

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Tenth Legislature
Day 6

Friday, February 13, 1948

The House met at three o'clock.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE
Continuation of Debate on Motion
for Address in Reply

The House resumed from Thursday, February 12, the adjourned Debate on the proposed motion of Mr. M.H. Feeley (Canora) for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. G.H. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on the main motion, I would like first of all to extend my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the motion. I am glad to see the member for Canora back in his seat in this Session again; he does not seem to be any the worse for the years of hardship he has just gone through. He did a very good job of reading his reports which embraced several of the departments of the government. I was very pleased to hear that he has done so well up in that part of the country so far as road grants are concerned. He said he had had big equalization grants from this Government which, of course, must have been paid by the dried-out farmers on the prairies, in my district and others, who subscribed that money during the last few years.

I would also like to extend my congratulations to the member from Hanley. He is one of the most sincere — and, should I say — absolutely good fellows in this House. No one can take any exception to what he says; he is so sincere and so honest about it that he impresses everyone who listens to him with that particular thing.

There have been many things said during the last few days in this House, and we on this side of the House have expressed certain opinions in the debate — I have myself, on the amendment to the motion now before the House — and we have been severely criticized by other members from that side of the House because we are warning the people of the province of Saskatchewan of the dangers of regimentation and socialism which are gradually creeping over the province through the policies of this Government. For my part, I am honest in that Mr. Speaker. I said a few days ago that the northern part of this province is completely in the grip of a dictator at the present time, and I find that it is even creeping out on the prairies. Why was the north picked out for the experimentation before anything was done in the south of this province? Was it because they were in a part of the province which was more or less isolated, and where they could not be heard? Where they could not make their demands and their wishes and their protests known to the rest of the people of the province of Saskatchewan?

Friday, February 13, 1948

In any case, the process is nearing completion, if it is not already completed, and we find that it is gradually creeping out on the prairies. There is a lake in my constituency called, Long Lake; and today that lake is completely under the control of the Minister of Natural Resources, and the same treatment is being handed out to the fishermen on that lake as was and is still being handed out in the north.

A Voice: — They liked it!

Mr. Danielson: — Just a moment and you will find out whether they liked it or not! I have had two or three telephone calls during the past few days, and there is a Returned Man at Holdfast — I am going to mention his name, because I was asked to speak freely about this thing — by the name of Gabriel Burkhart. He and his father finally got a licence to fish in Long Lake — the father has been fishing in that lake, Mr. Speaker, for thirty years, and he lives there, he is a resident of that district; he has helped to build that part of Saskatchewan and considers that he is helping to build a better Canada — well, after some haggling last fall, they finally got a licence to fish. Another younger brother asked for a licence and was refused — they told him he was not a resident of that district, which of course is not true. He is. A few days ago, they collected some fish...

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question? Would he be in favour of issuing all fishermen fishing licences — anybody who asked for one, irrespective of the number, and the size of the lake?

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, I am not running the Government today, the Socialists are running Saskatchewan today, and we are getting a good dose of it. Now, when they catch a lot of fish, there is a collecting place on the lake, and then they are carted off to a place where they are finally shipped out. In the transportation of these fish — no one knows how it happened — some impurities or dirt had been mixed into these boxes of fish belonging to this gentleman that I have mentioned; and by the way, this Returned Man's father is ill in the city at the present time. When they came to check over the fish, he was accused of playing a trick — putting something in the fish to spoil it — and I think anyone would know that he would never do that to his own fish, or anyone else's — but it was there, and how that happened I cannot tell you. Well, this gentleman who is Acting Minister of Natural Resources up there, representing the Hon. J.L. Phelps, took the licence away from this young man, took away his nets, and ordered him off the lake, telling him not to come back again. That is the situation. I am bringing the matter to this House to show that even in our part of Saskatchewan, which is generally free from any regimentation and domination — because I think they wanted to work out their experiment on the northern people first — in our part of —s we are now feeling the hand of regimentation and planned economy — of the application of a socialistic type of government.

I have another letter here, Mr. Speaker, and this gentleman tells me has written to the Premier — so I need not go any farther. That letter is from another man who lives in the district, and who, so far as I know, is not interested in the fishing industry at all; but he says

that the condition up there is anything but what it should be. He says conditions are deplorable. That is the result of government meddling in the fish business at Long Lake. I hope that this Government, or the Minister of Natural Resources, will see that the injustice that has been done to these young men is immediately rectified. I, as representative of that constituency, Mr. Speaker, demand that from this Government.

There have been some deplorable sentiments voiced in this House in regard to certain conditions existing in the world today. I agree with some of them – Yes, I do. We find that what we hoped for a year ago has not materialized, because certain nations in the world are bent, — not on establishing peace and order and happiness for mankind but on fostering their own ambitious imperialism and spreading all over the globe the ideologies of their own particular creed which they are imposing on their own people. What is the reason we do not have peace in the world today? Simply because the countries that are completely dominated by socialism today are the ones that prevent world order, peace and harmony being established in the world.

I listened with very great interest to some of the speeches that have been made in the House here – there have not been many, and until a few moments ago I thought there were not going to be any except my own, but I understand now there are going to be quite a number before the Session is over. I think perhaps I might get a few more of the twelve cabinet ministers to get on their feet and do a little talking before this debate is over. I was very much interested in what the member for Kerrobert-Kindersley said yesterday. He is a very gentlemanly sort of fellow, and he goes back into the old days. Now, I am an old man myself – I am not so young any more – and I recall some of the days he talked about yesterday. I remember the days of the old Grain Growers' and I was at the Convention at Saskatoon when this wonderful transformation took place of which he spoke. Now, he wandered over the world, criticized American Tourists for coming into this country and for criticizing the Saskatchewan roads.

Mr. J. Wellbelove: — A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. If you will read over any remarks that I made, you will see that I had no criticism for the American tourist. My criticism was of the daily press that was exploiting the American tourists' opinions, making them detrimental to the work that the Department of Highways was carrying out in this province. There was no criticism at all of the American tourists – we want them here.

Mr. Danielson: — That is just putting it another way, Mr. Speaker. He has just said that he was critical of the daily press that was exploiting the American tourists' opinions. What was the opinion? The opinion was the roads! Sure! We can say it in just so many words – we can change the phraseology and it means the same thing. Let that be as it may. I do not see why, when an American tourist comes up here and is

Friday, February 13, 1948

asked his opinion regarding the Saskatchewan roads, he has not the right to express it. He would not be honest with himself if he did not do so. As I was sitting here listening to his address, Mr. Speaker, I could not help wondering how the C.C.F. members on that side of the House could be so touchy, so delicate, so tender, when it comes to any criticism of their government or the policies pursued by it.

Why, we have a Minister over on that side of the House who is trying to run the American government. For instance, the Minister of Reconstruction went down to the Co-Operative Horsemeat Factory at Swift Current and criticized quite severely the foreign policy and the internal policy of the United States. He told about the terrible treatment they were meting out to the Negroes and some of their other people down there, and how the American foreign policy was leading us into another war! Why, my friend over here, the Minister of Agriculture, last year delivered practically his whole speech on the Budget, trying to correct the terrible conditions the United States had got themselves into because of their policies, both internal and external.

A Voice: — It has not improved much, either!

Mr. Danielson: — Well, you helped the Kremlin out when you did it, anyway. But I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, why there should be so much concern about an ordinary tourist – a farmer, maybe, or somebody else – and then of course he might even be a lawyer, coming up from the United States – well, somebody asks him what he thinks about the roads and he says “Well, they are not so good at all. They are worse than any I ever saw.” Maybe he would be telling the truth at that.

Then again, the hon. gentleman over there is very upset over the fact that the Press of Canada and Saskatchewan had made a statement to the effect that the Canadian Congress of Labour is the political arm – or that the C.C.F. Party is the political arm of the Canadian Congress of Labour. Well, that is a statement that has been made by the leaders of labour unions all through Eastern Canada – everybody knows it. They not only look to them as their champion, but they also get money from them for their campaign funds every month. Why should this be such a hushed fact on the part of my hon. friend, when this thing is mentioned in the Press? I cannot understand that. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, it is because the farmers of Saskatchewan are commencing to wonder now whether it is the Labour Government or the Farmers’ Government. Well, they have long ago come to the conclusion that it is not a Farmers’ Government. This government has completely surrendered to the labour unions in this Dominion of Canada. Yes! Yes! Your own Mr. – Pardon me, Dr. Shumiatcher – went into the courts of this province and tells that they passed legislation which was ‘loaded’ in favour of the labour unions. I wonder if anyone heard him say that they passed any legislation on the floor of this House that was loaded in favour of the farmer?

A Voice: — Yes!

Mr. Danielson: — Yes! You did! But it was in reverse, when your “King of

the North” – Mr. Phelps – passed legislation confiscating every mineral right held in the farmer’s name in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker: — Might I remind the hon. member: You ought not to refer to an hon. member by his name.

Mr. Danielson: — I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I will refrain from that in future. I thought he liked the title. I wonder if, after all, that was legislation in favour of the farmer? That is the only legislation that has ever been passed that I know of, that has done the farmers any good, in this House, and you know what it did – it took every mineral right from the farmer’s land in the province of Saskatchewan. And not only that, but at the present time there is in process a plan to take away the land that the municipalities hold. There was a convention in this City of Regina not long ago – a district convention – which passed a resolution protesting against that action being taken, but it is being done. They are going to make a clean sweep of it. Even the municipalities, who at least should occupy the same position as a government and not have their properties taxed or any rights taken away – they are losing the mineral rights to the land which they hold. That is your farmer legislation for the farmers of Saskatchewan by this socialistic government! The only Act that was ever passed was to confiscate the rights that they held in their land so far as minerals were concerned, and that could very well be the surface rights to these lands – if they did it once they can do it again if they have the opportunity.

