars worth of water that you sell to the people at 20 cents an ounce and pay your milk bonus for several years and there will not be any need to shed any tears over the babies.

**Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier):** — You tell the Federal Government to keep on the bonus they had.

**Mr. Danielson (Davidson):** — Yes, Mr. Speaker. I expected that, that is why I looked at him so long. The Dominion Government paid millions of dollars into the province, paying family bonuses.

**Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier):** — And took \$136,000,000 out in taxes.

**Mr. Danielson (Davidson):** — They are taking no more out of this province than they are out of any other province in Canada. and your \$136,000,000 is not correct – some day I am going to prove it on the Floor of this House.

What about the Education Tax? They make an awful big thing out of taking off this tax on fruit, meat and a few pickles and telling the people that they cut it down 40 per cent: the fact of the matter is that the prices of goods has gone up so high that they are getting more in Education Tax today than what they did before. That is the situation. You cannot fool the people all of the time, because these things will come out in the daylight sometime and we might just as well have them on the Floor of the House now.

This Government does not merit the confidence of the people because they have not conducted the business of this province in such a manner as to merit it. So do not come on the radio and cry about the babies any more. Take your liquor profits – or the water profits – and give a milk subsidy and you can feed all the babies in the province for the next ten years.

There is one thing that has convinced me, more than anything else – it is a simple thing in itself – but it indicates to me, conclusively, that the people of the province has lost confidence in this Government. This is not just a local thing but at the present time it affects just one part of the province and I think the Premier knows what I am going to talk about: it is the vote on the Health Region for Saskatoon this Fall. That was the most peculiar performance I have ever seen or have ever heard of in my life; and I think practically all of the rural people in that part of the province agree with us. The vote was taken on the same day as the municipalities election took place in the rural area. There was no information or no publicity given to this thing among the people in the rural area,

**February 10, 1948**

I say so without any fear of contradiction. No matter how many inspectors, and inspectors following inspectors, and supervisors travelling by car to that region, no one was notified. There were people in my district voting for councillor and reeve and they did not cast a ballot for the Health Region, either for or against it; hundreds of them. And I am telling you the honest truth. Then on the very day – and you can check this Mr. Premier – in the afternoon's mail, the day the vote was taken, there was a small slip of paper or card put in every man's mail box and if he called for his mail it was handed out with his mail – telling him to vote. That was on the afternoon, in my district, of the same day that the vote was taken. It happened to be on a Wednesday and, as you know, in practically every town and village Wednesday is a half holiday, and there are no farmers coming into town to get his mail on Wednesday. The town is more deserted than on any day of the week. For that reason there was no vote taken. Why wasn't that notice card sent before – a week or two before? There was no publicity on the radio until the vote had been taken.

I cannot understand it but I can draw conclusions. I may be wrong but just as soon as the rural vote had been taken, there was a whole month until the urban vote was taken and when the urban election came along there was all kinds of publicity then. Why! there was a regular election campaign. The Department of Public Health and their planners and their supervisors and brain trusts, by radio and otherwise, took part in the Saskatoon election campaign. You could not turn on the radio at noon, breakfast time or any time, before someone was on there denying something that Mr. Mills had said – one of the mayoral candidates in the city of Saskatoon, — that he had said so and so, and that wasn't correct. I do not think that the 'powers that be' had any hope that the rural people would vote for that and carry that vote and the fewer of those people that voted, the better. But they did expect, when the urban vote came along that they would carry the day, regardless of what happened in the rural district. Well they got fooled, — and do you know why they got fooled? I have had dozens of them, and more, in the City of Saskatoon that I asked when I was up there at the Wholesale annual meeting, what was the reason. They were quite frank about \_\_\_\_\_ said it was not the Health Region, it was just what this thing might lead to – the people would not trust it. He said this was the first step in advancing wages, so to speak. When you take the Saskatchewan Gazette and see the powers of this Board, and that it might be far removed from the man who pays the taxes, the people said, "we are not going to pay." They did not pay.

The people of Saskatchewan are not against anything that is going to benefit them, but they are not going to slip into the clutches of any superbody that is going to order them around. They had the experience of the Larger School District, and they are not likely to accept the same thing insofar as any other public service is concerned.

**Hon. T.C. Douglas:** — Well, there are six of them set up now, by vote of the people, and they like them and still want them.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Did they all get a vote?

**Hon. T.C. Douglas:** — Every last one of them got a vote, and all of them voted by 80% or over, I want to inform my hon. friend.

**Mr. Danielson:** — But that is the situation, and I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that convinces me more than anything else that there is in the minds of the people (they do not say much, but you talk to them by themselves), there is that distrust of what is behind all these things, and they say there is that distrust of what is behind all these things, and they say they are just going to wait and see. You had a clear demonstration of that in the city of Saskatoon, and what happened? The man who opposed it openly...

**Mr. Howell:** — He was a Liberal.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Oh, no. You are absolutely wrong, and I know that.

**A Voice:** — That statement is not true. I think both of those men were good men.

**Mr. Danielson:** — The man who opposed it was defeated. The man who was in favour of it was elected, but the bylaw was defeated. Now how do you account for that? Does that not mean anything to you, does it not indicate the feeling of the people? The two things are diametrically opposed. People reason like this: "Now, this Mayor so and so, he has given us a pretty good administration, and I think we will trust him with it again. but he wants this Health Region. Well, we do not want that, so we will just vote it out." That is what happened. People are capable of thinking for themselves here yet, and they will continue to do so, but the day is coming closer and closer when this Government must go to the people for judgment, and I am sure...

**Hon. T.C. Douglas:** — We'll not wait six years!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, I am not so sure, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Who said 'got' to go! You were scared to go!

**Mr. Danielson:** — I noticed a few days ago that the 'King' of the Highways, the Minister of Highways, went up to Alberta and he told them he would like it very much if that election could be held off until next fall so that he could complete his program. I listened to my friend, the

**February 10, 1948**

Minister of Agriculture, on the radio here several weeks ago, and in his broadcast he made this statement: "Whenever the Election comes around – 1948 or 1949." Well, you know these things are straws in the wind. When that day comes, it does not make any difference when it comes...

**A Voice:** — Well, we will not wait six years, you can be sure of that!

**Mr. Danielson:** — It does not make any difference, Mr. Speaker, whenever the day comes you are going to meet the same fate, because the people of the province of Saskatchewan did not vote for Socialism. You did not tell them you were going to give them Socialism. Oh, no. You were going to give them all those things that they would like to have, without money and without price. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the Amendment for the reasons that I have stated.

**Mr. P.J. Hodge (Rosthern):** — Mr. Speaker, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I do not see why we should adjourn the debate now. We have a procedure which has been set out in other yeas for debating. It is usual for the Leader of the Government to follow the Leader of the Opposition, and if my hon. friends are going to upset that, then I suggest that we sit through the evening. The usual courtesy is extended to the Leader of the Government to follow the Leader of the Opposition, and I do not know why my friends have chosen today to alter that. It has never been altered in the history of this Legislature, or in the history of the Parliament of Canada. Now that my hon. friends have sought to alter it, if they want to alter it, then let us sit on through the night. As far as I am concerned, I oppose the motion.

(The motion for the adjournment of the debate being put, it was negatived.)

**Mr. P.J. Hodge (Rosthern):** — Mr. Speaker, I did not expect that I would be called upon this afternoon to speak, and unfortunately I did not bring any notes with me, and I am rather surprised at the attitude of this House in this connection. However, I will continue for the next few minutes in any event.

In Biblical days, the city of Jericho was surrounded by a wall, and this had become an objectionable feature to the Children of Israel, and by a blast of trumpets they were able to demolish it. In 1944, a political, economic wall was commenced in this province, encircling the barriers radiating from the circumference a central point, in which the population of this province would be segregated according to avocation, so that they could be more easily directed and controlled, and more easily exploited.

At that time the people did not exactly understand this fiendish plot that was being perpetrated on them, but they have since learned the import of it, and it was on that account that we hoped that these oratorical blasts which have been started today here by the Leader of the Opposition and by the member for Arm River will do something to demolish that political monstrosity which we now find in this province.

