

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

## Fifth Session — Tenth Legislature

Wednesday, March 10, 1948.

The House met at three o'clock p.m.

### ON THE ORDERS OF THE DAY

**Mr. A. T. Proctor:** — Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I wish to refer to the speech which the Hon. Premier made, yesterday, in this House, in which he is reported to have said as follows: “Does anybody suggest that the \$69,160 went to the people who had invested \$100 capital, or was this one of the ways of buttressing the campaign funds of the Liberal Party?”

“The Premier pointed out that the Company had been incorporated in September, 1940, when Mr. E. M. Culliton had been Provincial Secretary. The concern sold the dye to the Saskatchewan Tax Commission, which was under Mr. Culliton’s Department. ‘It is very difficult for me to believe that Mr. Culliton, now a candidate in the Gravelbourg constituency, knew nothing about it,’ Mr. Douglas suggested. ‘When the Provincial Secretary joined the Army the Tax Commission was transferred to the Highways Department, presided over by A.T. Procter, the member for Moosomin.’” I was the Minister at that time.

“Mr. Douglas said: ‘Either Mr. Procter did not know what was going on, in which case he was inept and incompetent, or he did know what was going on, in which case he was a party to depriving the Saskatchewan Treasury of money which went either into the Liberal Party’s or somebody’s pocket,’ the Premier charged.”

I wish to state to you in this House, Mr. Speaker, that I listened to the charge Premier Douglas made yesterday in the House, with reference to purchases of dye from Acme Dye and Chemical Limited by the Provincial Tax Commission, and I have perused the report of his speech in this morning’s Leader-Post. When the Hon. E.M. Culliton joined the army the Tax Commission was transferred to me, as stated by the Premier.

The official directly in charge of the Provincial Tax Commission was Colonel Loy T. Sifton, the Provincial Tax Commissioner, and all purchases of dye and other equipment and supplies were made under his authority. The dye used by the Commission was a dye specially developed for colouring tax-free gasoline, and was purchased in large quantities by the Commission, under arrangements made before the Provincial Tax Commission came under my authority. The reason for a large purchase in 1942 was that Colonel Sifton had been advised that owing to many chemicals . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! Does the hon. member wish to make a statement on his behalf?

**Mr. Procter:** — On my own behalf — Yes! That is what I am doing. I am explaining it . . . that Colonel Sifton had been advised that owing to many chemicals being required for war purposes, there was a prospect that the dye could not be obtained unless ordered considerably in advance.

March 10, 1948

I have no knowledge who constituted Acme Dye and Chemical, other than the Premier's statement, and I have no knowledge whatever of any moneys they may have been paid being diverted to campaign funds at any time . . .

**Hon. Mr. Phelps:** — On a point of Order, Mr. Speaker!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Will you state your point of order?

**Hon. Mr. Phelps:** — Mr. Speaker: I think it is quite in order that a correction be made, but my hon. friend is now introducing new arguments, and proceeding to give this House another debate on the Budget. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that he is exceeding his authority.

**Mr. Speaker:** — As I understand the hon. member, he is making his own position clear, as far as the statement of the Hon. Premier was concerned.

**Mr. Procter:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker: and I go on . . . I fully believe that this is simply another unfounded charge such as Premier Douglas . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, Order! We cannot get into a debate on it.

**Mr. Procter:** — All right, Mr. Speaker. I wish to state on my behalf that I have every confidence in the administration of the Provincial Tax Commission . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, Order! If the hon. member will confine himself to his own particular intimate person . . .

**Mr. Procter:** — . . . I have every confidence in the administration of Colonel Sifton under my direction . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, Order! If the hon. member wishes to make a representation on behalf of himself, I will rule that in order, but I cannot allow a general debate on it.

**Mr. Procter:** — Very good, Mr. Speaker. For myself and my administration, not only of the Provincial Tax Commission but every Department placed under me, I say that nothing wrong or dishonourable ever took place in any one of those Departments . . .

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — That is out of order.

**Mr. Procter:** — Certainly it is in order!

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member may want to make a simple refutation on behalf of himself, and I will rule that in order; but I cannot allow you to associate yourself with . . .

**Mr. Procter:** — Any statement of inference or wrong-doing made against me by Premier Douglas is not only false but a malicious lie, told only for the purpose of obtaining political advantage for himself.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, Order!

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — I think we will have to have that last statement withdrawn — “malicious lie”.

**Mr. Procter:** — Just a minute, and I will give you something further.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I hope the hon. gentleman will confine himself to the position I have placed him in, and keep in order. I cannot allow a debate to go on.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — What about that statement about “a malicious lie”.

**Mr. Procter:** — There is just one more statement, and I will give you something. It is smears like this that have kept honest men out of public life. The Premier of this Province is a “stinking skunk”!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! Order! The hon. member must withdraw that last statement.

**Mr. Procter:** — I will not withdraw it, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker: I do not think we should cause any unpleasantness, but give the hon. gentleman a few minutes to reconsider what he has just said. Now I would like . . .