The member for Kerrobert-Kindersley spoke about conditions which brought about the organization, or what he called the “birth”, of the C.C.F. political party, and he said that they laboured for many years and always there was some Liberal cabinet minister on the spot to try and prevent what they were trying to do. I wonder if the hon. gentleman was not one of them himself? I think he was with the Liberals in the old days and I do not think he is any the worse for it – I think he is one of the best members in the House, and that does not say very much. Let me tell him that when this birth took place you produced what I would call a biological freak, namely, the C.C.F. Party. And the mother – she did not survive the ordeal. The old Grain Growers’ organization, the farmers’ economic and educational organization, had been built up for years and years with men who devoted their lives and their talent to do something for their fellowmen in this western country, and it all disappeared. It will never come back for the simple reason that no economic or educational organization that has a political heart can ever function to the satisfaction and to the good of the people it is supposed to serve. It never has been done and it never will be done. The old farmers’ organization was disrupted, completely broken up, and has never, since that time, come to the stage where it has been of any real use to the farmers of this province.

Friday, February 13, 1948

He spoke of the Larger School Unit. That is another thing that can be termed as a “stillborn baby” – The Larger School Unit Act which was on the statute books previous to the time this government took office. He said this: that when they came into office, they produced a “live baby.” Well, Mr. Speaker, they did not tell the people of the province of Saskatchewan before they came into office that they were going to do that. This is what they said, and this was their platform: that they were going to foster and promote the Larger School Unit legislation then on the statute books. Well, they threw it out the window and put in a typical socialistic, compulsory Larger Unit Act; and so far, in spite of anything that anyone, a minister or anyone else, says, not a solitary Unit has been permitted to vote on that, whether it wants to join a Larger School Unit or not. There have been statements made that no one who has asked has been refused. That is not true. There were eighteen units thrown in there, without even the sign of an intention to let them vote. We know what the Act was, when it was first introduced in 1944. The whole thing was at the discretion of the Minister, and eighteen units were formed between the special Session in 1944 and the regular Session in 1945. Did anyone vote on them? Oh no! Has anyone been permitted to vote since? Oh no! There are fifteen units now that could have voted – at least one in my district has been ready to take a vote for two years, Mr. Speaker. Well, why are they not permitted to take that vote? Why is it? It is the same in other districts. Well, you take care of your Larger Municipal Units, we will look after the school districts – the other fellows can do that.

Why are the people in these districts not permitted to exercise the right to vote after the Opposition here has fought and fought for two or three years for them and got that particular provision into the Act? Because you do not dare to let them vote. No, you do not. Just two years ago last fall, at the municipal elections, Watrous district was ready to take a vote. They have not had any vote yet. There is no intention on the part of this Government to let them vote on that, not at all; but you wait and see at the next election...

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member is in a position to interpret the intention of the Government?

Mr. Danielson: — I said that was my conviction. Am I not entitled to my convictions, Mr. Speaker? I would not attempt to interpret what is in the minds of the hon. gentlemen because that might be extremely difficult. I do say this – that to my mind, the stalling that has taken place during the last few years indicates to me that there is no intention to permit these fifteen districts to have a vote. There is going to be an election some time, and when that comes around and if, by any stretch of imagination – which I am sure will not happen – this Government should get back into power, do you know what they will tell us? They will say that we have a mandate now – there will be no vote. The same thing will follow with the Larger Municipal Units – the same thing. Where is the report of the committee that was appointed two years ago? Where are all the reports and data that was going to be gathered and submitted to the House and to the municipalities? We have not heard a solitary thing. I noticed

a Minister come into the House last year and took the provision out of the Municipal Act which permitted the ratepayers in the municipality to take a vote on matters of that kind.

A Voice: — No!

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, they did! or else the Municipal convention is wrong; because I have read a statement from them on that very fact.

A Voice: — They are wrong.

Mr. Danielson: — I do not think they are wrong. I think they know as much about it as the Minister. They are pretty well posted on their work; so there you are – gradually, little by little, bit by bit – this socialistic stranglehold, this dictatorship, this centralization of power is being drawn more and more into the hands of a few socialistic ministers in this government; and people do not like it – they are getting suspicious of it – they do not trust them any more, and their distrust is growing every day, and no one knows it better than the Premier, sitting over there.

Premier: — You are welcome to give them a chance, and see?

Mr. Danielson: — You will find out. I am not worrying about it as much as you do, that is a cinch. I am not worrying about my seat as much as you. To go on, the member for Kerrobert-Kindersley gave us a great deal of information about the Power Commission, making a comparison between what this Government is doing and what was done before, but he nullified his argument when he told us, in the latter part of his talk on this particular topic, that they had not been able to get the material that was necessary to do the work they had laid out. Well, now, in criticizing the old government, does he know that the War started in 1939, and that it ended in 1945? Could you buy a piece of wire, could you buy a cross-arm, could you buy a transformer, could you get labour that was qualified to do that work? Not on your life! The hon. gentleman knows that, and the criticism is absolutely unfair.

Mr. Wellbelove: — On a point of privilege, the comparison I was drawing there was in connection with Manitoba vs. The Saskatchewan Power Commission. What applied to one applied to the other.

Mr. Danielson: — No, no, no, Mr. Speaker, he was telling us what the Liberal Party had done and what this government had done, and in his comparison he brought in all the number of subscribers that had been added to The Power Commission system. Certainly that is all right, I have no fault to find with it, only he put the wrong interpretation on it. The point that he tried to make was simply that this Government had given all its subscribers the services which they now had. Mr. Speaker, when you go out and buy a concern that is operating very efficiently, three or four of them in the

Friday, February 13, 1948

province of Saskatchewan, do you add actually the number of subscribers to the old central body to which you joined them? That does not give one single, solitary subscriber light and power and services that he did not have before, does it.

Mr. Wellbelove: — This was independent of that altogether.

Mr. Hansen: — Absolutely!

Mr. Danielson: — He mentioned the “new subscribers” that had been gathered into the system, but we did not get any real figures on them, although I agree that there was a considerable number. Do not forget this, there is a gradual development throughout the province of Saskatchewan every day and every week. I venture to say that in the little town of Davidson there are twenty-five or thirty new subscribers during the last eight or ten months – at least during the last year. Why? Because houses are being built, material is becoming available, new families are moving to the town, and some of the people are finding themselves in a financial position now whereby they can afford to put light and power into their homes. This state of affairs is created by economic conditions, and we are glad such is the case. However, to try to make political capital out of it, criticizing the government that was in power when, as he knows, nothing could be done – and this same argument applies to the Highways system, which we will deal with some other time – is unfair and incorrect in many respects.

Could you buy any asphalt to put on highways during the war? No, you could not. Could you get labour – could you get machinery?

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — You could buy gravel.

Mr. Danielson: — Oh, no. You expropriated it. Your government took the farmers’ gravel pits away; but now you cannot get it, because the socialists grabbed that too. The same thing applies to highways. I remember the Minister of Highways, a year ago, and the year before, saying – and I think he is right in what he said – that he could not buy materials, he could not buy machinery, to do what he wanted to do. Well, that was not your fault. You are getting plenty of machinery now, only you have no one to operate it or do any work that is any good. That is the trouble now – you have good machinery, if you only had good men and good brains to operate it. A man cannot work for you without being fingerprinted and gazetted and registered to show that he is a true-blue C.C.F.er. He has to be socially minded. Your Minister of Social Services said that nobody could write insurance for this government unless they were socially minded.

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — On a point of privilege, I wish to say that I have not made that statement.

Mr. Danielson: — I have to accept his statement, but I think I will bring down a copy of his broadcast wherein he made that very statement; but I will accept his statement for the present. I am not a bit afraid of

having to hold the bag in this case. I will prove what he said, and more too.

The member for Kerrobert-Kindersley was very critical of the Opposition's attitude toward the hospitalization scheme. Now, Mr. Speaker, none of us are opposed to the hospitalization scheme – we never have been – I have been on a hospital board since 1928...

A Voice: — Too long!

Mr. Danielson: — Maybe so, but I could not get off, and I am still there, strange to say, and I have tried to get off several times, but they still kept me on. What we have taken objection to, Mr. Speaker, is the tremendous overhead in administration of that social service. The Bill setting up the Health Commission was passed by us in 1944; and, by the way, our friend the Minister of Social Services moved an amendment on that occasion that would remove the power of the government to set up that commission; but we did put it through, and if it had not been for the election and the disastrous outcome of that election – sure, the people kicked us out, we admit that, everyone knows it by this time; this government got 53% of the votes and we did not get enough votes to be elected, that was all – but today, if you consult the last Gallup Poll you will find a different situation in the province of Saskatchewan. No doubt he has already – he is looking pretty glum.

Premier: — Never felt happier in my life.

Mr. Danielson: — It is nice that he can take it pretty good, anyway – coolheaded. The members to your right, Mr. Speaker, criticized us as being opposed to the hospital scheme, and that is not and never has been true. What we are objecting to is the tremendous bureaucracy of socialistic servants and planners and dictators that has been set up to operate this thing – for all they do. Last year, on the estimates I asked the Minister – I said that \$6,000,000 would be the estimated cost. That is probably as close as anyone could figure it at the time – nobody knows – and I asked the Minister then, “can you figure approximately what the cost of operation will be n that amount of money?” He consulted with Dr. Mott or his Deputy and he said, “We hope we will get by with ten percent.” Ten percent on \$6,000,000 is \$600,000, Mr. Speaker. Now, I do not know whether that is too much or too little, but I do not think it is enough. I may be wrong. He says he is going to put up \$2,000,000 out of the general funds of this province. That is probably true – I am not disputing that statement – but he should also tell the people that that is not all new money. He took away the hospital grant, which we have had since 1912 in the province of Saskatchewan, and which amounted, every year, to half a million or sometimes more; \$600,000 for operating expenses — \$500,00 for all the hospital grants that were paid before! Why, the operating expenses could more than double the hospital grant, raise it to \$1.00 per day. And what do we get for this? Well, he goes out through the district and gets the

Friday, February 13, 1948

Municipality Secretaries to collect the money – a very logical thing to do, for who knows better, who can perform the service better than they can, and who can do it more efficiently? Who are the men that supply this bureaucracy set up in the city of Regina with all the information they get? Why, it comes from the little municipal secretaries. Children are born every day, old people are dying every day; people move out and people more in. Who keeps track of this and supplies the information to this wonderful planning set-up in the city of Regina? Why, the municipal secretaries.