The Member for Hanley informed us here yesterday that the Liberals always made the mistake of underestimating the intelligence of the people. I admit, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberals have made mistakes. Many Liberals made a mistake in 1944. The reason that so many liberals made a mistake in 1944 is that the hon. member for Hanley is here today; and for the same reason, a number of other members are in this House. One mistake that the Liberals never did make is to under-estimate the intelligence of the people. The Liberals always had a very high regard for the keen intelligence of the electorate of Saskatchewan, and they always considered that they had such a high degree of intelligence that they did not need to be told about the good things that the government did. The Liberals still think that the people have a high degree of intelligence, and that it was not lack of intelligence which did not make them appreciate the Liberal achievements, in 1944; but it was merely oversight on their part. If a person is sound in health and body, one takes no notice of a good heart, or a good stomach or anything else – you are never conscious of it. It is the same way with the people of Saskatchewan. Under Liberal administration for thirty-five years in Saskatchewan, they had become so used to good government that they didn't know they had it, and the only mistake that the Liberals made was that they did not tell the people what they were doing. they were hiding their light under a bushel.

The hon. Member for Hanley tells us that we made the mistake of underestimating the people, but their records show that they are making the very mistake that he accused the Liberals of having made. Is it not a reflection on the intelligence of the people to send them out propaganda by the carload every day of the week, not only by pamphlet, but over the radio and in every other way, through concerts and so on? Any thoughts that they might conceive, anything that they might do or intend to do is publicized and dramatized in every possible manner. Is that not telling the people – “You are children; must be told again and again what we are doing or else you will not be able to understand it?” If anyone is underestimating the intelligence of the people, it is the party which is now governing in Saskatchewan, and not the Liberal Party; but this intelligence of the people is now being manifested in many ways.

**February 10, 1948**

They are beginning to see what has actually happened. They begin to see that this Absalom, in the guise of the C.C.F. party, came around with their blandishments and deceived. You all remember the story of Absalom and David. The Children of Israel enjoyed a beneficent rule under old King David in biblical days, and people were perfectly satisfied until his son, Absalom, came along and sat outside the walls of the city where his father reigned and met this person and that person and engaged them in conversation and said: "What is your trouble and where are you going?" "Oh! I am going to see the king and I have certain grievances I want to lay before him." He listened to him and said: "Your case is just, you have just grievances, but my father, the King, will never listen to them. Elect me and I will see that justice is done." Fortunately King David found out about this fiendish plot of his son and was able to stop it, as a result of which Absalom finally died. Unfortunately that is where the similarity between Absalom and Saskatchewan ends. In Saskatchewan 'Absalom' was able to seize the reins of power, but the people, as I stated before, are not finding out that the story told them was absolute blandishment.

Another thing – we were told that this nuisance tax we have in this province – the Education Tax – was absolutely obnoxious, not warranted and should be abolished at once. And we were told about the horrible appalling health conditions in this province: it was just a political blackout that should be corrected immediately. We were told that we were living under horrible conditions in not having electric lights in the rural communities and that educational matters were very unequal for the children in this province and would have to be corrected. We were told that the natural resources of the province would have to be developed for the common good of the people, and in various other ways grievances were pointed out to them.

At that time, the people, like I said, had been used to government and had never really studied the question; they had taken good government for granted – they thought possibly that some of these matters that had been raised had something to them, and they voted to have 'Absalom' elected in this province, and he has been here ever since.

**Mr. Speaker:** — May I remind the hon. member that it is getting near adjournment time and if he wishes to carry on after adjournment time I prefer to call it six o'clock.

**Mr. Hoogy (Rosthern):** — Call it six o'clock.



AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 o'clock.

**Mr. Hooge** (cont.): — I wish to apologize to the members of this House for bringing them back here tonight but, after all, the matter was placed before them and they decided in favour of returning this evening. Evidently the suspicion got abroad that I was trying to fill somebody's radio time. That is just another instance of what this Government will do to the constituency of Rosthern. We cannot get anything – we can't get highways, we can't get relief, we can't get even a bit of radio time.

Before recess I was talking about mistakes – the Liberals, I frankly admit, made mistakes. when we did make mistakes we endeavoured on the next occasion to correct them as much as possible: that is one of the chief differences between the Liberal party and the C.C.F. party. The C.C.F. party make mistakes and in the last three or four years – in my humble opinion – they have made nothing but mistakes but they never admit that they made any. If they do make a mistake, they say it is the fault of the Federal Government or that it is the fault of the King's Bench Court. They say "we know the King's Bench Court is ignorant" but we had that eminent counsel Dr. Shumiatcher there – the man that combined all the wisdom of the ages – a man that knows all the laws of the province – and those people would not learn from him. Or they will say that it is the mistake of the Court of Appeal – that politically hide-bound bunch of corporation lawyers – they made the mistake. That is what the C.C.F. do instead of admitting their mistakes.

I was also discussing the intelligence of the people and saying that they are exhibiting their intelligence by seeing what this Government has really done. They noticed this socialistic monstrosity, that I refer to, was structurally unsound, because the pattern and design was that emblem of iniquity called the 'Regina Manifesto'. They might not have the lack of confidence in this pattern and design if the former architect had remained in charge but he was dismissed and others placed in charge, who arbitrarily changed this pattern to a very large extent. They also noticed the builders of this structure that is being imposed on the boundaries of this province are, to a large extent incompetent and inexperienced and that the material used is not selected for the purpose of fitness or soundness, but merely for the sake of momentary expedience.

**February 10, 1948**

They now realize that they formerly did not have a sufficient appreciation of the advantages of Liberal administration. They did not realize before the value of the freedom which they had acquired through descent, and the opportunity which was afforded them to really exercise their personal initiative. You cannot blame a good many of them because they never had the opportunity of comparison. Incidentally, in the Rosthern constituency, many of those people are in a better position. Many of them come from Russia and they have seen two forms of Government. They, therefore, can realize the advantages which they enjoyed under the Liberal Administration. Many of the other people in the province, unfortunately, never had that experience; consequently, like Adam and Eve when a glamorous apple was handed to them, they were not in a position to distinguish – should they accept it or should they not. but, having seen how this Government functioned in the last three or four years, they see there is very appreciable differences between the various types of Government. Those rights which they thought were sovereign and inviolable before, they see how easily they can be taken from them; they are not going to make that mistake again. They now realize they have been too gullible to listen to that ‘Absalom’ to which I referred.

They now see that that Education Tax which, it was promised, would be taken away from them right away, still is in force. In Rosthern, the stores – we have quite a few of them – have not been taken away yet under this administration and some of them are doing very well, but they are liable to be closed up any time – but these people came the next day after the election and when this Education tax was collected – after all we have some very honest people there to collect this tax, because it is the law of the country – they were quite hostile and said “the C.C.F. said that this tax was to be removed”. Well, they replied, “the tax is still in force”, — so they collected it. Now, we have been told time and time again in this Legislature that they never made those statements but if it wasn’t made any place else it was certainly made in the constituency of Rosthern over and over again that that Education Tax would be removed. Of course, I admit that the constituents were probably wrong in demanding that this should be taken off the day after the election, they could not expect it until the legislature was convened but, in any event, they were so such that the Education Tax would be removed that they insisted on not paying it the day after.

I think that the people are right in demanding that this tax should be removed. When the Liberal Administration put on this tax it was never intended for years and years, it was put on as a temporary measure to help out the financial deficiencies of education which at that time were in the most distressing condition. Had the Liberals remained in power, I am sure that the Education Tax would not be in force today, and even though a part of it has been removed, the fact remains that at the present time, owing to the larger amount of trade and commerce going on and the higher prices prevailing, I dare say that the Education Tax collected today is nearly the same as the highest amount ever collected under the Liberal administration. I am certain if not warranted now, it certainly was warranted at one time; the Liberals regretted having to put it into force at that time. But as I say, it was only a temporary measure to be lifted as soon as conditions changed and it certainly would have been done.