**Mr. Procter:** — My honour has been impugned in this House. I am the judge of what has been impugned, and without leaving this House, I am not going to withdraw it.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker: All I wanted to do was to rise to say that, on behalf of the Government I am prepared, this afternoon, to give assurance that we will appoint a Royal Commission to investigate the charges made yesterday by the Premier, and to investigate the conduct of the past government with respect to the purchase of dye. We are prepared, if the members prefer, to appoint a special committee of this Legislature, on which will be every member of the Opposition; or, to refer this matter to the Public Accounts Committee with power to act. We are very anxious, Mr. Speaker, to have this matter thoroughly investigated, and if the Opposition would like that to be done, all they need to do is ask for it, and it will be.

**Mr. Procter:** — Mr. Speaker: I have given this matter consideration, and I won’t withdraw a single sentence.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Then, if you will not withdraw, of course I am in no position to decide. It is up to the House to decide what is to be done in your case.

**Mr. Procter:** — That is perfectly all right with me, Mr. Speaker.

March 10, 1948

**Mr. Speaker:** — Does the hon. member still refuse to withdraw?

**Mr. Procter:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Then I am afraid I will have to name him.

**Mr. Procter:** — Very good, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — This places us all in a most embarrassing position, particularly in view of our friendly feeling toward the hon. member. Nevertheless, I think that we all agree that we must operate this House under Rules of Order and we must maintain a certain amount of order here; and we must all abide by the Speaker's decision. If we cannot, then, instead of having order, we have chaos. I am sure we would not want that, and I would make one last appeal to the hon. gentleman to withdraw that statement to avoid any unpleasantness.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Is the hon. member prepared to withdraw?

**Mr. Procter:** — No.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Then, Mr. Speaker, I move that the hon. member be suspended from the service of the House for the remainder of to-day's sitting.

**Mr. Speaker:** — It is moved that the hon. member be requested to withdraw for the rest of this sitting. Those in favour will say "aye".

**Mr. Patterson:** — Who was the Seconder, Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. Speaker:** — I do not know whether a Seconder is required to this Motion.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Seconded by the Hon. Mr. Brockelbank.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Moved by the Hon. Mr. Fines and seconded by the Hon. Mr. Brockelbank, that the member for Moosomin be suspended from the service of the House for the remainder of to-day's sitting. Those in favour will say "aye"; opposed will say "no".

**Mr. Speaker:** — I declare the Motion carried, and I would ask the hon. member to withdraw.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — A recorded vote decision.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Call in the members.

**Mr. Procter:** — Do I withdraw before the vote, or after, Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. Speaker:** — The matter is not decided until after the vote.

**Mr. Procter:** — May I ask for your ruling? I do not think I am entitled to vote on this. Am I correct?

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think you are correct.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The vote about to be taken is on the Motion which arose out of the result of my ruling in regard to the withdrawal of an epithet which was used by the hon. member for Moosomin. Those in favour of the ruling being upheld on the Motion, which was that the hon. member be suspended from service of the House for the remainder of this sitting, will please stand.

The Motion was agreed to, 43 to 4.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I want to say to the member that no one regrets this more than myself, and I think, upon reflection, he will regret it also. I would ask him to withdraw.

## **BUDGET DEBATE**

The House resumed, from Tuesday, March 9, 1948, on the proposed motion of Hon. C. M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (the House to go into Committee of Supply).

**Mr. H. Gibbs (Swift Current):** — I wish to congratulate the Hon. Provincial Treasurer on bringing down such a fine Budget. True, the Budget is the highest in the history of Saskatchewan; but I have always been of the opinion that in advancing progressive measures, while we live and exist under the monetary system, we shall have to spend money; and as far as I am concerned, if money is being spent on behalf, and for the benefit, of our people here in the province of Saskatchewan, and for progress and development, and all that is vital to the welfare of our people and the province as a whole, then I am indeed greatly gratified.

I am very sorry indeed that no action has been taken to completely eradicate the cantankerous Education Tax; however, I shall have more to say in this regard later.

Since the opening of the present Session of the Legislature, I have listened patiently to the ranting and raving of my hon. friends and members of the Opposition, and how they have belaboured with castigation the members of the Government side of this House; and I have as yet to hear any one of them utter or come out with any kind of constructive criticism. To me their method seems to be — destroy, tear down, and destroy again; and of this method I shall have something to say again a little later. The record of the present administration in four short years of office speaks for itself, and myself as one humble member of the present administration, am mighty proud of these achievements which this Government has accomplished in so short a space of time.

I am also certain and assured that the great masses of the common people of Saskatchewan feel and think the same way. It is true, Sir, we are not perfect; but I have yet to see or come in contact with anything that is. At least we are trying to build up and construct, under a planned economy, and province and future life that will be beneficial to every man and woman and

child who are living within our boundaries.