Premier: — ...and we paid them.

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, you do, and they are the ones that earn the money they get – and they get a very, very small part of it – that is the trouble, they do not get enough. That is a continuous work for these men out in the municipal offices, and why should they not be paid, when you import planners and experts and give them up in the thousands and thousands of dollars per year? Not just one or two, but dozens of them! Yes, that is the situation, and these are the things, Mr. Speaker, against which we protest; and I say to you that the service supplied by this scheme now has been supplied throughout my own district for four years, in one municipality, and for five years in my own, at approximately \$3.00 per person per year; and now they are paying \$5.00 per person per year. Now, someone might say, “you had to come to your own hospital.” Mr. Speaker, we let the patients go to Regina, Moose Jaw, Saskatoon and Winnipeg, and if necessary, to Rochester, and we paid the bills. During the war, when there was a shortage of skilled doctors and staff in our hospitals, practically all the serious cases had to go away, and we paid more than half of our payment to hospitals outside of our own hospital; but, even at that, the cost was nothing compared to what it is at the present time.

And remember, \$5.00 per person per year is not all. The Minister is going to take \$2,000,000 of the taxpayers' money out of the General Treasury, which we pay also. These are the things that we as Liberals in the Opposition protest against. We submit that we can give better service than is being given right now, for far less money.

Premier: — Why didn't you do it?

Mr. Danielson: — Let me point out to the hon. gentleman that for five or six years previous to 1940 this government paid out \$2,100,000 in cash, in grants and medical taxation out in the rural areas of this province. In addition to that they paid out hundreds of thousands of dollars in special relief grants to the hospitals throughout the province of Saskatchewan in order to enable them to operate and give service to the people of the province. You do not know that, because that is a thing that you evidently do not like to know. That was done, however. Mr. Speaker, I am going to correct my statement, as I have the figures here. An amount of \$3,101,000 was paid out, not \$2,100,000 during those years, and that was in cash money, much more than you have ever paid out yet, and don't forget it. That was in addition to your hospital grant, or sanatorium grants or anything else.

Premier: — May I ask what period that \$3,1091,000 was for?

Mr. Danielson: —Yes. It reaches back from 1939 to 1942, but there was very little after 1940.

Premier: — We are paying out that much in one year.

Mr. Danielson: — And collecting three or four times as much – we will deal with that in a little while.

Now to proceed with the thing that I really wanted to deal with. It is becoming more and more evident every day that we are going to have an election. when it is coming I do not know – nobody knows, unless it is the Minister of Highways, who said he had a very strong desire to complete his Highway program before there was an election next fall – but I am not going to tell you when to have an election – it does not make any difference so far as I am concerned, nor so far as the Liberal candidates are concerned, either – but we are going to have an election. The campaign is going on now, and one of these days when the sun shines and the gophers get out on the highways, and the puddles on the Minister of Highways' roads are getting pretty deep, from Eastern Canada will come a cavalcade of imported planners and brains – from the East, from the West, from everywhere – and one among them will be, I am sure, our friend Clare Gillis from Cape Breton, who will come out here and tell the farmers of Saskatchewan what is wrong with Saskatchewan. Sure, he knows it all! However, I want to remind the Minister of Public Health and the Premier that he could take that opportunity to ask him all about that steel subsidy down there in Cape Breton. Now, he is the Member for Cape Breton in the Dominion House, and the other day, when the Premier was speaking – he was painting a dreadful picture of these big mortgage companies and these 'big shots' and 'big moguls' who are trying to trample the rights of the poor man right under their feet – making a really rabble-rousing speech – that is what they do when they want to prepare the people for an election...

(continued on P. 12)

Friday, February 13, 1948

He mentioned, among other things, the income tax and one thing and another, and he referred to the steel subsidy. I would say to the Premier, that when Mr. Gillis came out here to win this election for you, and you asked him about that steel subsidy, he might have been able to give you some real information on that. If he tells you the truth, for surely two good C.C.F. socialists would be honest with each other, that he pleaded with the Dominion Government to give them that steel subsidy down there, in order to pay it out in wages and raise the wage level, in Nova Scotia to the same level as other places in Canada, if possible. Then Mr. Coldwell, as his party support, said to Mr. King, Mr. Abbott, or Mr. Ilsley, or whoever it was, he said: "we need this thing, and we have to have it". And he did it – I think it was justifiable. So, when he comes out here, I would ask the Premier to take the opportunity to get the information, and then he won't have to go on the platform when this election comes around and give the interpretation and create the impression that he did on the Floor of the House a few days ago.

I said, a few moments ago, that out in the highways and byways of the province of Saskatchewan, we have agents of the C.C.F. – not the fellows who drive cars any more, because they can't now, they fly mostly – but there is, here and there all through the community – I know, in my constituency last fall, there were a lot of meetings going on in the schoolhouses – this heart to heart talk was taking place. People came to me and said is this so, and so, true, the things spread all over the country by the Premier, for the past three and one-half years, claiming they have done all the social services for the province of Saskatchewan? I do not know a single one – they have even gone so far – I do not mean the Premier in this case – as to claim it is because of the work of the C.C.F. that we have the family allowances; for the P.F.A.A. benefits – they take credit for that. I had a man come into a business place in my town, last fall, and he had a cheque and he said: "you know it is great to have a Government like this". I said: "What Government do you mean?" He said: "Mr. Douglas". That is spread all over, and it is true. So one of the things they have consistently and persistently taken credit for is the free cancer treatment in this province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to deal with this for a few moments. I have been asked – I have a note here of when two gentlemen spoke to me about it, and I am going to begin at the very beginning.

The Cancer Clinic in this province was started by the Anderson government – not by the Liberal government; by the Anderson Government. It was carried on, and was extended, and a nominal charge was made for the services of the Cancer Clinic up until 1944. The Free Cancer Treatment Bill was Bill No. 53 of 1944, and here is Section Three: "All patients who are residents, and have been residents of Saskatchewan for a period of at least six months, prior to making application for admission to a clinic, shall be entitled to care and treatment at the expense of the Province."

That was the Bill, and that is the Bill.

The first Session of this House – that was the Second Session of 1944 – opened on October 19, 1944, Thursday, and in the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, was a paragraph like this: “A great concern has always been felt by the members of the present Government, about the inadequate health services in this. Dr. Henry E. Sigerist Professor of History of Medicine at Johns Hopkins University, was given a commission to survey the situation and make recommendations to the Government as to the steps that may be taken to rectify it by the institution of some kind of Health Service. Dr. Sigerist’s report has been tabled with the Executive Council.” That was the statement – that is correct – that is from the Speech from the Throne. You want to be careful about the date, Sir; Thursday, October 19, 1944.

Then, I have here the report presented to the Government by Dr. Henry E. Sigerist, M.D., D. Litt., L.L.D., Professor of History of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, United States. On page eight of this report, which was presented to the Minister on October 4, 1944, he said this: “While at the present, examination, radiological treatment, hospitalization, are provided without charge, cancer patients still have to pay for the cost of operations. This is, undoubtedly, against the intention of the Act, and the cost of operations should be defrayed by the province.” That was on October 4th. There is not dispute about that, is there?

Then we go on and come to February 20, 1945 – I am sure the Premier is familiar with this thing – the record of accomplishment, from the review of the Saskatchewan Government’s activities from the speech of Hon. T.C. Douglas, Premier and Minister of Health, in the Debate, on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne: on page six it said this: “We are now giving complete free cancer treatment, not only diagnostic and x-ray treatment, but also surgery”. I remember that the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. Procter), insisted at the last Session, that money had been voted in the last year’s estimates for surgery in cancer cases. Well, no one in my department can find it. It is true that \$5,000 was provided, but that was to set up a clinical roster — \$5,000 would never begin to pay for surgical treatment, which even my hon. friend must admit.” That is from the Debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, on February 20, Mr. Speaker; four months less one day from the Throne Speech of the Session in the fall of 1944. And he refers back to that speech, and when the hon. member for Moosomin said there was money voted for that purpose, he got up in his chair, in this House, and here is what he said – and he repeats it on this occasion; and four months afterwards he repeats it again.

Now, I shall read you the part of the Budget Speech from the Session of 1944, given by the Hon. W.J. Patterson, P.D.; every old member of the C.C.F. in the House at that time has copies of that speech,

Friday, February 13, 1948

and here is what he said: “public Health increases cover the cost of providing medical and hospital treatment to patients suffering from cancer. It also provides an amount to cover the cost of work preparatory to establishing a health insurance plan in the province. The increase in the vote for Old Age Pensions covers the recent increase in pensions payable to the individual pensioners and, as already explained, 75 per cent of this amount will be contributed by the Federal Government.” But this is what he said: “that public health increases cover the cost of providing an amount to cover the cost of work preparatory, to establishing a health insurance plan in the province.” That was the \$5,000; but the vote was increased by the government, to cover the cost of the cancer treatment.

Premier: — It does not say that. Read where it says that.

Mr. Danielson: — Yes. The Budget Speech, 1944 Session, February 29, 1944, on page eight: “Public health increases cover the cost of providing medical and hospital treatment for patients suffering from cancer”. I am going to stop there, so as not to confuse the matter.

Mr. Speaker, in 1943-44, the vote for the cancer clinic was \$76,760 – everyone who went through that paid a nominal fee of \$10, and this is what the Government voted to supplement, and keep the service going. That had been done for years before. That was the year 1943-44. In 1944-45, the vote was \$215,000, an increase of \$138,240; not for the Department of Public health, but for cancer treatment, cancer services – they were increased \$138,240 – and the \$5,000 which our hon. friend mentions, when he denies the statement of the hon. member for Moosomin, which was true – which he has in his own Department. He has the Budget – he has everything there – it was for establishing initial expenses for the Health Insurance Commission. That is the Bill set up, and which was also passed at the same Session, by that Government – the Liberal government.