Since then, not only have conditions improved rapidly, but we are getting this large grant from the Dominion Government. Surely it is no longer necessary that this tax should be imposed. The people in their intelligence – and their intelligence has been questioned today – they certainly see that it should not be necessary to have this Education Tax in force any longer.

In regard to the matter of health – as I pointed out before the adjournment – that prior to the last election, we are told how horrible and absolutely abominable conditions were regarding health services. The Government, in order to bolster up the statements they had made, appointed a man by the name of doctor Sigerist who made, I presume, a close study of the question, and practically absolved the former Minister of Public Health, Doctor Urich and said that considering the conditions in this province and the remoteness and so on, that conditions were really very, very good. Now, what have they done since? About all that we have done, we have all sorts of statutes in connection with it, and as I said at one time, we seem to have so many of these statutes that are so difficult to understand them. There has, however, been some clarification since and the matter is now more easily understood, but the fact remains, that very little has been done except to introduce this Hospitalization Act.

Now, what is this Hospitalization Act after all? Is it something new? It is a different name but that is about all. We had hospital units before, people did not die like flies before. In fact I know of no case in this province before 1944 where a person had to die because he lacked medical care. Today with all these so-called high approved facilities, and the most advanced legislation of its kind in the world, what are the conditions now?

**February 10, 1948**

We have used this hospitalization unit, the prepaid plan, and when people want to get in sometimes they can and sometimes they cannot. It all depends on the doctor and whether there is room in the hospital. But after all, what is this so called prepaid Community Health Chest – and it is not even as good as the Community Health Chest because ordinarily in a Community Chest you contribute voluntarily and it does not cost anything. Anybody that goes around collecting for a Community Chest does so voluntarily and out of the goodness of his heart, and the people are glad to pay it because they know it is going to a good cause. In this case you contribute to this Community Chest and it costs you at least from 10 to 15 per cent to collect. I think the Minister of Health has told us that they expect this plan to cost around \$6,000,000. Well even if it only cost 10 per cent to collect, and administration and so on, that is a lot of money.

We have a neighbour of ours who runs a little nursing home close to our house. She sends in her account and has to wait months and months and she is nearly frantic. She does not speak or write very good English and because she does not cross a T or dot an I her mail is sent back and there is months and months of delay and finally the poor woman nearly starves until she gets those few dollars. All this red tape in connection with delays is certainly abominable.

In connection with this plane service, the member from Canora heralded it as something absolutely new, something never heard of before. I understand that long before this matter was conceived by this party, that a similar service was conducted by some veterans in Regina, and practically at the same rate. I think the notion is abroad that this service is being given free. I think most people believe that they can just phone to Regina and get this plane to come out there free. To me, I think that notion should be dispelled altogether. If I understand the member from Moosomin correctly, he said some patient had to be flown from Moosomin to Winnipeg and he had to prepay \$90 before he was taken there. I am not saying they should not be paid for the service but you can see it is not free by any chance.

We were definitely told before the 1944 election that this would be a move ‘without money and without price’ and things would be given free. Now there is certainly no sign of anything free about that.

In connection with the tenure of land, this is something that has been bemoaned very much by the members of the government. Owing to the obstructions of the court and the obstructions of Ottawa, they cannot get through with this land tenure. This is something they were really proud of; they were parading something that was never

conceived before, and in spite of all they want to do for the people of this Province, they cannot get it through. It is because of “bad Liberal Government”, in collusion with the judges of the province, that they cannot put it through. They are now going to take it to the Throne of the King and see if they cannot do something for the people of the province. Now, what does the thing really amount to? It amounts to absolutely nothing. I have been practising law in the town of Rosthern and ever since this law came into force, and people actually – you may not believe it – but some people actually trust me and come to the office. Even some good CCF supporters have enough confidence in me to come to the office, and I am telling you the truth when I say that since this law has come into force, not one person has come into my office to take advantage of this law. In fact I think people are scared of this new legislation.

Ever since this government came into power, the people have bestirred themselves to pay off their agreement and their mortgage in order not to get under this legislation; this law has never been invoked. there might be the odd case where the Mediation Board has stepped in, but to all intents and purposes we are still functioning under the old law which is under the Land Contract Action Act and the Mediation Board, and under which – in my humble opinion and the opinion of my other friends – they had absolute protection, and the protection still exists today. No judge of our courts, no local Master, will allow a farmer of this province, no matter what political affiliation he belongs to, will not allow an agreement for sale, or mortgage foreclosure so long as he can show that he has made a reasonable effort to satisfy his creditors. I have been practically 30 years practising law before various judges in different parts of the province and that has definitely been my experience, and I think that it is the experience of my friends from the Mediterranean Area and Moosomin and any of the lawyers you care to consult in this province.

On the matter of electricity – although you people are not groping in the dark on your farms, you have kerosene lamps – where are the lights? This government has taken over some of the electric lines, and have taken over the companies that are operating in various parts of the province, but I fail to see yet where any farmer has been given the rural electrification.

With this matter of education. We were told that the government was going to take this over and it would be a provincial concern; there was too much inequality between children of one district and the children of another, and that this would be rectified, as we understood it, without any extra cost. All that has happened is the establishment of the Larger Unit without asking the people about it. I have tried to find out how these Larger Units functioned. I have inquired from one district and another if there is any improvement and have been assured from all sides that as far as they can tell there is no difference between conditions before and now, except the administration costs a great deal more money. the member from Canora has told us that in his district, referring to two districts side by side, one a Larger Unit and the other was not. The motion for the Address in Reply is a motion of Confidence.

**February 10, 1948**

I am endeavouring to show why people should have no further confidence in this Government. That is pertinent to the issue. The hon. member from Canora has told us that there are two districts there, lying side by side, and that the difference in cost is practically the same. In fact, I'm not so sure whether the cost in the Larger School Unit was not even cheaper. If that is the case – and I suppose we must take the word of the hon. member for that – he is to be congratulated if the people in his district can conduct their affairs in such an economical manner, certainly; but that is not the history elsewhere, in most parts of the province.

In the constituency of Rosthern, so far as I am aware, we have no Larger School Unit. The notice of formation was given, if I am not mistaken, about two years ago, and the people there, without any intervention on my part, saw fit to circulate petitions asking for a vote, but that vote has not been taken. That was their right, given under the Act – it was a democratic right, apparently they complied with all the requirements of the law – but nothing has happened. If that vote had been taken, I do not know what would have happened. I have done nothing to change the sentiment of the people in connection with it. After all, the petition was not signed by everyone in Rosthern constituency – it only takes a certain percentage; but, if a vote was taken, the possibility exists that they might have voted in favour of it; I do not know. Supposing they had, then we would have had a Larger School Unit now. The point that I am trying to emphasize is this: there is such a vast difference – although I have not been able to see any improvement with the exception of a few frills and furbelows like additional libraries and so on, which is very nice but which could be dispensed with if necessary – but with that exception I have seen very little difference in the Larger School Units. There is this difference, the Larger School Units get a larger grant than the others, and that is what we are suffering under. We have no Larger School Unit and, consequently I wrote to the Minister of Education some time ago – I frankly admit that that was the case – but he pointed out some things, why it was and so on, but the fact remains no vote has been taken; we have asked for the vote to be taken but they do not see fit to give it. We pay our taxes in the Rosthern constituency. Why don't they have this vote? Why don't they give us the same grant that they give others?

As far as the natural resources of this province were concerned, we were told before election that they would be developed and the revenue used for government purposes, and so on. The facts actually are that the only development that has taken place – in fact you could hardly call it a development it is exploitation – connected mainly with the fur, the fish and the lumber. The people are not being allowed to develop it

it is the Government that developed it – for the use of the people, mind you, — but they are forced to do the work and the Government takes the profit.