When we hear, Sir, from the hon. Opposition members (and I notice they have all left the House now, to sympathize with their colleague) about the terrible C.C.F.'ers and socialists, to the uninitiated it is enough to make one's blood run cold.

Now, Sir, I am not going to go into detail and deal with the progressive measures this Government has put into being and operation, because the Hon. Premier and Hon. Ministers and members who have spoken in the House previously, have already dealt with those matters; so in order to avoid repetition I do not intend to go over the ground that has already been covered; but, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal briefly on one or two subjects that are vitally important to the people residing in the constituency of Swift Current, and the surrounding constituencies of Swift Current; and the first one is — yes, the hon. members may well smile, because you guessed it — the proposed Bridge at Saskatchewan Landing.

Now, as you know, Sir, and also most hon. members of this House, the bridge has been the stock-in-trade 'big laugh' and a source of amusement for many, many years. I think I can say, possibly without fear of contradiction, it has been one of the biggest political footballs, too, that this province has ever experienced; however, I can say, Sir, that at long last the 'pipe dream' which some anti-socialist editors fondly loved to call it, is coming true, and they are beginning to wonder what magic powers the C.C.F. Government consist of. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, it is no surprise to me, because we have told them and told them that the socialist fundamentally and practically believe in construction and not destruction, and I want the hon. members of the Opposition to definitely note that.

I would like to dwell for a few minutes, and point out to the hon. members, how this 'creation' — that is, the Bridge — took life. It was neither a miracle nor was it black magic! It was just a matter of determination, common sense, and the will to do things. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, in the year 1944 a new provincial government was born in the province of Saskatchewan, and in the election campaign of that year, Mr. Taggart, who was then Minister of Agriculture of this province, went on the hustings; thing in the political world did not look too rosy, and the perpetual promises of the Liberal Government had about petered out. So, Mr. Taggart and his Liberal cohorts were at their wits' end and did not know what to drum up for eyewash, to try and fool the electors with again; however, one of the bulbs burst with a loud bang and somebody said — I presume some member of the Liberal Executive — "The Bridge! the Bridge! We can fool them again!" You see, it was in the dying hours of the campaign; there wasn't much time left, and something had to be done and done quickly, in order to elect Mr. Taggart. So out of the bag came the old, old bogey, and once again the creation — only it was a 'soft-soap bridge' this time — and as you will recall, instead of soft-soaping the electors, the marvellous ingenuity of the

Liberal pranksters soft-soaped themselves out of office. You see they never figured it would boomerang!

I do not need to repeat to this House as regards the two bridge Resolutions that were submitted to Ottawa, because they only went the way of several others relative to this province, and that was, in my estimation, in the wastepaper basket, or the ashcan!

However, this Government and my colleagues never lost sight of the project, and we kept working, and I am most happy to say a solution has been found and brought to fruition. We went to work and set up a non-political bridge committee composed of good citizens of various political affiliations. This committee was split — half to work north of the River, and half to work south of the River — to raise \$600,000. As you know, the bond drive is on, and I have no doubt whatsoever it will go well over the top, in spite of Mr. Walter Tucker, the Provincial Liberal Leader, who, when he spoke to a large meeting in Swift Current, a short while ago, tried to deliberately sabotage the whole project with his fantastic statements.

The Committee had previously gone over the pros and cons long before Mr. Tucker came to Swift Current, and I can tell this House we will look after the details without Mr. Tucker's aid, and also the Federal Government's aid. They have not yet offered us one red cent.

Mr. Tucker, in his speech at Swift Current, tried to discourage the people at that meeting. He told them it would be foolish to put their money into such a foolish venture, and here is the report in the 'Leader-Post' the day after Mr. Tucker spoke at Swift Current: "Tucker counts on Spring Election" and then in great big letters — I believe everyone in this House can see them from here — "C.C.F. Bridge Plan Obsolete." That is what it said.

Well, I can tell Mr. Tucker, as we told him up there that day, when he tried to bring in the implication that when Mr. Gardiner's proposed Dam for irrigation purposes, was finished — that if we put in the bridge it would be under water, on account of the backwater from the proposed dam down at the Elbow. We had already discussed those things, we had gone into them thoroughly with this Bridge Committee; and when Mr. Tucker made the assertion, one chap who was sitting in the front row at the meeting said, "Well, it is like this, Mr. Tucker — we have been looking for a bridge for the past thirty-five years in this neighbourhood, and a bridge under water is better than no bridge at all, so we're going ahead with it." We did arrange that if the Federal Government or even the weaklings of this province want to come into the picture, it is still wide open. We are making reservations for the construction of this thing. If it is necessary, if we deem later, that it should be a high-level bridge, we are prepared to build the abutments and the piers to take care of a larger and heavier construction.