Premier: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. This is the second time this has been up, and the second time the hon. member has called in question my veracity. It was up last year in the Speech from the Throne. I do not mind my hon. friend mentioning it as often as he likes, but as it is my veracity that is being called into question, may I ask, first of all, that he read the breakdown of the estimates for the Cancer Clinic? May I tell him that if he reads that breakdown he will find that there was no money provided for surgery and not one dollar was paid for cancer surgery between the first of May, when the Act came into effect, and the tenth of July, when that administration left office.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, that is typical of the hon. Premier. Now he brought in these “weasel words”, because it is a definite statement made by him on four occasions. He did the same thing last year; the fact is this – that last year I desired him to make a statement to the House that there was not an account in his Department that had been paid, or that had been presented for payment, at that time; but he did not do so.

I am going to go on, Mr. Speaker, and read you the facts this time, the facts; and the deductions and the “weasel words” are not going to get away with it this time. The fact is this...

Premier: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I do not mind how often my friend stutters and stumbles, but the fact remains that when I give a statement, I do not propose to have it called “weasel worded”. If my hon. friend wants a further statement of fact, I am prepared to give it. If my hon. friend wants a committee of this House set up, to have all the facts placed before them, I would be glad to do so; but I do not propose to have a statement which I have made – a statement which...interruption— will the hon. member sit down, I have a point of privilege.

Mr. Danielson: — Is he making a speech?

Premier: — I am not making a speech, I am asking that the words “weasel worded” be withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: — The terminology used is unparliamentary.

Mr. Danielson: — It is not in the facts, Mr. Speaker, that it is something entirely that has not been brought up this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: — On the point of order. In connection with the terminology used, in my opinion, it was not parliamentary and I think it should be withdrawn.

Mr. Danielson: — I will call it “double talk”.

Mr. Speaker: — That is not parliamentary either.

Mr. Danielson: — I am going to say then that there is not a half-truth in it.

Mr. Speaker: — Use some other term that is parliamentary, but you can do so only after you have withdrawn the words you used at first.

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, last year when the Premier used...

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Do you prefer to withdraw those words?

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, I will withdraw the expression.

Mr. Patterson: — You ruled – “misrepresentation, half-truths and innuendoes.” all right?

Mr. Danielson: — That was declared when the Premier used it last year, I have the quotation here. It is all right for the Members of this House, Mr. Speaker, we are all members here, nothing more.

Mr. Danielson: — Now then...

Premier: — Mr. Speaker, the statement has been made that I used that term last year. I am quite certain that I have never used it; if I did, my hon. friend would be wise to produce the record where I used the words “Weasel worded”. If I did, I would be glad to withdraw it.

Friday, February 13, 1948

Mr. Patterson: — Is it not true, Mr. Speaker, that you ruled that the expressions used by the Premier, “misrepresentations, half-truths and innuendoes” were parliamentary? You will remember the occasion, Sir, I am sure.

Mr. Procter: — In case you should not remember that...

Mr. Speaker: — Sit down, you may sit down.

Mr. Procter: — You will recall that you caused me to desist from using it, ‘for tedious repetition’, in dealing with the statements of the hon. Premier.

Mr. Speaker: — The point I draw to the attention of the House is that my ruling was not on what he said afterwards, it was what was said and not withdrawn.

Mr. Procter: — Does the Premier’s statement object to the use now of “half-truths, misrepresentations and innuendoes?”

Premier: — I did not object to that at all, I objected to “weasel worded”.

Mr. Procter: — That is all right, that was disposed of when you got up. The member had withdrawn it before you got up.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member did not withdraw before he started to use the other terms. I was insisting that the hon. member withdraw the words “weasel worded”, but he did not withdraw...

Mr. Danielson: — I did, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — ...and substitute other words. That was my ruling.

Mr. Procter: — Pardon, Mr. Speaker, you may not have heard him but the hon. gentleman said that he would withdraw those words; and I suggested to him to use the other words – my colleague, Mr. Patterson, suggested it to him, and it was after that the Premier got up to make his second objection. Now, you may not have heard that, Sir, but...

Mr. Danielson: — I withdraw.

Mr. Speaker: — All right; continue.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, my position has become mighty clear – I used the words “weasel worded”, as is used quite frequently, and if it is unparliamentary it is withdrawn. That is all there is to that. I then said it was double-talk, and you said that was unparliamentary and I withdrew that statement. Then I said they were only half-truths, and that was declared parliamentary language by you, yourself, two years ago, and I apply it now.

I read from the Budget Speech of Mr. Patterson, which is on record, and it says this: “Public Health increases covers the cost of providing

medical and hospital treatment to patients suffering from cancer, is now announced in the Speech from the Throne". Now, check the estimates – and surely to goodness there are dozens of copies of the estimates anywhere in this building – in 1943-44, the estimates for the cancer Clinic, and not for anything else – I have checked and double-checked every estimate for the last few years, and I know it, regardless of what the Premier says, there is nothing else in there – was \$76,760. In 1944-45, in line with the statement of the Provincial Treasurer, when he introduced the Budget, was increased to \$215,000; just for cancer treatment and nothing else, regardless of what the Premier says – an increase of \$138,240. And that is the amount that the Premier, even today, says was never voted.

Premier: — On a point of privilege – I am sure the hon. member does not wish to misrepresent me, and I surely do not want to quarrel with him, or to interrupt his speech – I have not said the money was not voted. The amount of money which he has quoted was money which went for hospitalization for cancer and for running the Cancer Clinic; but there was no provision for surgery for cancer. My hon. friend and I are talking at cross-purposes apparently. I am not saying that extra money was not voted for the Cancer Clinic but it went for hospitalization and it went for the operating of the diagnostic facilities of the Cancer Clinic. There was no provision for cancer surgery, except a sum of \$5,000 to set up a roster, but nothing to pay for cancer services; and nothing was paid for cancer services – surgery services – until this Government came into office.

Mr. Danielson: —Mr. Speaker, in the estimates there is no division between surgery and hospitalization, or anything else, for cancer: \$138,000 was voted for that year.

We will go one step farther in the history of this particular case – I will take my time until I find it, Mr. Speaker, because this is important – and we will now come to the C.C.F. government. This Budget Speech, which I have quoted, that the former Provincial Treasurer delivered, was the last, at that time, anyway. On March 15, 1945, the present Provincial Treasurer delivered his Budget Speech, and here is what he said: "Patients suffering from cancer, will now receive complete medical, surgical and nursing treatment. This will be provided at an additional cost of some \$78,000 over last year's estimate." Does anyone think that that \$78,000 did not provide any money for services not started the year before. The Provincial Treasurer stated that the \$78,000 was added to it and the following year he added to it again and raised it from \$215,000 to \$293,000. Mr. Speaker, you know what happened; the first time you start anything new – it was the same with your hospitalization scheme – it takes a little while to get it going and the second year the prices of everything went up; nurses' salaries were increased, and charges of every kind, in connection with Public health was increased, and all he needed to do at that time in 1945-46, was to add \$28,000.

Friday, February 13, 1948

Premier: — \$78,000. That is what cancer surgery costs, approximately \$75,000 annually.

Mr. Danielson: — You are correct, pardon me, \$78,000. There is absolutely no reason, or grounds, or anything else, except political expediency, to go out and create the impression with the people of Saskatchewan that there is nothing existing here today, in the shape of public services, or social services, without this Government providing it. It is not true, that's all! Again, Mr. Speaker, I think that I can truthfully say that the record of the Liberal government, in that respect, is one that anyone can be proud of; and all this Government has done is take hold of the same legislation, and the same service that we built up and started, and which was originally started by the Anderson government. Give credit where credit is due! You have started no new services except the hospitalization scheme – that is all you started and, after all, there are 137 rural municipalities in the province which provided that for themselves. There were thousands and thousands of people in the province of Saskatchewan who, by co-operative effort, provided it. There were 97 municipalities, if I remember correctly, and a number of towns in the province of Saskatchewan, who provided free medical services also, and there were thousands who provided that for themselves by co-operation. They paid the “shot”, like we do now, and they did not expect it ‘without money and without price’ either; but you promised them that. Yes! you promised them that; that is all you did, and you do not get away with that any more because the people are wise to this.

I now want to deal with a subject that no one has said very much about. One of the few things the Premier spoke about a few days ago was, in order to draw a picture of distress and to leave the impression with the people that there was some scheme or plot afoot with the Federal Government to take away from the people of the province of Saskatchewan, and the people of Canada, particularly the low-income class people, the earnings that they have, and let the “big-shots” go scot free. He left that impression with this House and I just want to say one or two things about it.

First of all he mentioned the Excess Profits Tax. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Excess Profits Tax, I understand, was discontinued on the 1st of January, 1948, by the Dominion Government – at least that was supposed to have been done – whether it was actually done or not I do not know, but I think it was done. He held that up as a horrible example which was to hand back to the big corporations this excess profits. Now, I would like to ask him how it is that Great Britain and the United States and other countries, did that a year ago or more – they disbanded the Excess Profits Tax entirely. I remember, I was reading a speech by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in Great Britain, in which he said that if we are going to sustain, and develop, and increase the industrial activity of this nation, the people have to have some of the money left of their earnings; in order to be able to do that and provide the work and goods to be exported to other nations to get the exchange they need to purchase the good which they cannot get at home.

That was the reason Great Britain, the United States, and, I am pretty near sure, Australia has done the same thing, or if they have not, they are doing it now. What is the use of trying to leave that impression with the people of Canada, and the people of Saskatchewan?