In the matter of industry, they pride themselves greatly on the fact that they started industry in this province – something that was never heard of before; it was something that had been neglected for 30 years. In Moose Jaw, for instance, they started a wool factory – they have finally conceived this idea which was dormant – a potential moneymaking proposition, never thought of before by the Liberals they started it, and a shoe factory, and some clay and brick and that sort of thing operated for a few months of the year. That is all right, it employs a few people but it is very doubtful that in the long run it will make any money, particularly if you take into consideration that these various municipalities lose. All of these concerns do not pay any taxes and a loss to the municipality is involved. I submit if that is taken into consideration – the loss that occurs to the people of these municipalities by these enterprises being established, and the loss that the merchants and the other businesses sustain by virtue of this unfair Government competition, that there would be no profit at all.

Then in the matter of slogans. They really pride themselves on their slogans – they really won this election on their slogans. “For use and not for profit”, “Humanity first”. I think that is stooping to the lowest, to appeal to human emotions for the purpose of achieving something and then absolutely doing the opposite. that was what this was: “for use and not for profit”. What were the actual facts? They used the people – and the slogan should be changed to this: “people for use and not for profit” – that is what it practically amounts to. Take the lumber business – they get the people to do the rough work and then later on they pay them about \$35 per thousand for the lumber produced and they sell it for \$50 or \$55. They use the people for it – that is the people for use and the Government for the profit. The same thing with the fish. They use these poor Metis, and others, to catch the fish and stand all the rigours of the northern climate to transport them for hundreds of miles in the dead of winter and pay them a very small price. Of course, they say “we will pay you some more”. I have seen these second payments come along – I saw one the other day – it was for 8 cents, another one for one cent, and that sort of thing. Here again you have them using the people for the Government to get the profit.

Then they have this slogan “Humanity first”. These words should be inverted too – it should be “First humanity”. They want to get after humanity first. What the slogan of this Government should be is “Dollar first”. They make darned sure they get the dollar first before they do anything.

**February 10, 1948**

One of the systems that has not been taken over in the Province is the railways. Under this system you can send goods or a telegram C.O.D. – cash on delivery. This Government does not even do that, they collect before delivery. They should be called the C.B.D. Government – collect before delivery. Dollar first, not humanity first. The people, in their intelligence, now realize what they have lost and what they had before – that they had freedom which they have lost now. They have lost their fishing rights; they have lost their lumbering rights; they have lost the right to carry on insurance in this province; they have lost the right to conduct industry in this province, they have to compete with Government industries now that pay no taxes at all. They now notice that they have lost revenues in connection with the industries which they carried on before, like fishing and lumber – they could get everything that the traffic would bear but now the Government take it and they get very little out of it. The municipalities have lost money.

They also realize that one of the bulwarks of protection that they formerly had is now about to be lost, when the Leader of the Opposition referred to it – that the Premier had attacked the Judiciary, and they see that this probably last right may be tottered. In this connection, I just want to express my appreciation – I was just reminded of an incident to which I wish to refer. It is this: the Leader of the Opposition had in his hand this afternoon a copy of a radio address made on the 14<sup>th</sup> of January. I wish to thank the Premier, personally, for the great act he did for the Liberal party on that occasion – quite unwittingly on his part. the hon. members will probably remember that on this occasion we had quite a storm – I do not know the conditions prevailing in Regina at the time but we, in the Rosthern constituency, had an awful snowstorm on that occasion. Mr. Tucker, on that occasion – you have heard of Mr. Tucker before, I think – Mr. Tucker and I intended to go to Hague on that day – he wanted to go to Hague and asked me to go along. In view of the prevailing weather conditions thought we should go by train but he insisted on going by car – he had a new car and he thought we might be able to make it. In the afternoon, about 2 o'clock we started off, and Mr. Tucker is a fairly fast driver and we plowed through the snowdrifts and got to Hague – held a meeting but I was getting rather nervous. I kept looking outside, and saw the storm and said we should be going back and we finally did about 4:15. Just about the time we started out the velocity of the wind increased and the snow began to fall faster than it had before and when we got about half-way between Hague and Rosthern – as far as I could judge — because the visibility was very limited and we could not see where we were; the storm was so severe we could not see where we were going or how we were going and we were entirely stuck. I assure the hon. gentlemen it was no laughing matter at that time – we tried our very best to extricate ourselves from the difficulty – Mr. Tucker finally drove to the side, we could not see where we were going and we drove into the side of the snow bank which was made by one of the C.C.F. government plows and we got hopelessly stuck. We could not see any light; we could not see any house and we were sitting there in the car, just contemplating. the heater wasn't functioning and the temperature was dropping; the storm was raging and we felt entirely helpless against the elements raging about us and we were just contemplating the irreparable loss, unless the storm abated, the Liberal party might sustain, when lo and behold! about 8:30 in the evening, we heard of mellifluous tones of the Premier.



We decided to live a few minutes more. He referred to the judiciary and then our blood really started to tingle again and we formed a firm resolve that we were going to battle the elements – that we were going to live – that we were going to survive, and here we are.

We have been told by the hon. members of the Government that they see no hope at all under free enterprise and that anything that can be achieved can only be achieved under Socialism, which they now – I think they are ashamed of the word Socialism – label Democratic socialism. You might just as well call a wolf a sheep wolf as call Socialism, Democratic Socialism. You might just as well call a lion a rabbit lion. You might just as well call a skunk a rose skunk, as to call socialism, Democratic Socialism that is just drivel to call it that. Just look what socialism did to Germany; what did it do to Russia, and to England. The member for Hanley told us today – he referred to England – he referred to Scandinavia – he referred to New Zealand – he likes to wander all over the globe – I believe he was in New Zealand at one time and he likes to make these imaginary trips – he probably hasn't the money to travel about now, but he like to go there in his mind anyway – he told us there is really no hope except to follow the pattern of these countries. I notice he does not mention Russia this time. Last fall he was taking an itinerary across the province in the company of Mr. Fines, and if I am correctly informed by this very faulty press of ours in the province, the member for Hanley is reported to have said on one occasion, when he was comparing the system prevailing here with that of Russia, he said: "the people of Russia are getting somewhere". They are getting somewhere! Yes, indeed, they are getting somewhere! They are being driven in millions to the concentration camps. If the member for Hanley is so anxious to get somewhere, and believe me now that he is not going to serve his country after the next election, he really should start to travel and see the countries that he admires so much. Why does he not go to Russia and see and visit Joe. Stalin – I notice he has quite an accent – quite a burr – and I think he should not find it very difficult to learn the Russian language. I do not know much Russian, just a few words and I would just like to give you a sample of it. There are some in this House that could probably correct it and if they do – I am not trying to show I know anything about the Russian language but I want to illustrate that it contains the same sound as the Scottish language. Now I am just going to quote a few words from what was formerly the national anthem of the Russians: "Boshe Tzarrachanei..." Now there you have it. It is very similar to Russian isn't it – I think you understood me as well as you did the member for Hanley.

**February 10, 1948**

I think that the member for Hanley quoted quite copiously from **Bobbie Burns**. I think if he went to Russia and visited Joe. Stalin, and made his living there, he would forget all about **Bobbie Burns**; and he would be very much concerned – I think he would pledge his immortal soul if he could get ‘**Bobbie**’ to come back to Hanley.

It is a peculiar thing to me that the members of this Government will actually endeavour to point to Socialism as the answer to all of the ills of this province, when it is so apparent that Socialism is the one obstructing factor today in the ills of this province. Look at the efforts the United Nations are making to try and establish peace in Europe. Surely none of us think that the United States has any of these Imperialistic plans that the Minister of Agriculture, and others, have so often told us about. They have enough territory now, they do not want any more land – all they are concerned with is merely the establishment of peace, and they are willing to spend millions to achieve it. Who is stopping them? It is Socialistic Russia that is stopping them, and they are stopping it alone.

**Hon. T.C. Douglas** (Premier): — Socialistic Britain?

**Mr. Hooge** (Rosthern): — That is another thing. I am glad the Premier reminded me of that. It is countries that have not carried Socialism that far, like Great Britain. Who do they come to – do they go to Russia for aid? They tried it but Russia turned them down, and they have to come to the free enterprise countries like Canada and the United States as the only help. They are the only help for the ‘widow’s son’.