At this point I would like to thank the leading personages up there in Swift Current, who have taken such great interest and put such effort into getting this Bridge proposition under way. I would like to

March 10, 1948

thank Mr. Gillander, Secretary of the North Committee; Mr. Trumble, Secretary of the South Committee; Mr. D. Harding, General Chairman; the Hon. Minister of Highways; the Hon. Provincial Treasurer; and last, but not least, Mr. Tom Bentley, Federal Member for Swift Current, who gave us information and kept us fully informed as to what was going on, from Ottawa; and I sincerely thank Tom for what he has done, so that we can now see our dream coming true.

At this point I would just like to read an excerpt from a letter I have received from the General Chairman of the Bridge Committee. The bonds were put on the market around February 1, and I got this letter on March 1, and he says: "Up to date, Harry, applications have been received to the amount of \$105,000 already." I understand, too, that the Hon. Provincial Treasurer has received applications from Ontario, Manitoba and possibly one or two more. So, you see, in spite of what Tommy Tucker did, in his 'wind-bag' talk up there, things are moving along very favourably indeed.

I would like to say, too, for the benefit of the House, that the Headquarters' Office for purchase of bonds is at the Newton Motors Company, Box 836, Swift Current — so don't be shy, boys! Send in your applications, and I am sure we will have that bridge in the very near future.

Now, Sir, I would like to bring to the attention of my hon. friend, the member for the Mediterranean Area — I am very sorry he is not in his seat to-day — that when he is casting reflections and throwing insults in his overbearing and pompous manner, at the Socialists or 'Communists' as he is so very fond of calling us on this side of the House, that I was raised and brought up a Socialist and for his information I want him to thoroughly understand that I am heartily proud of the fact, and I am also quite content to align myself with the Nollets, Sturdys and Lloyds — so that may be another one for his book. The hon. member apparently believes that the Socialists are forever destroying and ready to blow up everything in sight. My experience has been the direct opposite, and I would submit that by the actions and comments of the hon. member from the Mediterranean Area, in this House, he is the one who would probably enjoy doing the things he accuses the Socialists of doing.

I would just like to quote what one gentleman said a few years ago. It goes like this: "I painfully reflect that in almost every political controversy of the last fifty years, the leisure classes, the titled classes, have been in the wrong. The common people, the toilers, the men of uncommon sense — these have been responsible for nearly all the social reform measures which the world accepts to-day." Now, that was not a quotation from Karl Marx, or Friedrich Engels, or Nikolay Lenin. That was from one of the most eminent statesmen of Great Britain, William Gladstone. In my lifetime we have fought two wars to end war; at least that was the general impression, and yet the blood-soaked battlefields of Europe are still wet, and the talk still prevalent is — War! War! War! I do not think it is fair, or playing the game, to shout from the house tops and lay the debacle of unrest, chaos and bloodshed at the feet of the Socialists; because my hon. friend must know



that war, chaos, destitution and degradation, are the spawn of capitalism and human avariciousness.

I have been around a little in my time, but have yet to see monuments and statues put up in honour of the working man; so I will leave it to my hon. friend's imagination as to who the monuments and statues represent that I know he must have seen while he was over in other countries. I think, though, that in the great paintings of the world, where the artists have painted the common people as their subject matter, we find them portrayed in peaceful industry. Take, for instance, Millet's work of "The Gleaners" and "The Angelus" — just humble working folks trying to live in serenity. Now, my friend will observe that mostly the common people largely constitutes and believe in the philosophy and doctrines of Socialism, and there is a reason — and a big reason — why that is so. Take, for instance, the history of the working-class people of Great Britain, of which I am a native. When I look back over my childhood days, and reminisce, and look back over some of the deplorable conditions under which the common people had to work and exist, and were being exploited by unscrupulous and ruthless employers, it is no wonder to me that the great masses have changed their political viewpoint and rejected the old line Parties, whose main belief, to my estimation, was the law of 'Rule and Divide'.

I wonder whether my hon. friend had to come through the bitter experiences that millions of working-class people over in Great Britain and the countries of Europe have had to suffer. Does he realize that hundreds of thousands had to emigrate to Canada, the U.S.A. and countries of the British Commonwealth?

Hundreds of thousands of Socialists and their children fought in wars. We have had two great wars in my lifetime. I was over in one of them, as you know; and my hon. friend was over in the last one; but it seems as though he would like to give the impression that he was the only one that ever was in the war, and that he won the war. The scurrilous statements he has made at this side of the House! When I, brought up as a Socialist, defended my Country as a Socialist, fought for democracy, fought wars to end war, and then another world war comes along — and who goes into it? The very children and families of the men who fought the First Great War. Hundreds of thousands of our children have died on the battlefields, they have been debauched with bloodshed, and yet we hear the statements coming over from my hon. friend of the Mediterranean Area. Surely it is about time he took the cobwebs from his eyes, and looked around to see what was going on! We have had good Socialists in this world, and Socialists will fight — they will fight for democracy, no matter what land or what nation they belong to.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that any man or woman wishes to leave the land of their birth on their own volition. In the great majority of cases it is a matter of bettering oneself, both from a monetary and an economical viewpoint. True, there are a few cases where it is a matter of health — so,

by taking the picture of exploitation, desolation and poverty, I think it clearly sums up why we here in Canada have such a cosmopolitan populations, and also why the good people of Saskatchewan, through the years of economical unrest, saw fit to change past governments, for a People's C.C.F. Government, which believes in humanitarian security for its people.