During the last year, Mr. Speaker, the Excess Profits Tax was 15 per cent; the Corporation Profits Tax was 30 per cent, making a total of 45 per cent. If you were a capitalist, like I am, Mr. Speaker, you might have a share in the Imperial Oil or in the Bank of Montreal or something, and you get a three or four dollar dividend – I am sure not over that – you would have to add that to your income tax, as it is income, and you are taxed again, after the government had taken 45 per cent out of that before you got it and you are taxed again. Canada is the only place that I know of – even in Great Britain they do not tax them twice and three times. There never has been double taxation in Great Britain, but we have it here, in this capitalistic nation – according to the Premier – where the “big-fellow” is having his own way all the time, and the “little fellow” is ground down in the dust.

Then he quoted again, I did not hear him exactly, but I believe he quoted. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to say I know, but I think he quoted a case, something to this effect: “when the reduction in taxable income taxes were made, the “little fellow”, with a certain income produced so much and the fellow with so much income he produced so much.” Well, of course that is true – it can never be any other way, because the tax is based on the income. I know no better means of explaining this matter, and clarifying it for the House, than to take this example that the Leader of the C.C.F. party used in the House of Commons in 1945, when he said – Mr. Coldwell cited the instance – “a worker, with a wife and one child, earning \$1,500 a year; to this man the 16 per cent tax would mean \$8.80 per year. Another man, earning \$6,000 a year, and with the same number of dependents, would pay \$263.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is all perfectly true, and, of course, served its purpose very admirably – it creates the impression that the Leader of the C.C.F. party in this country of Canada wants to donate it, and leaves it there. He did not tell them this – he very carefully refrained from doing so – that is, the man earning \$1,500 a year is taxed \$54.95 – and may I point out, Mr. Speaker, that was in 1945; today he pays no tax; he can have over \$1,700 today and pay no tax, while the man earning \$6,000 paid \$1,647.16. The high-income man paid 30 times more in taxation than the low income man, when he earned only four times as much. That is the situation.

Another thing: today, if that situation existed, Mr. Speaker, that very same man would have received approximately \$96. in family allowances, and as he only paid \$54, he would receive about \$41 more, from the Dominion Government, than he ever paid in. but, today, having an over-all decrease in taxation from the peak in Canada, insofar as personal income tax is

Friday, February 13, 1948

concerned, that individual pays no taxes. A man, today, with under \$1,700 pays no taxes, as a married man. It works out on this basis: a man today, with two children, pays very little taxes on a \$3,000 income, if he deducts the family allowance – and he is nothing out. I have the table here from Mr. Abbott, and that is the situation.

So, there we are; they use everything possible to create the impression in the minds of the people, to build up the bogey of the “big-shots”, the fellow that is ready to grind the people into the dust in order to exploit them. You know, Mr. Speaker, I wonder sometimes how the minds of these C.C.F.ers work; I cannot understand it. These big business interests in Canada must not have any sense at all, because I find this: when I have money to spend, the big merchant, the hardware man, the wholesaler, the gasoline dealer, the Imperial Oil company, and everybody else, make money out of it. That is the time they make money, when I have the money to spend. What is the sense in trying to make the people believe that these big corporations have ground the people down in the dust, reduced their purchasing power and starved them? That is the attitude, and they have tried for years to build it up and drive it into the minds of the people. I just wonder sometimes if that is dedicating yourself to the work of the Kingdom of God. That may be one way of doing it, Mr. Speaker, but they were not the Christian ethics when I was a child.

I was very much interested the other day, when the Premier spoke, on the Floor of this House. He has on numerous occasions, for the last few months, I think for five or six months – I read speeches reported in the press, and I have heard him myself on the radio – and he has on ten or twelve occasions, including the press reports, repeated this story – this fairy tale – that Mr. Tucker did not vote on the Amendment to get \$50 per month Old Age Pensions; but in the House here, Mr. Speaker, he did not say that; he said that Mr. Tucker did not vote on the Speaker’s ruling. I just wonder why there was a difference. Did the Premier think he could not get away with the other statement on the Floor of this House, because we have been sitting here for ten or fifteen years, many of us, and know something about the difference between an Amendment and a Ruling of the Speaker? That is an entirely different thing. I listened to the gentleman on the radio – I have the clipping here, and on every occasion this statement... he smiles and he grins now, Mr. Speaker,, he glories in it...that he has left the impression with the people of Saskatchewan that this Liberal Leader, Mr. Walter Tucker, who seems to bother his mind very much – he is rather uneasy about it – stood up in the House and voted against the Amendment...refused to vote for the Amendment...

Premier: — That’s better.

Mr. Danielson: — Refused to vote for the Amendment, but he knows that nobody voted on the Amendment, Mr. Speaker, not even Mr. Knowles from Winnipeg, who moved the Amendment, because the Amendment was moved out of order by the Speaker of the House.

Premier: — Why didn't he?

Mr. Danielson: — This is the situation...now sit down, there is no point of order. That is the double-talk, Mr. Speaker. Why did he not make the same statement on the floor of the House as when you spoke at the schoolhouse. You talk one language there, and then you come here and say another thing.

Mr. Knowles moved that Amendment in the House and you know, Mr. Speaker, you have done it in this House, even last year – we introduced a Resolution here and by some stretch of imagination or some deduction, I am not criticizing exactly – you said that that Resolution was directed to the Government for spending money and that we could not move that resolution. Now, I am not quarrelling with you, I think you were right, when you threw that Motion out. We drafted it in another way and you passed it, because it was in accordance with the rules of the House. Exactly the same thing took place in Ottawa. Mr. Knowles knew, when he moved that Motion, that it would be thrown out; it could not be anything else – I am not blaming him; that was his privilege to do that; but when the Premier of this province tried to create the impression by radio broadcast, by speeches out on the length and breadth of this province, that the Leader of the Liberal party did a certain thing, which he never did, well then, I am protesting on the Floor of this House, and it is a remarkable thing that he did not have the courage to come in here and make the same statement. He told us the incident as it was, and that is the first time he ever did it.

Premier: — Why didn't Mr. Tucker vote?

Mr. Danielson: — You will find the reason. You seem to be able to find reasons whether they exist or not. The Premier has made the statement, time and time again, and I am not sure but I think he made it on the Floor of the House, but there has been all kinds of occasions where he said the average Old Age Pension in Saskatchewan in 1943, under the Liberal Government, was \$17.55 a month. That is not so – it is not true. I have here the 'Votes and Proceedings' of Wednesday, February 27, 1946, Mr. Speaker, and that is not 1944, when the Liberals were in power – given by the Ministers over there, and asked by Mr. Hall. It says here: "What was the average Old Age Pension as of June 30, 1944, and what was it at June 30, 1946?" He said: "the average Old Age Pension, June 30, 1944, was \$23.80." I have here the annual report of the Bureau of Child Protection for Saskatchewan, including the Old Age Pensions Branch, for the fiscal year ending 1942-43. I am going to read you this,

Friday, February 13, 1948

now this is not mine. It is written by a Department of the Government whom I know to be absolutely right. "The first increase of \$1.25 per month was made pursuant to the interim report of the Select Standing Committee of the Legislature Assembly of the Province of Saskatchewan dated April 12, 1943, which provided a supplemental cost of living allowance to all pensioners in the Province as the Province's share of a suggested \$5.00 general increase.

The second increase of \$5.00 per month was made pursuant to an agreement between the Province of Saskatchewan and the Federal Government for the general increase of Old Age and Blind Pensions and was substituted for the former supplemental allowance paid by the Province, except where Pensioners could not qualify for the latter increase. These retained the supplemental cost of living allowance.

The thanks of the Department and our Old Age and Blind Pensioners are due to Premier Patterson for the representations to other Provinces which enabled an agreement for a general increase to be made. The increase of \$5.00 per month to Old Age and Blind Pensioners in the Province has been a great boon. As a result of the new agreement 92.33 per cent of our Old Age Pensioners received increases and 93.33 per cent of our Blind Pensioners received increases. The average Old Age Pension paid in the year 1943 has increased to \$22.90 per month, and the average Blind Pension has increased to \$24.54 per month."

I am quoting the Annual Report, the Bureau of Child Protection in the Province of Saskatchewan including the Old Age Pensions Branch for the fiscal year 1942'43. On page 17 "Report of Commissioner of Old Age Pensions for the fiscal year 1940-43.

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — Could the hon. member tell us when that increase came into effect? I believe it was the first of September or October.

Mr. Danielson: — I would ask the hon. gentleman to tell me which increase he is referring to.

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — That is the five dollar increase.

Mr. Danielson: — It was included with the August cheque for 1943.

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — That would be payable the first of September?

Mr. Danielson: — Where did the Premier get this? In one place he said \$17.55, in another place it is \$17.50, and in another place something else again. None of them are correct; everyone of them is wrong. Now, what are you to think when you read this thing; but the deplorable think about it is this: an election is coming off; the people all over

the province of Saskatchewan are sitting at their radios, reading the newspapers, talking to big crowds, and get this stuff into their minds which is absolutely untrue. Surely this statement is not true, because if it is true this whole set-up and that administration is wrong. I could take out the letter written by the Hon. Mr. Martin setting out in detail everything from the beginning up so far as Old Age Pensions, bearing out every word of it. And I know he did not write the letter personally, it must have come from the department head in Ottawa.

What can you believe? And do not be harsh, Mr. Speaker, when I say that I have a reason to doubt the hon. gentleman's statement in view of the figures which have been used.

Premier Douglas: — The hon. gentleman says he has a reason to doubt my figures. I have equal reason for questioning the figures which he has just quoted, but I would like to say the figures which I gave him the other day — the entire table — both as to gross amounts and per capital figures were supplied by the man in charge of the Old Age Pensions Branch, and I would be very glad to compare them to the Annual Report to which he refers and see if there is any discrepancy, and the reason for the discrepancy, and give the information to my hon. friends. Those things were not prepared by me, they were prepared by the man in charge of the Old Age Pension Branch who ought to be familiar with the fact.

Mr. Speaker: — I would suggest that the hon. member from Arm River and the Premier get together because the reports on both of these arguments were prepared by the same individual.