**Hon. T.C. Douglas** (Premier): — Why do they?

**Mr. Hooge** (Rosthern): — Because they are the only ones who ever had anything and ever achieve anything, and the only ones who have a heart. It reminds me what the member for Canora said about the people of Canora. He was actually trying to tell us that in the constituency of Canora, there are people there who would turn down an emergency case at the door of a hospital. I think people like that — I think they are referred to in the Bible as Levites. I wonder how the people of Canora would like it if they heard that the member for Canora had related such an incident in this House. That they actually would not admit an emergency case in the hospital. I never heard of such a thing as that. If that actually happened, I am certainly not at all surprised that the member for Canora does not wish to represent them any more. I certainly would not want to represent a bunch like that, in this House, if they are actually that hardhearted; if they have no more milk of human kindness in their veins than that. But I doubt very much if that is the case, it seems so preposterous – we know that nobody would stop to enquire about financial aid when it is an emergency case – the law provides for it, you do not have to make any financial arrangements. It is provided by law that the municipality from which the person came from, in an emergency case, must pay for it.

But I must not take up the time of this House too long. In conclusion, I simply wish to say that the reason the people in this province are waking up – their intelligence is aroused – they see all these things; that they see that this Socialist Government is a negation of everything that has been achieved before; it is an absolute negation of the evolution of freedom; it is a negation of the first commandment that we had, which was to replenish the earth – it had dominion over the fowls of the air, the fish in the sea and everything that moveth about. That was said to individuals, it was not said to a state. It was said to individuals to go and acquire these things; but the Government wants to change all that any say it should not be the individual, it should be the Government.

We were created in the image of God. We were supposed to be the crowning achievement of the Creator's work and certainly humanity was always put first in the New Testament. But what has this Government done? It has tried to change all that; it is going to set the truth "the golden calf of the state for the human soul.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the Amendment.

**Mr. Embury** (A.S.V.R.): — Mr. Speaker, I understand that we are sitting tonight because of the anxiety of the Premier that he will not be able to get on the radio tomorrow.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, Order. We are sitting tonight because we are sitting under the rules of the House.

**Mr. Embury** (A.S.V.R.): — Thank you. In any event, Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is fair to say that if we were not sitting tonight, that the hon. Premier would not get the radio tomorrow. Be that as it may, the comment which I would like to make is this: that I have yet to see a Socialist that wasn't very anxious to get on the radio, for the purpose of spreading far and wide the socialistic ideologies, with which he seems to be so profoundly and so bitterly imbued, from one end of this province to the other.

I think tonight, that that is the main difference between this side of the House and that. There is no other important matter which should engage the attention of the House, and I suggest, through this House, to the public at large in the months that lie immediately ahead for all of us. And I may only say this, before I move to the body of what I have to say tonight, and that is, that I do not want to have the members of the House in any anxiety that I propose tonight to conduct any gerrymander beyond the hour of 11 o'clock, for the purpose of depriving the hon. Premier from the intentions he has to go on the radio tomorrow.

**Hon. T.C. Douglas** (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. gentleman certainly cannot be familiar with the rules of the House. The rules of Debate in this Legislature, over the years, has been well established. (interruption) Mr. Speaker, I speak on a point of order, and I am quite in order in doing so. The procedure of Debate is quite clear and it has been carried out over the years.



Yesterday.....

**Mr. Embury** (A.S.V.R.): — Has the member a point of order, or privilege?

**Hon. T.C. Douglas** (Premier): — I am stating my point of order, Mr. Speaker. Apparently the hon. member hasn't sufficient experience to know that. If he would listen, he might understand it but he is so busy talking most of his life, that he never listens to anybody that is why he knows so little about this and everything else.

**Mr. Embury** (A.S.V.R.): — What is it? Why don't you state it then? Gen on with it.

**Mr. Speaker**: — Order, Order!

**Hon. T.C. Douglas** (Premier): — I am taking orders from the Speaker, and not from the gentleman who sits there and says "get on with it".

Yesterday, when the Mover and Seconder completed their remarks, the Leader of the Opposition was given the courtesy, by the House, of adjourning the Debate. that courtesy is always extended to the Leader of the Government, in order that he may carry on the following day.

**February 10, 1948**

It is not a matter of the debate being carried on for my particular benefit, whether I should have the radio any more than anyone else – my hon. friend has the right to the radio and last year he had the radio. Other members have the right to the radio, and all that I am asking, Mr. Speaker...

**A Voice:** — What is the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker?

**Hon. T.C. Douglas:** — It is a point of order, not a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The point of order is very clear in pointing out the order of procedure. The procedure has been carried out; there has been no deviation from it, either on my part or on the part of anyone else.

**Mr. A.W. Embury** (Armed Services): — Well, it is your ruling.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The Premier rose to a point of order, really more to explain the procedure which has been general knowledge of the House. As you know; the rule of the House is that if the debate is not finished and is adjourned, and as the adjournment of the debate can only be by consent, we go on according to Standing Orders. Tonight we are in session according to Standing Orders, and as long as I am in the Chair this House is going to be conducted according to Standing Orders.

**Mr. Embury:** — But what is your ruling, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order raised by the Premier?

**Mr. Speaker:** — The ruling on the point of order is that it was a point of order on the procedure in the House, and I think the point of order was well taken as far as procedure was concerned.

**Mr. Embury:** — I did not quarrel with the procedure.

**Mr. Embury:** — May I speak, on this alleged point of order? The object of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, is simply to point out that I do not intend to conduct any gerrymander through until eleven o'clock for the purpose of forcing the hon. Premier off the radio tomorrow. That is not my purpose. It was only to set the hon. Premier's mind at rest that I had no such intention; and if he will allow me to get on with my speech I will finish just that much sooner. If the hon. gentleman had a point of order to make in respect to those rather innocuous comments, I am eager to learn what it was.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think the point of order really was that you intimated that this House was being conducted in the interests of the Premier and not of the House as a whole.

**Mr. Embury:** — The point of order is, then: if the hon. Premier wishes me to retract or do anything in accordance with the ruling which he insists upon, I shall be happy to do so, as I appreciate that he would not like brought into the public view any such purposes as that,

no matter how apparent it may seem that we may be conducting ourselves – and I am sure we are, Mr. Speaker – well within the rules of the House in conducting the proceedings tonight as we are doing. But I would say this upon the amendment – and it is an amendment to the main motion which reads as follows: “That we respectfully submit...”.

**Hon. Mr. Valleau:** — I will raise a point of order, and I will quote the rules of the House. the point of order is that the hon. member who now has the floor is imputing to the Premier motives which the Premier does not acknowledge, and if the hon. member cares to read Rule 297 – if he has not got a copy of Beauchesne I will read it to him —:

“The imputation of bad motives or motives different from those acknowledged, misrepresenting the language of another, or accusing him, in his turn, of misrepresentation, charging him with falsehood or deceit; or contemptuous or insulting language of any kind; all these are unparliamentary and call for prompt interference.”

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! Will the hon. member kindly take his seat.

**Hon. Mr. Valleau:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Embury:** — I might say in passing, that I was only saying that I did not want the hon. Premier to impute motives to me which I did not have. This motion – if I may proceed after that great champion of the rights of free speech, the hon. Minister of Social Welfare, is through attempting to interject himself into the middle of my remarks – has to do with the motion to amend as follows (introduced by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, in which he says and moves): “We respectfully submit to your Honour that your Honour’s present advisers do not possess the confidence of the citizens of Saskatchewan.” It is to that amendment only, Mr. Speaker, that I propose to address any of my remarks, and upon the amendment I feel it my duty to say a few words, and for this reason.

In this House, the voices who are charged with the responsibility of giving opposition to the various government measures – and it is their duty to do so loyally – are not as numerous as is the best interests of the debate. I say that in all sincerity. As I have said before so often in the House, any interest in the politics of the matter at all, nor, by my background, I think, could it be said that I had any interest in the political future of the hon. Leader of the Opposition at all. However, the hon. Leader of the Opposition leads a party in this House who obtained more than one-third of the votes of the people of this province who are opposed to the ideological experiments and the experimentations of Socialism which we see going on around us all the time.