I wonder if my hon. friends have ever done any reading of Socialistic works? Sometimes I wonder at the statements they throw over here to us on the Government side of the House. I would just like to refer them to some of the Socialists of an older day, or some of the members of the Fabian Society which preceded the Socialists — good people, every one of them — and to-day, over in Great Britain, we have a Socialist Labour Government through the efforts of those people and the working class, combined.

I would like to refer my hon. friends to the works of Robert Blatchford — “Old Non-Com,” that was his ‘nom de plume’ in those days. I remember reading Robert Blatchford when I was just a schoolboy, when he wrote “Merrie England”, “God and My Neighbour”, “Britain for the British”; and the books of Robert Tressall, who wrote “The Ragged-Trousered Philanthropist.” I wonder if my hon. friends have ever read any of those books? If not, I advise them to get busy and do so, because I am sure it would not only improve their minds but probably improve a heck of a lot more.

I wonder if these men have ever heard of the good Fabians, the like of George Lansbury, Sydney Webb and his wife, Arthur Greenwood, Bob Clynes — they are not Communists, Mr. Speaker — they are all good men and women, of good British stock, people of the British Commonwealth; and this is what we get from our friends over on the other side of the House, throwing only epithets and everything else over at this side. Why, a lot of them have never even been out of the country! It is about time they started to travel! I wonder if they have ever thought of scientific advancement. It seems to me, here in this House, that they don't want to advance anything; but yet, every day in their lives, they see scientific industrial advancement taking place. I am not going to go into detail about these advancements, but what do we see, Mr. Speaker? I, as a railroader, had quite a few years of railroading — started as a young man — I have seen tremendous changes. I was on the road when we had nothing but wooden coaches, with bare wooden seats and everything that went with them. The railway companies had to advance with the times, and what do we find to-day? We find things considerably changed on both the C.N.R. and the C.P.R. The wooden coaches and boxcars have been replaced with steel; we see larger locomotives. The other day, when I travelled to Swift Current, possibly I was lucky, because I know the C.P.R. hasn't got many of these coaches out yet; but I travelled in a brand new coach that was a treat to ride in. It had what they call “sleepy hollow” chairs, that conform with the body make-up, and there is no doubt they are a comfort to sit in. Now, these companies are putting millions of dollars into expansion and scientific advancement of their line of business. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but the railroads of to-day have on the road to-day a coach which cost around \$60,000 — it is a school in itself. I hear my friends talking about the Larger School Units, and all this and that, but here is a coach put on the road for the benefit of the employees; and in our district Mr. Bert

Knox, a locomotive engineer, is one of the head men of the Safety Movement. They go from place to place, trying to cut down the average of accidents to save lives, to better the community, to better life all around. Of course, we have people in our own workshops who are stupid and stubborn, who want to still carry on with the old way of doing things. They do not like to adopt anything new; and of course we have quite a little trouble trying to educate them in the importance of these safety movements.

I suggest to the Liberal Party — we see all these changes, they go on right under our eyes each and every day — they can see them too, but they do not want to change their political activities or their political stride. They seem to think that everything else can change but politics. Well, I say it is about time politics had changed — we are changing them, and I think it is all for the better.

Under the caption — “Socialism — What is it?” — and giving a thumbnail description, I would like to quote the description given by a lady, Mrs. Jessie E. Cameron, which I think is excellent, and I quote:

“I believe in the four-fold plan of life — the intellectual, the physical, the spiritual and the social. Socialism, then, to me is this: How can I be happy intellectually, physically, spiritually and socially if you are not happy intellectually, physically, spiritually and socially?”

That, Mr. Speaker, embodies a great deal of what the common people are thinking and hoping for to-day, and we are not crying or wanting war and bloodshed on our doorsteps. We wish to live generally in peace and happiness and comfort, and without class diversion, and surely in a great country like Canada this philosophy can be accomplished if we can get together and oust the bitterness and hatred from our social and political life.

I would like to quote a few words of a man who lived a number of years ago, who said: “No men living are more worthy to be trusted than those who toil up from poverty, none less inclined to take or touch aught which they have not honestly earned.” Now, those words were not uttered by Maxim Gorki, Joe Stalin, or Leo Tolstoy, but the great American Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln.

I am sorry my hon. friend, the member for Moosomin is not in his chair, but after that exhibition of Monday, I was really going to say something; but possibly at the present time he is feeling a little ‘down in the dumps’, for I know that our hon. Premier, yesterday, gave him more than he could take, and possibly that is why he is feeling as he is to-day.