Mr. Danielson: — These reports have been printed and are all over the province.

Mr. Speaker: — The Premier stated that his figures were supplied by the department also.

Mr. Danielson: — I do not know what sort of a department is operating here any more, because there are three different figures in three different places. It is true that the difference is not very much but it is such that it would never come out of the department.

Another thing, he has made statements on numerous occasions, that is when he quotes these figures, that in 1943 there were so and so, which of course is wrong, three or four dollars wrong per month. And he then turns around and says they are now \$30. Well now I take exception to that, because the average pension at that time of 1943 was \$25 after August fifth as far as the province of Saskatchewan is concerned.

Hon. O.W. Valleau: — Not the average.

Mr. Danielson: — If I said 'average' I am glad you corrected me. I mean the full pension, the basic pension. but this is the average pension,

Friday, February 13, 1948

that is the average; then he goes to work and says it is now \$30 per month. It is all in the same paragraph – in the same sentence. I know enough about this thing – I do not know very much but I do know this – that the basic pension is not the average pension paid, Mr. Speaker. It cannot be because there are many, many pensioners who cannot draw the full pension because they have income of their own to supplement the pension, and this government is subject to that regulation the same as any other government. That is the situation; and to say that this basic pension, or ‘average’ pension, — and do not forget the word ‘average – is now \$30 per month, that is not correct either, because I asked one of the gentlemen a short time ago, when I was in, in regard to a certain lady who had been cut off from the Old Age Pension – she wrote me a letter and I took it in to your commissioner – I asked him that very question, and he said, “No, it could not be.” He did not tell me what it was, and I did not ask; I just said, “On the whole, your average pension would not be \$30,” and he said, “No, it could not be, anybody knows that.” Then why, in the name of all that is decent, spread this report? There is no regard for what is correct and what is not correct.

Mr. Howell: — Are you including the cost of medical services?

Mr. Danielson: — No, I am not. According to the footnotes below the question; “What was the average Old Age Pension (a) as at June 30, 1944; and (b) as at January 31, 1946 – Ans. (a) \$23.08; (b) \$24.59”; these averages represent payments made in accordance with the provisions of the Old Age Pensions Act (Canada) and do not include a Supplemental Allowance of \$3.00 per month paid to Saskatchewan pensioners, so we are leaving that out entirely.” I can deal with that.

When the Premier spoke in the Session just before that service was extended, he said that if we paid it the amount would be \$5.00. when he said it, the amount was \$3.00, and that was paid from – I think – April 1, 1945, and continued to be paid, I believe, up to May 1, 1947; then the increase was met, and we will deal with that later.

Again, I would like to say a few words in regard to this amendment that has been discussed so much, which never was an amendment at all – it was a vote on the Speaker’s ruling. If anyone wants to know the attitude of the Liberal Party, get Hansard and read how the Federal member for Rosthern pleaded for the Old Age Pensions in the Federal House, and that will knock every argument and every statement that has been made by the C.C.F. agitators throughout the length and breadth of this country and this province all cuckoo. His statements are clear and to the point, and there nothing in them that anyone can take exception to – and that is farther than any of you fellows ever went.

Mr. Gibbs: — He didn’t vote for the increase, though.

Mr. Procter: — There was no vote on the increase.

Mr. Gibbs: — On the amendment, then.

Mr. Procter: — There was no vote on the amendment. It was on the Speaker's ruling.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, let me tell the hon. member that there was no such thing as a vote on the increase, and you know it. Now, I would prefer not having to speak on this subject, but I am going to deal for a few moments with the deplorable action of this Government in dealing with the Supplementary Allowance to the Old Age Pensions.

According to the statement by the Minister himself, made not on one but on two occasions that I know of, I understand that there was not the money to pay, and that the province had to economize in order to carry on other social services, the cost of this Supplementary Allowance, which had been carried on at \$3.00 per month from 1945 – I think from April 1 – to April 1 this last year, when it was increased to \$5.00 per month, and this House last year voted the money to pay that Supplementary Allowance of \$5.00 per month. When the Dominion Government increased the Old Age Pensions by amending the Old Age Pensions Act, as usual, like any government, they were slow in coming through, and the Amendment to the Act was not really put into operation until, I think, September, 1947; but when they brought it into effect they made the payment of \$3.75 per month retroactive up to May 1, 1947. Now this province, through the present Government, had continued to pay, as I said, from the first of April up to – shall we say – October 1, that \$5.00. That means the pensioners of the province of Saskatchewan had received their pensions on the basis of a basic pension of \$30.00 per month for six months. When the Dominion Government put their increase into operation, instead of continuing to pay the \$5.00 per month, which would have paid their \$2.35 or 75% of the \$5.00 increase granted, and leaving the other \$3.75 as it was; they made no increase in the payment of the provincial government. If that had been done the old age pensioners in the province could have been paid a pension on the basis of a basic pension of \$33.75. I say basic, not average.

Now, then, as I said a few minutes ago, according to the statement made – I am not questioning the statement, they know best what the situation is – but I have one statement here from the 'Saskatchewan News' of October 6, 1947, in which the Minister of Social Welfare makes this statement: "If we were to pay an additional \$5.00 bonus over and above the cost of these services it would cost us a further \$1,000,000 a year, relieve the federal government of its responsibility and cripple our own social services." That is taken from the 'Saskatchewan News' so it must be correct.

Again, the Deputy Minister of Social Welfare made a very fair and straightforward statement to the Press in regard to this matter, and he said that the savings to the government would amount to \$675,000 a year.

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — Might I just make a clarification here, Mr. Speaker? In the answer given to the question asked the other day in the House, the figure was \$614,000. That was more accurate.

Friday, February 13, 1948

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have it here. I was looking for it so I could quote it. Two days ago I received this answer from the Minister; that the total saving would be \$614,000. Now we have \$1,614,000. I imagine the Minister's last statement is correct.

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — Would you mind just a brief explanation of that? I can give it to you in a second.

Mr. Danielson: — That is fine.

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — The \$1,000,000 would be an additional \$5.00. The \$614,000 is the \$3.75.

Mr. Danielson: — That explains the matter very nicely, Mr. Speaker. Now, the Premier made a statement not long ago in speaking on this matter, wherein he said that "no province pays more." He made that statement at Nipawin on December 18th.

Premier: — "No province pays more?"

Mr. Danielson: — No province pays more.

Premier: — No Liberal province.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, it is incorrect either way. You can have it whichever way you like. I have a list of provinces here. In British Columbia, a coalition government made up of capitalists, Liberals and Tories — these money grabbers who are trying to drive the people down into the dust — they are paying a \$30.00 per month basic pension, and add another \$10.00 per month, making it \$40.00 per month. That is what they are doing. Then we go down to Ontario, where there is a Conservative government — all these bloated moneybags who have been held up as such horrible examples by the C.C.F. They pay a \$30.00 per month basic pension and \$10.00 additional, making it \$40.00 per month.

Premier: — Oh, no! They do not.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, where do you get your information?

(continued on P. 27.)

Mr. Valleau: — May I ask a question.

Mr. Danielson: — Go right ahead.

Mr. Valleau: — Is the hon. member aware that in the month of January, in Ontario, the average supplementary allowance was 60¢ per month, per pensioner.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, that is getting worse again, Mr. Speaker. Now we are coming in with the average again. Premier Drew has made that statement. That is what he was going to do. The Premier says that the average is \$30.00 which it is not.

Mr. Valleau: — The average in Ontario, the average supplementary is 60¢.

Mr. Danielson: — I am not quibbling about the average there at all – I am giving a statement that was made by a government official, and also by others than government officials of the provincial government, that are in a position to know. Now then, there is a Conservative Government; we will go to Manitoba. What have we got there? We have a coalition government again. They pay \$30.00 a month and they add another \$5.00 per month.

Premier: — When?

Mr. Danielson: — They did that not long ago.

A Voice: — That is not true.

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, it is true. Where is your authority?

A Voice: — Where is yours.

Mr. Valleau: — I have a letter here from the Manitoba Pensions Board. That is my authority.

Mr. Danielson: — I see! Perhaps you would use it when you get up to speak then. We will get the information from you. I still say that the information that I have is placed another way, that Manitoba pays a supplementary pension of \$5.00 per month. I still make that statement until I am absolutely proven to be wrong. Then we go to Nova Scotia. We have the same thing there; \$30.00 and \$5.00 supplementary – making it \$35.00. Then we go to Alberta – there we have a Social Credit Government – and by the way, Nova Scotia, I think, is a Liberal Government. I think that is true, is it not? There were a lot of C.C.F.s there when the election was on, but they all lost their deposits...

Premier: — ...They paid \$30.00 a month and no bonuses.

Friday, February 13, 1948

Mr. Danielson: — Just a minute...they have their health services. Then there is Alberta, with its Social Credit Government; they are orthodox capitalists like the “Tories” and the “Grits”; and remember this preaching of ‘humanity first’, they are not trying to talk about it to the poor old people, or these poor unfortunates, like the C.C.F. are. So, there you have \$30.00 per month and \$5.00 supplementary payment – making \$35.00 for health services; the same as the Saskatchewan Government. I am willing to give this Government credit for putting into force the health services; am sure every Liberal in this province is willing to give you credit for it. That is only an extension of the social services that were started a way back and gradually increased, and the province of Saskatchewan has been to the forefront of this extension of social services in the Dominion of Canada. You can laugh all you like, too. Take some time off when you are not busy, and go back and check on it; then see what percentage of the Provincial Budget was devoted to social services in the Province of Saskatchewan one or two years before you came into the House; see what percentage actually was devoted; get a hold of the interim report of the select committee, skipping 1943-44, including all your own number practically, at least five or six of them – take it up to your chair – sit down and read it and you have a complete list of what part of the Provincial Budget went into social services in this province, and you will be astounded. The Minister of Social Services...

Mr. Valleau: — Minister of Welfare.