**February 10, 1948**

In that opposition, Mr. Speaker, I may say with absolute frankness to the House that the hon. Leader of the Opposition and I see eye to eye, most definitely. The number of persons in the House who support the point of view of the hon. Leader of the Opposition and myself, as a lesser individual and figure in the House, are in no way commensurate with the number of the public who follow the political and ideological views which he holds.

If the C.C.F. Government would today put into effect the single transferable ballot, as they promised to do at one time, so I am told – although I was many miles from here when that went on, but I am sure that if it was not true the hon. champion of free speech yonder would be up to interrupt me before now – if they would do what they said they would do, perhaps that situation could be avoided in the future. In the meantime, in the interests of our democratic processes, I believe that it is of assistance to the House and to the debate, that more voices be heard, so that the opposition to the proposals of the government can be given more full opportunity to be heard; and that, Mr. Speaker, is the sole reason that I find myself on my feet.

As this House well knows, I have no confidence in the C.C.F. Government, and when I say that I do not wish it to be thought that those sincere and well-meaning members of the C.C.F. Party in Saskatchewan do not embrace a very lofty ideal. I have no doubt in my mind at all, and I am quite sure that a great many of the Veterans follow me in this, that the honest farmers, teachers, and men of all walks of life who came together in the depths of the depression, which occasion has been related to us more than once in this House, those men (and women, too), intended in that day and year to form a government which would some day grapple with our problems in a sensible and in a progressive way, and who would stand up and fight for our provincial rights; but I think that that same Party, as we see it in Saskatchewan in 1948, has been led astray by a group of extremists and alarmists, and those very people are doing a great deal to harm our provincial economy.

The people to whom I refer in particular, Mr. Speaker, are the socialist agitators who parade themselves up and down this country, month in and month out, who occupy time on the radio, giving typical socialist agitators' speeches, designed, Sir, to stir up hatred and internal discontent, and to bring contempt and contumely upon one class of the people of Canada versus another class of the people of Canada. May I say, Sir, that in my view, and of course in the experience of us all, that in all walks of life in Canada there are no classes at all. In the army, if that be any example, may I say that I had no officer serving in the battalion with which I had the honour of serving, who had not started out in the ranks and worked his way to commissioned rank and to the responsibilities entailed in the administration of his duties and his responsibilities as he found himself and worked his way towards them.



Those men were appointed for the officer classes, about which I have heard socialists speak with contempt before now – not because there was anything preferable about them in the way of their family or their connections – but men from the very humblest of beginnings rose to serve side by side in senior rank in the Canadian Army with those from any walk of life.

In Canada, those who pretend that we had a class warfare, or that there is such a thing as a ‘ruling class’, are talking about people who have risen from the very humblest families in the whole of our dominion by reason of their own ability and capability and integrity, and their capacity to assume large responsibilities. This socialist talk about classes, Sir, I suggest is mere socialist agitation, and not founded upon fact at all – that it is a figment of the imagination of a socialist agitator. I have said some things which I feel, as do a great many others, about the socialist party in Saskatchewan. There is no doubt in anybody’s mind that it is composed of a great many sincere and honest people. I disagree with them with respect, and I would say of them what the hon. Premier has said about the judges. I would say this of the C.C.F. and say it honestly too – that most of them have honour and integrity. But you see how clever in disseminating adverse publicity such a statement can be, Sir, because it clearly implies that some of them have not.

Let me read to you what the hon. Premier is reported to have said about the judges of the province of – Saskatchewan. I hope you will correct me if I misquote him, because I have no intention of doing any such thing; but he is very widely reported to have said this: “Let no one imagine that I am making any attack on those who preside in our courts.” Perish the thought! Then he goes on to say this: “Most of them are men of honour and integrity.” I suggest to you, sir, that that clearly implies that some of them are not men of honour and integrity. But he did not stop there, as this report goes – he is supposed to have said this: “It is also true, however,” – (this is the sting in the tail) – “that most of them are either defeated candidates or former members of parliament or the legislatures. They represent the point of those who believe in our monopoly capitalistic system. Many of them, as lawyers, have represented large corporations for years before going on the Bench. What is more natural than that they should feel that the status quo must be maintained, even when it is in conflict with basic human liberties.”

I suggest to you that that passage, taken in conjunction with the remainder of his observations in this speech, raises a plain implication that our judges – these men whom he says have honour and integrity – by reason of their former associations and business associates of one kind or another, are biased in their judgments in favour. I suggest, Sir, that the words actually used give rise to that clear implication, and that they are not capable of any other reasonable implication when heard by a casual or interested observer or listener to what he had to say.

**February 10, 1948**

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say this – that when the hon. Premier suggests (and it is a very insidious form of propaganda indeed) – when he suggests that he would not dream of making any attack on those who preside in our courts, and goes on to say that ‘most of them’ are men of honour and integrity, and then goes on to say that notwithstanding the honour and integrity which ‘most of them’ are supposed to have – that they would be biased in their judgments by reason of their former business associations – that that must be the socialist’s idea of honour and integrity. I have often wondered, Sir, if they knew the meaning of the word; but if that is their idea of honour and integrity then please let me repudiate it and have no part or time to follow a man who would say or suggest such things as that.

The question of the integrity of our judges is a very vital one indeed. It is far too serious a matter to be treated as a mere political football. The place and function of our courts, functioning independently, in accordance with the highest traditions of British justice, handed down as they have been to us ever since the wrong and cruel ideologies of the Court of Star Chamber were done away with in our jurisdiction, has risen to a point where they are completely independent of any influence in our community, and where they are completely independent of any influence in our community, and is a matter which is vital in the conduct of our constitution for the future.

May I suggest further that it is the independent character, this traditional impartiality of our judges, which is one of our mainstays of our constitution as it stands, and perhaps the greatest guarantee we could have against a totalitarian design. The surest and best and safest conception which a British subject can have is the privilege that he may go freely to a court which will not jump through any hoop held up to it by socialism or any other totalitarian government, or obey the dictates of any person other than its own righteous conscience.

My hon. friend, in attacking that institution is not alone. Preceding the hon. Premier in his (what I suggest, are) attacks upon the integrity of our judges, was the notorious Shumiatcher. I have never ventured to criticize that gentleman in the House before. As a matter of face, enemies of the government can be very thankful for Shumiatcher. I do not believe that if we had had to choose a man as a neighbour for the Premier in this building that we could have found one who would lose him more votes, if it is a mere matter of politics. But that gentleman has gone a little bit farther than a matter of politics. Retained by the government, as he has been, on a number of cases, he has argued some cases in the Court of Appeal, and on two occasions, well-known to us all, (and I am sure that if the members of the House think I am overstating the fact some of them will correct me) he went to the Court of Appeal and pleaded a lack of integrity in the Court of Appeal. A government Counsel!

Now, I could excuse that in the case of a young counsel and an eager counsel – a chap who might overstate his case – and I am sure we all do it at times, but there are very few of us who could conscientiously suggest to any one of our judges, and particularly our Court of Appeal, whose integrity fortunately is well above the attacks of any socialist agitators like Mr. Shumiatcher – Dr. Schumiatcher – but he did that, and he was government Counsel! He repeated that again a few weeks later before the same Court in another case. It is not only the hon. Premier who does it – the point I seek to make, Sir, is this – that they sent their Counsel down to do likewise, and that there is a deliberate intention on the part of the hon. Premier and his socialist government to undermine the integrity of the courts; and I suggest to you Sir, and I hope that I am not going beyond the rules of the House when I do so – that when the hon. Premier or his counsel or any of his followers do a thing like that, they are acting like mere cheap, socialist agitators, and irresponsible at that.

There is only one other point which I would like to make – the hon. Premier invites us to consider the background of His Majesty's judges. He likes to hold up to the public view their background and what they are likely to do in a given situation today. I can only say this, Sir – that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones. What type of background do you think the hon. Premier has? Do you suppose the reliability of the hon. Premier is equal to that of any of our judges? As far as I know, and I do not know anything about it personally, but by general reputation (and I am sure he will correct me if I am wrong) as a younger man the hon. Premier was a minister of a great church. Most men of that high calling are imbued with the spirit of sacrifice and devotion to the needs of humanity, and they devote their lives to it. Sensible and able men of every walk of life condemn this socialist agitation, Sir, because of his efforts to stir up internal hatred, which most people hate and do not subscribe to at all, nor believe in even if the hon. Premier does.