Now, Sir, if our friends of the Opposition and the hon. member for the Mediterranean Area can obliterate from their minds — and I would suggest that their minds are completely befogged at the present moment as to the philosophy of Socialism, and, in particular, our C.C.F. Crusade — well, then, I would suggest that they throw in their lot with us on this side of the House, and

March 10, 1948

fight with us instead of against us, in order that we obtain for the people of Saskatchewan and of Canada the security and comfort we so much desire, and forever do away with that great curse — Fear! It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that is the very thing the Opposition members are preaching at the present time.

I have another quotation to make here —a quotation by Cicero: “The recovery of freedom is so splendid a thing that we must not shun even death when seeking to recover it.”

I sincerely believe the majority of the people of this province have great faith in the present provincial government in the things they have accomplished for the betterment of our people. I do not intend to go into detail about the progressive legislation brought down by this government, because other speakers have dealt with those matters, and a very fine over-all picture was presented by the Hon. Provincial Treasurer in bringing down the Budget, and for the larger part of the Budget I can only offer my commendations; but, Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry indeed to see that nothing more was done to eradicate the Education Tax from our midst.

For some years now I have been anxious as regards this Tax, and it was, and is to-day, a much talked-of topic; in fact, ever since the past Liberal Government put it into effect. I remember some years ago, 1939, I believe, when I was an Alderman for the City of Swift Current, there was much criticism about this tax, and I submitted a Resolution to Council at that time which was accepted and forwarded to the urban Municipal Convention asking the Liberal Government to completely eradicate the Education Tax. The Convention passed the Resolution by a very substantial majority. Nothing, to my knowledge, was done about it for the remaining years the Liberals were in office. It ended up like a lot more Resolutions — as I suggested previously — in the wastepaper basket or the ashcan.

However, since the C.C.F. came into power they have gradually taken the tax off various commodities, for which I thank the administration; however, I earnestly felt that by the time our first term had expired, complete eradication of the Education Tax would have been observed. I am of the opinion that still more graduation of the Tax could have been made this present Session and that at least it could have been taken off all clothing, especially where school children are concerned. I think we are all aware of the vast amount of clothing growing boys and girls go through in the course of a year, and I sincerely hope, Sir, that my appeal will not be wasted and that the Government will give it serious consideration at all times, and in so doing, will rectify this regrettable matter.

Well, Sir, before I take my seat I would like to say that a few years ago, when we were supposed to be at peace with the world, conditions in Saskatchewan and other provinces in Canada were absolutely deplorable, and we saw the atrocious waste that was going on, with unemployment rife, and prices at a very low ebb for the essentials of life we produced. It made one's heart

sick to hear and read about the food produced in our country being deliberately destroyed, and much of the fish and fruit used as fertilizer, because of the simple fact the market was so low it would not pay producers to ship.

We cannot forget those conditions just as easily, perhaps, as our Liberal friends would like us to do. As Emerson said, "The firmest and loveliest ground on which people can live is Truth — the real with the real, a ground on which nothing is assumed," and I can assure my hon. Friends that is one thing the C.C.F. people's Party of this province believes in — Truth, Honesty!

My thoughts go back to a few years ago, when, in the State of Tennessee, there was a court trial about whether evolution should be taught in the schools. I think members will recall that a terrific debate ensued between those two eminent lawyers, Mr. Clarence Darrow and Mr. William Jennings Bryan — since the time of that episode, and seeing and expressing what has gone on in Canada and other countries, for that matter, and hearing the other day my hon. friend, the member for Rosthern, mention the Darwinian theory, it struck me as rather funny. We have been accustomed to his fairytales, and his childish statements. I remember the first or second Session we were in here, he made some remark about himself, likening himself to a mouse — I think all hon. members remember that — a mouse! why, I don't know — whether he looked mousey, or felt mousey, I don't know; but he did refer to himself as a kind of mouse. It might have been 'Mickey Mouse' for all I know. Well, the other day, he mentioned the combination of the Darwinian Theory of monkeys and man. As a matter of fact, he made that remark to one of our hon. members on the government side of the House. I could not get the drift of it at all, but, of course, I had heard the hon. member rave before, but this time he was talking about the Darwinian Theory. In previous Sessions, that same member talked about 'Cinderella' and 'Little Red Riding Hood' and 'Little Bo-Peep'. They seem to be his favourite classics. I would like to suggest to the hon. member that he try something else in future, go in for something a little heavier, say, 'Aladdin and his Wonderful Lamp' or 'Robinson Crusoe'. This is the member who talks about 'Socialist drivel'! I often wonder whether the hon. member has given any study to the Darwinian Theory. He seemed to be a little self-conscious when he mentioned it; and I must confess that at times I have been guilty of looking very seriously in his direction, because sometimes it struck me there was a very striking resemblance to the Simian variety. It is too bad that there are not a few chandeliers around here. We could have had some fun, for I am almost certain he would have been swinging!

I picked up a rather amusing diatribe the other day, and it happened to be concerned with — not the human viewpoint — but the monkey's viewpoint! It reads like this:

"Three moneys sat in a cocoanut tree  
Discussing things as they're said to be.  
Said one to the others, 'Now listen, you two,  
There's a certain rumour that can't be true  
That men descended from our noble race.  
The very idea is a darned disgrace.