Mr. Danielson: — Yes. I beg your pardon sir. I can see that – the Speaker of the House knows we’re not arguing about that – I am saying this, as far as that committee was concerned, we heard it was, I think, \$38.50. And we did not finish in one year, we went back the next year, and I do not think there was a member of that committee, who was not heartily in favour of doing everything possible that could be done, to increase these services. You will find that again – we now have at least one, two, three, four, five, six provinces that are paying supplementary services – supplementary allowances in addition to the \$30.00 per month pension – British Columbia, Ontario, Manitoba, Nova Scotia and Alberta. Now then, when the Premier says that no province pays more than Saskatchewan, he should have said that there was no province that paid less. That is what he should have said – there is not province that pays less.

Premier: — There is no Liberal province that pays more; there is no Liberal province that pays as much.

Mr. Danielson: —I am sorry, there is no use talking to the Premier because he will not hear anyone that tells the truth; but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, instead of saying that there is no province that pays more than Saskatchewan, the thing is exactly the reverse, and there is no province that pays less than Saskatchewan.

We have heard a lot of talk about Walter Tucker and the crime that he committed – or was supposed to have committed – which he never did – for voting against an Amendment which never was voted on by anybody – not even the man that made the Amendment himself. When this thing was before the House of Commons, I think that someone of the Government – I am not sure, but I think it was the Premier himself, said that they sent the Provincial Minister of Social Welfare – I am going to be correct on the title this time – down to Ottawa to fight for an Old Age pension of \$50.00 per month. Well, you know, that is not the way I heard it. The MacLean's Magazine is pretty reliable, and anything that comes out of that editorial page – I call it the editorial page, — and with the information at their disposal, it is pretty well correct.

Mr. Valleau: — He did not sign his name to it.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, you know who he is anyhow.

Mr. Valleau: — Do you?

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, I can tell you. I will bring the information tomorrow, and he dead sure is not a Liberal. I can tell you that, too.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Danielson: — Here is what he said officially – he said many things but this is dealing with your visit to Ottawa that I want to read – “officially”, there is no difference of opinion between Ottawa and the Saskatchewan C.C.F. Actually, the difference of opinion appears to have been pretty sharp. Last spring, about the time of the campaign for \$50.00 Hon. Paul Martin, Minister of Health and Welfare, on the forthcoming Old Age Pension Act. Mr. Valleau was openly aghast at the timing of the C.C.F. \$50.00 pension campaign; he told the Health and Welfare people that from the Saskatchewan point of view it would be ruinous, and would they kindly tell him how he could stop it? Do not ask us, they told him, ‘go and talk to your own Party Leader! Mr. Valleau did so, and came back despondent. They would not listen to him; what had he better do?’”

Mr. Valleau: —On a question of privilege. May I reply to that. I know the hon. member would not want to say anything that was not correct, but it is quite correct that I was in Ottawa last spring. It is quite correct

Friday, February 13, 1948

that I met there the Department of Welfare officials and the Minister, which is only natural; but I, on my responsibilities as a member of the Assembly, categorically and without any reservations whatsoever, deny the rest of the material which the hon. member read. Now, may I say further, for the information of the members in the House, that I have written to MacLean's Magazine with that denial, and they have not done me the courtesy of publishing it, although I was willing to sign my name to my denial, which the man who wrote that, did not sign.

Mr. Danielson: — The Minister is denying the statement and that of course is his privilege.

(continued on page 30)

Friday, February 13, 1948

Now we have the record of the minister's and the deputy minister's that if this government had continued to pay the supplementary allowances, and there was not the money to do it, that it would have had to continue social services in another way.

Well I am not going to question the statement because I do not know, that statement may be absolutely true. It is, however, extremely difficult for me to accept or believe that that could be possible. There are certain reasons for that, Mr. Speaker, and did you ever realize that today the province of Saskatchewan is paying \$7.50 per month of the \$30 pension. The Dominion Government is paying \$22.50 per month. Did it ever occur to you that in 1929 and 1930 this government was paying \$10 per month toward the Old Age Pensioners in the province of Saskatchewan.

Hon. O.W. Valleau: — That is before Bennett raised it.

Mr. Danielson: — I know all the criticism. I was going to come to that. I am willing to debate it with you and give credit where credit is due. Today, with millions and millions of dollars rolling into the pockets, especially in this province, they cannot afford to pay anymore than \$7.50 per month.

Premier Douglas: — Five dollars per month for Health services.

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, and we have heard a lot about these Health Services and nobody has ever told us exactly, yet, I have seen figures and heard as much as \$32 and \$33, whether applied to the average or the individual pensioners, I do not know. When you sent a pensioner to the hospital then why do you not change your ruling or your policy in regard to that matter, like the last year or so, you take the pension away from them. If that is not done now, it was done. How far did the pension that was taken away from the sick man or woman in the hospital go to pay the expenses of the hospitalization and the medical services? This is a question I am going to ask of this House sometime before the Session is over. I have been interested in that, and I want to get the matter cleared up.

Now I know one thing, and it is a case I know of personally, where a lady was taken ill, and it was a mental case and she was taken to the mental hospital – the Provincial Hospital you call it now – for a month or six weeks, and the pension was cut off.

Premier Douglas: — Not in a month or six weeks.

Mr. Danielson: — Well I had the letter and I went to see her and her brother – she lived with her brother – and that is their statement to me; and I have every reason to believe it.

Hon. O.W. Valleau: — Her pension was not cut off.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, she did not get her money.

Hon. O.W. Valleau: — No her pension was not cut off.

Mr. Danielson: — Well I am going to ask this question. If a pensioner is put into the hospital and stays there a month or six weeks or two or three months, does he still receive his pension?

Hon. O.W. Valleau: — Yes, that which he is assigned.

Mr. Danielson: — His full pension?

Hon. O.W. Valleau: — Yes, as I said, what they assign him.

Mr. Danielson: — Now, I understand the Old Age Pensioners come under the five dollar hospitalization plan.

Hon. O.W. Valleau: — No, they definitely do not.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, I think I am going to ask some questions on that in view of the Press report. It has been said that...

Hon. O.W. Valleau: — No, they do not, they do not pay the five dollars.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, I do not see any reason why they should.

Mr. Procter: — The pensioner does not get his full cheque in all cases.

Mr. Speaker: — If the hon. member wants to get information on these matters, he can get it more accurate and in a more proper manner by asking questions in the ordinary way.

Mr. Danielson: — However, if it was not for the interruptions coming from my hon. friends over there this thing would never have arisen.

Hon. O.W. Valleau: — He asks the questions and answers them too.

Mr. Danielson: — Now that is the situation, and I am going to have this matter straight before the Session is over.

The fact that remains is this, that so far as the money to pay for this thing is concerned, to my mind it should be a very simple problem for the people and the Saskatchewan Government in view of the fact of the revenue they are receiving from different sources from which they are collecting that revenue. I understand that, today, the Education Tax — which I think, last year, was \$3,000,000 — today has now reached over \$6,000,000. Now that shows you another thing, and that is this: that the budget that was submitted here, last year, was evidently held down and underestimated for the purpose of getting in a position where we could show there was a bigger budget submitted by the Liberal Government a few years ago. Political propaganda.

Friday, February 13, 1948

Yes, the Education Tax was estimated at approximately \$3,000,000, and today it is over \$6,000,000. No wonder the provincial taxers do not want to let it go!

Your liquor profit last year was \$8,104,260; two years ago it was \$6,605,449. In two years you collected from the people of the province of Saskatchewan \$14,710,000 in liquor profits. Thirty per cent of that is water, and this figure represents the net profit after you have paid the fellow for pouring the water in. And still you say you have not a few thousand dollars for milk subsidy. You cannot pay \$3.75 to Supplementary Pensions for Old Age Pensioners in this province. This 'Humanity First' government, these fellows who stand on the platform, in this House, and scorch and denounce everybody else who dose not agree with them! The Tories and the Grits and the Social Credit, they are the 'big shots' and the fellows who are going to grind these poor people into the dust.

This is the first time in three and a half years that I have ever heard this government talk about economy, and then they had to chisel on the Old Age pensioners' meal ticket to do it.

In view of these things, and in view of the facts that I have submitted, I wish to move the following amendment to the motion: Moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Hooge: "That this Legislature regrets that Your Honour's Advisors decided in 1947 to discontinue the payment of a supplementary allowance to Old Age and Blind Pensioners, the monies for such supplementary allowances having been voted by this Legislature at the last Session."

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

Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, after hearing what you have heard this afternoon, I am sure you will find my remarks rather quiet.

At the beginning, I wish to join with those who have preceded me in congratulating the Mover (Mr. M.H. Feeley) and the Seconder (Mr. Aitken) for the excellent job they did in moving and seconding the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. The hon. member should confine his remarks to the amendment.

Premier: — Mr. Speaker, on the motion and first amendment there was general debate. I noticed, last Tuesday, on the discussion of the original amendment here, the whole range of the Speech from the Throne was dealt with, quotations were made and actual extracts taken from the Speech from the Throne although we were discussing the amendment.

A Voice: — The first amendment was a general want-of-confidence amendment to the motion. This is a specific amendment, limited to Old Age Pensions, and that is the difference between the two amendments.

Mr. Speaker: —I am drawing the attention of the hon. member who has the floor to the fact that, if he wishes, after this amendment is disposed of, he can speak on the main motion. But if he speaks on the main motion now, and makes connection with the amendment, I think he has exhausted his rights to speak on the main motion.

Premier: — On a point or order, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the amendment itself. It reads: That the following words he added to the Motion:

“That this Legislature regrets that Your Honour’s advisors decided, in 1947, to discontinue the payments of supplementary allowances to Old Age and Blind pensioners, the monies for such allowances having been voted by this Legislature at its last Session.”

The amendment contains a statement which is not a statement of fact; but even if it were, I doubt whether a motion containing a statement of this kind is admissible. However, the fact is that the monies for such allowances were not voted by this Legislature at its last Session...

Mr. Patterson: — Yes, they were. We were so informed when we were considering the supplementaries, last year.