But the hon. Premier, Sir, in his career as far as we have been able to see it, has bettered his own estate while preaching this gospel of socialism which I submit to you is one of hatred and avarice.

(continued on P. 58)

**February 10, 1948**

I do not believe, Sir, that a man who started out with the idealism of a great clergyman in the church and who has forsaken all that and has become what we see the hon. Premier today, has very much to congratulate himself on. Nor do I suggest that he is in any better position to criticize the background of our judges, than those who praise and have confidence in our judges and in the system that they represent.

Now if I may turn to a different subject...

**Mr. Speaker:** — I would like to warn the hon. member that he is getting very, very close to being out of order if he is not exactly there, and I hope that he will not transgress any more.

**Mr. Embury (A.S.V.R.):** — Well, may I suggest to you, Sir, for my part it would be with the greatest regret that I would go deliberately beyond the Rules of this House. If I am within them, then, Sir, I hope that I may proceed with my remarks without interruption. If I am beyond the rules of the House I am quite sure that the hon. Premier – who is very quick on the trigger in these matters – would have called me long before now.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I will take care of that myself.

**Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier):** — I would like to know the source of his remarks, as to whether or not I should take any action.

**Mr. Embury (A.S.V.R.):** — I imagine the judges do too.

**Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier):** — That is right, and they will probably give you a pat-on-the-back for your speech tonight.

**Mr. Embury (A.S.V.R.):** — The judges will probably consider the source from which the hon. Premier's criticisms of them came. I am quite sure the hon. Premier should be able to accept similar criticism which he directed at the judges.

If I may now – as I was endeavouring to do some time ago – go to a new subject, I would like to discuss anyone of these matters that I discussed, quite thoroughly with the Premier.

A great many people in Saskatchewan have supported this government as a Provincial government because – as I suggested – they were under the impression that it would be impossible to have real absolute socialism inflicted on us by a provincial government. I suggest to you that they thought this because a provincial government has only limited powers and jurisdictions. There was a time when I thought this myself, but I have learned, as a great many other people have learned, that I have underestimated the ingenuity of the

government's backroom boys and planners who I suggest have a great deal to do with the legislation and the extreme proposals that have been placed before us from time to time. I suggest, Sir, that it is possible for a provincial government to go a very great distance down the road to absolute socialism using only the powers of a provincial government. Sometimes governments such as this one tries to use powers which are beyond those of a provincial government and of course when that is done, great hardships result to vast sections of the public even though a Bill is well known and well recognized to have been ultra vires at the time it was passed.

I do not believe, and I am quite sure the hon. member from Moosomin (if he were here) or the Attorney-General, who is probably busy on the radio – I am quite sure they would bear me out when I say that if this House was told by the best counsel that it had at its disposal in respect to a number of these Acts, that those statutes were beyond the power of the Provincial Legislature, and that they would be found ultra vires.

Now in particular with that statute which we have had so much to do with and have heard so much over the radio and various socialist speakers, in respect to interest and farm mortgages: it is well recognized – one does not have to be a lawyer, and there is no black magic attached to the thing at all – it is quite clearly set forth in the Canadian Constitution that the Federal Government has the jurisdiction to deal with a matter of interest. But the fact of the matter is, that all judges, except Judge Taschereau, came to the conclusion, and may I suggest a very obvious conclusion; the counsel in this House, who did not go into it as thoroughly as Judge Taschereau did I quite agree, but whose first reaction was that it was not within the powers of a provincial legislature to deal with the matters of interest.

**Hon. T.C. Douglas** (Premier):— I would like to ask my hon. friend a point. He made reference twice, to a counsel for the legislature who thought the legislature was ultra vires. What counsel is he referring to?

**Mr. Embury** (A.S.V.R.): — Well it would be hardly fair to talk about the Attorney-General giving any assistance to this legislature. I personally think you ought to transfer him to the Adult Education Branch or something, and get him an Attorney-General who would give you some advice.

**Hon. T.C. Douglas** (Premier):— Mr. Speaker, I did not ask for advice as to what to do with the Attorney-General. The Attorney-General can quite ably take care of himself, and my hon. friend; I asked him to back up the statement he just made. Twice he has said, the legal counsel for this legislature or this government, advised the government that this legislation was ultra vires, and I was asking who the legal counsel was that gave that advice.

**Mr. Embury** (A.S.V.R.): — I do not suppose I have to answer questions for my hon. friend all night but...

**Hon. T.C. Douglas** (Premier):— If not, I would say there is no legal counsel who gave such advice.

**Mr. Embury** (A.S.V.R.): — Is the hon. Premier in order, or am I, Sir?

**February 10, 1948**

**Mr. Speaker:** —The hon. member knows the Rules of the House to this extent: If a member asks the member speaking a question, it is within the rights and jurisdiction of the member either to answer or refuse. If you do not want to answer the question...

**Mr. Embury:** — Am I in order or is he?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Certainly you are in order.

**Mr. Embury:** — What I was referring to was the opinions of counsel who are members of the Legislature here, such as my hon. friend from Moosomin, who were happy to have seats and did express the opinions to the House, I do not suppose he was aided very much by the Attorney-General, but as I say, I am sure the hon. member from Rosthern has the same thing to say. It is a fact that perhaps those are the only other two lawyers who we have in the House that could give you any assistance other than the Attorney-General. If Dr. Shumiatcher had a seat in the House perhaps he could be of more help to us. In any event, the point I wish to make is this, that this legislature deliberately assumed – or seemed to assume – powers beyond its provincial jurisdiction. and if they did so in that instance – true Judge Taschereau agreed with them; but generally the majority of opinions on the part of any of the ordinary lawyers, labourer or anybody else, seemed to be that that was dealing with a matter of interest and trying to do indirectly, what you did not have the power to do directly and that we had no power to pass.

In the course of time, as was expected, that legislation was desired to be ultra vires, and at that moment the hon. Premier and all of his socialist friends turned on the barrage of socialist propaganda over the radio and by leaflets and pamphlets, which we receive in such numbers since they came into power, to pat themselves on the back for having done something to save the farmer, and that the judges had turned them down. As a matter of fact, the judges did not turn them down.

**Mr. Speaker:** —I think I would like a little information here myself. Is it not a fact that this is till before the courts?

**Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, I was going to raise the question as to whether this matter was not a subjudice but in view of the fact that the hon. member was a lawyer, I thought he would be much better informed of the law than I am.

**Mr. Embury:** — I believe it is in the Speech from the Throne.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think it is before the courts; is that not right, Mr. Premier?

**Mr. Embury:** — May I speak to Point of Order?

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — The Speech from the Throne says it is before the courts.

**Mr. Embury:** — Well I will not pursue it. My hon. friend says it is in the Speech from the Throne and they have won the right to do something or other; it does go rather more than a mere comment. ‘During the past year my government has directed its attention to the enforcement of laws designed to give security to farmers in each of their homes, to workers in their employ’. That has reference to the Bill I refer to I imagine.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well if the government has it before the courts, I rule the...

**Mr. Embury (A.S.V.R.):** — It is in the Speech from the Throne. Does it have to be deleted from the Speech as well Sir?

**Mr. Speaker:** — No. It was merely a statement or report.

**Mr. Embury (A.S.V.R.):** — Perhaps your Honour will allow me to speak when it has been finally disposed of, if we are still alive. It is unfortunate that the matter could not be aired tonight.

I have said this, Mr. Speaker, that a great many people supported the government because they were under the impression that a provincial government could not go very far down the road to absolute Socialism, and I have indicated that I have come to the conclusion – and a great many people have with me – that the Government, with the aid of provincial powers only, can go a very considerable and damaging distance down the road to Socialism.