“No monkey ever deserted his wife,  
Starved her babies and ruined her life,  
And you have never known another monk  
To leave her babies with others to bunk,  
Or pass them on from one to another  
Till they scarcely know who was their mother!

“And another thing you will never see,  
A “Monk” build a fence ‘round a cocoanut tree,  
And let the cocoanuts go to waste,  
Forbidding all other monks to taste.  
Why, if I’d put a fence around the tree  
Starvation would force you to steal from me!

“Here’s another thing that a monk won’t do—  
Get out at night, and get on a stew;  
Or use a gun, or club, or knife  
To take some other monkey’s life,  
Yes, Man descended — the ornery cuss,  
But, Brother! he didn’t descend from us!”

Before taking my seat, I would like to draw to the hon. members’ attention the complaints I have received recently as regards the Federal Income Tax forms that western farmers are receiving. They tell me the questions they have to answer are absolutely absurd and ridiculous, and that they differ to those which the eastern farmers have to make out. Sometimes I wonder whether Saskatchewan is labelled or not — could be, you know.

For the benefit of my hon. friends in the Opposition, who are always overjoyed whenever the Labour Party or Socialists or C.C.F. lose a Seat — a few weeks ago, I believe it was on the Throne Speech, the hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned some of the C.C.F. seats that had been lost in Canada, and I happened to remark to him — “What about Great Britain?” The other day, we got a report — “The Thirty-Seventh Win by Labour” — in the Seat of Wigan, Lancashire, they won another seat. They have lost one seat out of thirty-eight contested so far since the Labour Socialist Government came into power in Great Britain. It indicates that the large masses of people, the working class, farmers, businessmen and so on, see that it is the only future for them — to have labour legislation or socialist legislation; and I am glad that they took Wigan seat by a very comfortable majority — I happen to come from about six miles from Wigan.

My hon. friends talk about the scourge of Socialism and what it is going to do to the people of Canada and to the people of the world. I took a clipping out of a Canadian paper the other day. The headline is — “Legacy left British Labourites Despite Education in Socialism.” I will just read you a couple of excerpts from this paper. It says: “The windfall came from a wealthy Yorkshire industrialist, one Robert A. Atkinson, who recently died, leaving his

entire cash assets to the Labour Party, naming four Labour members of the Party as trustees. He directed in his Will that the money be used for the education of the people of this country in the principles of Socialism. The Trustees, two of the five appointed to administer the educational trust were Mr. Greenwood, and the Party Secretary; the others are, Emanuel Shinwell, M.P., Chairman of the Labour Party; Philip Noel Baker, M.P., and Thomas Williamson, M.P. Atkinson's fortune was left in the names of the first four."

That man, Mr. Speaker, left in the neighbourhood of one million pounds to the Labour Government of Great Britain. In our money, that would be approximately five million dollars. I wonder what our Opposition thinks about that?

**Mr. Danielson:** — He wouldn't be a capitalist, would he?

**Mr. Gibbs:** — Maybe he was, but he had seen what was going on in the Old Country; I mentioned in my speech a little earlier what went on — what you fellows yet haven't got through your thick skulls can happen, but it will happen if we keep the likes of you in power!

As I say, Mr. Speaker, we are a Government and a Party that believes in advancement. The other day I was seated at my desk when a group of young girls came and stood at the door of the House, and said, "May we come in?" I said, "Why not? Your parents helped to buy this place, helped to build it. It belongs to the people of Saskatchewan — not to a private few." Those children came into this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, and they all wanted to sit in the Premier's chair — they considered that an honour. They will remember the day they sat in the Premier's chair, as long as they live.

There are other suggestions I would like to make at this time, Mr. Speaker, to show you the advancement that is taking place. We members sit in nicely upholstered, comfortable chairs. I presume when this place was first built they sat on hard chairs — I don't know; but I have often wondered how in the world the spectators (and we have quite a number here every day) can sit on those antiquated, outdated seats up in our Public Galleries; and I suggest that if we cannot completely do away with those seats, we could at least have them cushioned, to make them more comfortable. Now, perhaps there is something about those seats — maybe there is a history behind them — possibly the Liberals never gave it a thought, because I don't suppose it mattered to them — maybe no one ever came to hear them; but we do have large audience, and I will leave that just as a suggestion. It was rather amusing when I first took my seat in this House in 1944 to see the comical side of a lot of things; and when I saw you, Mr. Speaker, come in the House with your three-cornered hat on, it made me smile. I thought to myself, 'Well, that's peculiar,' because I had read about the Seventeenth and the Eighteenth Century, and my mind went back to when the Bow Street runners of London used to wear the same kind of hat that you are wearing now — the three-cornered hat. You see, the Bow Street runners preceded the present 'bobby'. Not only that — the highwaymen of those days, the bad bandits used to wear these three-cornered hats — Dick Turpin and others; and so, Mr. Speaker, I think it might be a little more dignified even if you adopted the old college mortar board or something like that, to uphold the dignity and decorum of this House.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am confident that when election day rolls around again, the people of this province will re-endorse the present Government, who have done so much for their welfare; and I shall definitely support the Motion.