Mr. Procter: — The question was specifically asked, and that was what we were told.

Premier: — The monies were not voted at last Session for this purpose. The statement is inaccurate.

Mr. Speaker: — On a point of Order, I can only rule on the form of the amendment, at present, and, in my opinion, it is in proper form. As to the other point, whether or not the statement is an accurate statement and admissible, I shall have to defer my ruling. In the meantime, the hon. member for Bengough may proceed.

Mr. Brown: — Do I understand your ruling to mean, Mr. Speaker, that I have the right to go ahead as I started, provided I do not attempt to speak again Is that the ruling? or must I confine myself to the amendment?

Mr. Valteau (A.S.V.R.): — We are in the position where there are actually two motions before the House, which is not permitted under the rules.

Friday, February 13, 1948

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member may go ahead as he started, speaking, as I understand it, on the main motion, without exhausting his right to speak on the amendment, provided to does not tie his remarks in with the amendment.

Mr. Brown: — As I said previously, Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with those who have preceded me, in congratulating the Mover and the Seconder for the excellent job they did in moving and seconding the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

As far as the Mover is concerned, particularly, I do so with a little more than simply expressing appreciation from my seat here in this House. I do so with a deep personal regard, for it was the member for Canora who, some many years ago, first interested me in the C.C.F. Movement. It was his sincere and unselfish devotion to a Cause that first suggested to me that possibly I might in some small way, make some contribution to that same Cause in which he so sincerely believed. He has done something more, possibly, than any other member in this House. He has given to those who have entered public life at an early age, a hope that they may be able to retire from public life with the same regard which he holds from his fellow men.

(continued on next page)

This afternoon we have once again heard a great deal of criticism from the Opposition, but I have yet to hear them suggest one alternative to the policies that are being advocated by the government. Out on the hustings and on the platform, they have made many wild statements as to what they propose to do and what they will do. It is possible that, in this House, they are afraid to make the same statements, knowing that they will be officially recorded, and suggesting to them that it may at some future date be used against them.

They have spent some considerable time criticizing the policies of this government in the North. I, as you are well aware, represent a constituency that is in the extreme southern part of the province of Saskatchewan, and we have heard considerable of this criticism, originating from the Opposition, down in our part of the country. I have attempted to find out the effect of this criticism on the people in that area. The criticism has largely been upon the operation of the Fish Board and the Timber Board. The general reaction of the people to this sort of criticism – and I think it is a natural reaction – is that the tone, and even the remarks included in the criticism, is identical with the criticism that is being levied against the Wheat Board; and the people realize that if this criticism has the same general tone as the criticism against the Wheat Board, it is unquestionably coming from the same source, and with the same intent and purpose, in an attempt to destroy the security that the Timber Board and the Fish Board have brought to the northern settlers, to the same extent, at least, that the Wheat Board has meant a means of stability to the agricultural industry.

At times I feel rather sorry for the men who are in the Opposition, for anyone who fights to retain the status quo must, in this own mind, realize that he is fighting a losing cause, and that is unquestionably what the Opposition are doing. It is interesting to note that they are opposed to social democracy and to the principles to socialism, yet, when by one means or another a socialistic principle is forced upon them, either by pressure from the people or in some other way, that they are forced to inaugurate that socialistic principle, they immediately become champions of it.

We have one illustration of that, and I think it is a good one. The P.F.A.A. is the greatest socialistic venture that was ever attempted in Canada. It was an attempt to bring social security, or rather economic security, to the farmers, by compelling us to put into a social fund a certain amount of the proceeds from each crop. It has been suggested that the Government here is not a farmers' government but one that has sold out to labour. That is a rather far-fetched statement, considering the majority of representation that is here from the farming population if it has – and I think it has – shown its favouritism to labour in the struggle between labour and capital. I further realize that I, in my farming occupation, am simply a rural labourer as compared with those who live in urban centres.

Friday, February 13, 1948

I further realize that any benefits that an urban labourer obtains will in the final analysis reflect itself in better living conditions for those who work in the rural areas.

I do not think that the statement made in regard to American tourists, by our hon. friend from Arm River, needs any answering except in one regard. An American tourist was travelling through Canada, and he was asked – “How did you like the roads?” His reply was – “I got here, didn’t I?” That is something he could say today, but which could not very well have been said a few years ago; and when he was asked, “What do you think of the Government?” he replied, “Everybody is against it except the people.” I think that is a very fair statement and one that implies the general impression that is outside the province of Saskatchewan. It is true, I believe, that everyone except the people of Saskatchewan, is against this government.

In rising to speak on this Debate, Mr. Speaker, I had in mind one particular reference to the Speech from the Throne. It is short, so with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will read it.

“My Government, recognizing the important place of local government in provincial affairs, has been giving consideration to the needs of municipalities. The province has assumed some of the burdens formerly borne by the municipalities and additional revenues have been granted them. The government proposes to convene a conference of representatives of the municipalities and of the province, for the purpose of dealing with provincial-municipal relations, A study of their respective responsibilities, and source of revenues, is now proceeding.”

The hon. member for Canora, in his moving of the Address in Reply, dealt with the assistance that the provincial government has given to the municipalities, and has illustrated very clearly how the government in many respects has relieved the municipalities of certain definite responsibilities; but I have always felt that there was a definite need for closer co-ordination between our different governing bodies, and that applies not only to the municipal governments and the federal government in Canada, but also a closer co-ordination of efforts by the different national governments in the world, with the result that we might set up a world government to which we, as a nation, would give certain sovereign rights. It is interesting to note that this Government is taking the initiative in an attempt to work out a means whereby we can obtain a greater amount of co-ordination and co-operation between our local governing bodies and the provincial governing body.

It is true that when the municipalities were first set up, their responsibilities were rather light; but as our social obligations extend and a realization of our social responsibilities extend, the municipalities have unquestionably entered into a greater field of responsibility; and it is only right, in the light of our present social and economic position,

that a new study should be undertaken in an attempt to arrive at a means whereby there can be this closer co-ordination and co-operation between the provincial government and the municipalities. In the past few years – and it will no doubt continue to be more pronounced in the future – we, as a society, have accepted greater responsibility for the individuals within society. No longer can our individual outlook be so pronounced as it was in the past, and that is true, not only of Saskatchewan, but in Canada as a whole. If our individualistic viewpoint reduces in size and we begin to look at our problems more in a collective manner, then it is only true and right that we should place our governing bodies in a better position to meet these ever-changing conditions. I also note another reference to the type of conference which I feel is essential to the well-being of not only the farming population but of every population in Saskatchewan. A conference of farmer, labour and teacher organizations, sponsored by the Adult Education Division, in co-operation with the Occupational Group Council, the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, and the Saskatchewan Co-operative Union, succeeded in fostering understanding of the problems common to those groups and paved the way to further co-ordinating activities. It is proposed that several conferences be held this year.

Once again it is interesting to know that the initiative was taken by a socialist government in attempting to bring all groups of people together in an endeavour to work out their problems for the benefit of all concerned. I think that is a true Socialistic advance. It is not a conference of farmers attempting to work out their individual problems – that was one step in advancement we took when we as farmers joined together to work out our problems. This is an editorial step, when all organized groups in the province of Saskatchewan meet around the same table in an attempt to work out their problems for the benefit of all concerned.

This afternoon we heard some criticism of the larger unit of administration. The Minister of Education, no doubt, will deal to full extent with the progress that has been made in the field of education since the inauguration of the Larger School Units. It is interesting to note that while our friends in the Opposition criticized the larger unit of administration, the criticism is not always in the same vein from their own colleagues, and not even always from their own publications. I can refer you to the latest issue of the 'Liberal Advocate' and whether it means anything to the members of the Opposition here, I feel satisfied that the 'Liberal Advocate' means something to the Liberal Party as a whole; and it, in referring to an article on the Hon. Mr. Glen, Minister of Mines and Resources, had this to say: "From 1920 to 1924 he served as President of the Manitoba School Trustees Association. During his term of office he expressed himself strongly in favour of the establishment of a larger unit than the local school board." Here is once again an illustration of the tactics taken by those who attempt to retain the status quo. If they had put into effect – only they were afraid to – the larger school unit of administration as advocated by the Minister of Mines and Resources, unquestionably it would have been a good thing; but if we put it into effect, then it is unquestionably a bad thing for the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

A few days ago our hon. friend, the member for Rosthern, made some remarks in regard to democratic socialism. He was rather wandering around in a quandary as to what democratic socialism meant, and I think he ended up by attempting to convince himself – I am satisfied he did not convince anyone else – that there was no such thing as democratic...

(continued on next page)

Friday, February 13, 1948

socialism. I am inclined to agree to this extent, that I do not think you can obtain true socialism unless it is democratic socialism. In my opinion, you cannot have socialism unless we have true democracy. Any other type is not socialism in the broad and true meaning of the word socialism.

Under socialism, we are extending democracy into the economic field; into the economic and social field as well as into the political field. Those of us who believe in democratic socialism, believe in the social need of production and distribution of both goods and services. Those who suggest that they are opposed to democratic socialism must be opposed to the social ownership of the means of production and the channels of distribution of both goods and services. The way that we here in Canada are going about educating the children of this country, is a social way of educating children. It is a social way of distributing a service which is needed by the children of this province. Do those who are in opposition to democratic socialism suggest that they are going to remove this social service that is at present being given? I do not think so. The same can be said of a lot of other things that have been in effect for many years; and what we propose to do under democratic socialism, is extend those social services which have been of benefit to the people, and inaugurate new services and new means of production which will be of benefit until we reach that position whereby we are socially owning and controlling the means of production and the channels of distribution in all forms of goods and services.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I not only support the motion, but I would like to suggest to the people of the province of Saskatchewan, through this Assembly, that we in 1944 accepted a definite responsibility that we would be the vanguards in advancing social security and social legislation, and I am further prepared to suggest that the people of the [s are convinced that we are still in the vanguard in advancing this legislation and services.