This Government imposes the very highest taxes they can upon the people of Saskatchewan. Last year, when the hon. Provincial Treasurer was introducing his Budget, he said: “before any new taxes could be levied, that he intended to infer that they were taxing to the limit at that moment. I suggest to you, Sir, that that is done so they will have lots of money, and with that money they can buy their way into a lot of businesses. There are many ways, with a lot of money, that you can make most substantial strides towards the eventual and complete eradication of capitalism from Saskatchewan, as the hon. Premier has so emphatically stated that he intends to do, on so many occasions.

With that money, it would be possible for him to buy his way into a great many businesses. Certainly that is one way in which it can be acquired, as a piece of property of a Socialist government – a business is what I am referring to. Quite often, in the case of business – and I must say I was quite sympathetic at one time, to the public’s view in respect to this particular matter, but on the whole of it, as the years have shown, I was probably wrong – they can so reduce and subjugate the various businesses by various activities in the labour field, or otherwise, that they can acquire it by expropriation, or some other way, as they did in the case of the box factory. but they cannot do it without money, that is why we have the taxes.

I am told, and I am sure I will be corrected if I am wrong, but I believe it to be true, otherwise I would not say it here – that there is another way in which they could acquire somebody’s business and bring it into the scheme of socialization of industry, is be refusing, or threatening, to refuse a public licence or an annual licence to a business, as they did in the case of the Greyhound Busses.

**February 10, 1948**

Another way, and I must say I have not seen any specific instance where this has impinged upon a particular private owner in Saskatchewan; but I have suggested in this House before that Labour Legislation may be designed to the end that there is danger that that may be so, when it is being manipulated by people who say they are determined to eradicate capitalism from Saskatchewan – would be to so manipulate their Labour Legislation as to impose an intolerable burden upon the employer, or the owner of the business, so that there would not be any profits, and drive him out of business altogether.

Another way – and the Government has certainly done this – to drive a man out of business, or to gain control of a business, or to disrupt a business, or an industry, in Saskatchewan, is for the Government to go into competition with it, as it did in the insurance business. That is another way in which it can be done.

The point I would like to make is this, Mr. Speaker, that with provincial powers, it is possible for the C.C.F. Government to go a long way down the road – a long and damaging way down the road to Socialism, with provincial autonomy only. And those who do not believe in socialism, among whom I am numbered, will view that with some alarm, and it may come as a piece of news to a lot of us.

The C.C.F. party are socialists, and I do not care whether they propose to inflict Socialism on us by constitutional means – the hon. Premier took such care to explain to me last year that one of the main differences between the Socialist party, as he envisages it, and the so-called democratic socialists proposes to bring Socialism about in our community by constitutional means, whereas the Russian socialist proposed to put it into action by revolution and bloodshed. The point I see in the matter is this: whether you be a Russian Socialist or whether you be one of the C.C.F. type of socialist, they both intend to impose socialism upon us, and the end result is the same, whether you have it by long drawn out strangulation or by quick strangulation – in the end you get it anyway. Article 12, sub-paragraph (1) of the Constitution of the United States of Soviet Russia says this: “That the principle to be applied in the United States of Soviet Russia, is that of Socialism”. And they are Socialists, and all this black magic and this magic that the hon. Premier seeks to have us believe in, as to there being some magic difference to his kind of socialism, and the Russia kind of Socialism, it seems to me that the only difference that exists at all, is the difference about arising out of the means whereby they manage to inflict it upon the population.

I do not like to see this either, and I know I speak for a great many men interested in the movement, when I say so. I do not like to see the efforts that these Socialists make to impregnate their ideas into the co-operative movement. to hear these Socialists talk, they would think



that co-operation and Socialism were the same thing. To hear them talk one would think that without Socialism that the co-operative movement could not do anything. As a matter of fact, long before I was old enough to take any active part in the affairs of this province, or to be able to study the affairs at all, the co-operative movement was flourishing in this province and that was long before the C.C.F. had ever been heard of. Unless I am very much mistaken, the co-operative movement is not going to allow any part to 'tie a political can on its tail'.

The member for Hanley, in a very moderate speech, I thought, and a very interesting and sincere speech, said that he thought the arrival of the C.C.F. in Saskatchewan was inevitable. I suggest to the House that it is nothing but a group of people who took advantage of wartime and post-war conditions to gain an election, and who have been using much of the public's money to bombard them with socialist propaganda ever since, in the hope that people would swallow it and let them stay on. I do not think this socialist party is inevitable at all. I suggest that they are trying to do the same thing in the Trade Union movement, as they are trying to do in the co-operatives. I doubt very much whether any union man considers his union to be the mere sounding board for any political party, particularly a party like the socialists, whose minister would speak to employees, as the hon. Minister of Natural Resources would speak to employees, of the box factory – the remarks which were quoted to this House this afternoon by the hon. member for arm River.

These high sounding phrases used by Socialist speakers in aid of this movement are not warranted, in my opinion. The hon. member for Canora, moving the main motion in this House, told us of a number of instances in which existing facilities of a government had been used to advantage, and I am quite sure they were used to advantage, but the socialists have been here long enough for us to find that they do not always work to advantage; and this is particularly true, I think, in the case of the larger school units, and in the case of some of the hospitals. I do not believe it is unfair to say, or suggest, to the House, that in a great many instances local school boards and local hospital boards know their own problems better than a group of planners in Regina.

On the whole, revenues are buoyant now and this Government should be able to do better than its predecessors. We have always been faced in Saskatchewan with the same inexorable equation. In this province it is the inevitable, I think, compromise between enormous distances and a rugged climate through many months of the year and a very sparsely settled population.

**February 10, 1948**

Those are obstacles we will always have here, and I do not think that the C.C.F. can do anything to change that equation at all. I doubt whether they can do anything today that is worthwhile, or help in working it out, that any other government could not do better. The reason I suggest that any other government could do it better than yours is because any sensible government would refrain from these irresponsible and extravagant socialist experiments. They would refrain from attacking the Courts. They would refrain from passing legislation that they have been advised is beyond their jurisdiction. They would get on with the business of running this province sensibly, and would use most of our taxes for the benefit of the province and not in favour, or for the purposes, or in aid, of those ideological experiments.

I have not touched upon the land settlement policy of the Government, as far as it applies to veterans, and I may say that I do not intend to do so tonight – I intend to cover that fully on the main Debate later on. But, I would like to say this much about it: in the course of this Debate, the hon. member for Arm River stated that this Government would not sell a piece of land in Saskatchewan for private purposes. That took place this afternoon, Sir, as you have heard. Whereupon the hon. Premier rose in his place – out of order as usual – as is the way with so many Socialists like him – and he stated, not on a point of order, or a point of privilege, or anything like that – he just got up to interrupt and so on – but he stated that the hon. member for Arm River was entirely wrong and that this Government was doing it every day and every week. That is what he said, and I am sure he would correct me if I was wrong.

That is great news for the veterans, Sir. That is great news for the veterans. The hon. Premier has indicated that he intends to speak tomorrow and in his remarks I challenge him right now to say...

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, Order. We cannot have any challenges in this Chamber.

**Mr. Embury** (A.S.V.R.): — Very well. May I suggest to him that it would be as well if he said – and I would like to ask him right here and now to clear up that point when he speaks upon this Debate tomorrow – I would like him to say whether or not his Socialist Government will sell a piece of provincial Crown land outright to a veteran under the Veteran Land Act, or otherwise, immediately. Have I made that quite clear? I should like him to say here and now whether or not his Socialist Government will see a piece of provincial Crown land outright to a veteran, under the Veteran Land Act, or otherwise, immediately. That is an answer the veterans would love to have.

**February 10, 1948**

I do not want an evasion to that question, but I think he should tell us this Debate, whether his group of socialists will do that or not.

And now, Sir, I have come to the end of my remarks on the question. As I hope I have been able to indicate, I have no confidence in the Government and I, accordingly, will support the Amendment which is proposed.

Amendment defeated on recorded vote.

**Hon. T.C. Douglas** (Premier): — I beg leave to move the adjournment of this Debate.

(Agreed)

**Hon. T.C. Douglas** (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The House adjourned at 9:35 o'clock p.m.