**Mr. Wm. J. Arthurs (Melville):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the Budget which was brought down a week ago last Thursday by our Provincial Treasurer, I do so with great pride. Sometimes I think I am in the same position as most of the Opposition, although I may have a little more insight into it. The question is this — they just cannot understand how this Provincial Treasurer can bring down a Budget as large as this — last year it was larger than the year before, this year it is larger again — and at the same time pay off \$70,000,000 of debt in this province without putting on any additional taxes. You may have noticed, Mr. Speaker, the same as I did, that the other night, when the Provincial Treasurer was making his Budget Speech there wasn't any person in this House who was pounding his desk any harder or any more often than the hon. Leader of the Opposition; then next day he came back to tell us that everything was wrong with the Budget.

The hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. H. Gibbs) mentioned the fact that he was not quite satisfied with the Education Tax. I might say that I was in that same position for a long time myself, and what changed my mind with regard to the Education Tax was when this question came before our Convention, which represented the whole province of Saskatchewan, at Saskatoon, last year, and they voted unanimously in favour of not taking the tax off. That is why we have the tax to-day — because the people of Saskatchewan want it still left on; and it was not “boys in the back room” who arranged to leave this tax on.

I have heard a lot of criticism of the Government; in fact, just a few days ago, we had a Resolution before this House, one dealing with coarse grains and doing away with the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. True enough, no one can deny that it was a socialistic resolution. I have heard the Opposition, day after day, crying down Socialism; but, after they had delayed this resolution, talking against it for some two hours — you have heard that old saying about when you have to stand up and be counted; well, that is what happened that day. When the Motion came before the House for a vote, every one on that side of the House, including the hon. member for the Mediterranean Area, stood up in favour of the socialistic resolution to do away with the Grain Exchange.

I really like honest criticism, Mr. Speaker, but when the hon. member for the Mediterranean was discussing a certain question the other day, what did he say? He was opposed to a thirty-three year lease, absolutely, and then he wound up by stating that the Veteran should be able to buy his land shorter than the ten-year waiting period; then he said this, that the rent charged by the Government was one-sixth to one-tenth percent — one-sixth to one tenth of the crop. He said it was no inducement for a man to buy. Isn't that a wonderful argument against a thirty-three year risk? In his own argument about selling the land to the Veterans he says, “They re charging so little rent, there is no inducement for the Veteran to buy the land at all.”



On the subject of co-operative farms, he went on in the same manner — he opposed co-operative farms, but wound up by stating that these Veterans who are on them are perfectly satisfied. Now, what can I, or anyone else listening to him, think, other than that he was merely giving one man's opinion?

The hon. member for Rosthern, the other day, made a statement that the Liberal Government had put on the Statutes of this province 325 Acts, of which 13 were for agriculture. I think perhaps the Liberal Government did a lot of work, in a province where there is as much agriculture as in Saskatchewan, to get 13 Acts pertaining to agriculture, out of 325 Acts passed. That is a record they should really be proud of.

That is the trouble I find to-day with our Opposition — they have not discovered yet why they were defeated in 1944; but I would like to quote from the Calgary paper of April 18, 1944:

“Legislation being brought down at this Session is bringing to a glorious conclusion, under the leadership of Prime Minister King, the platform adopted 25 years ago by the Liberal Party.”

That statement was made by Mr. Gardiner, on April 18, 1944. Again I say, as Mr. Churchill said — everything that they had been doing was ‘too little and too late.’

I think the Liberal Government put some very good legislation on the books of Saskatchewan, but they did not follow it up. It was the Liberal Government that put The Moratorium Act into effect, and until this Government came into power they had only used it five times; but this Government has used The Moratorium Act over forty times since they have been in power.

I would like to say something, also, in regard to the Larger School Unit system. I believe it was the former government that started that, as far back as 1918. The Foght Report of 1918 had recommended a change in the system of Saskatchewan administration of rural district schools. Again, the Martin Report of 1939 approved of the Larger Unit principle, and recommended a pattern of organization in some considerable detail. This Report recommended that three experimental Units be established — one in south-east Saskatchewan, one in the Kindersley district, and one in the Nipawin district. In the 1940 Session of the Legislature, The School Divisions Act (1940) was passed. This Act was varied in terms, and in fact, was the basis upon which the present School Unit Act, R.S.S. 1944, Ch. 41, was constructed. The 1944 Act was permissive in nature, but remained inactive, and no units were established before the change of government. It is noted, however, that in 1943, progress was made toward organization of School District Unit No. 1 in the Swift Current area; however, bad weather intervened at the time set for the necessary organization meeting of trustees and ratepayers, and the project was dropped, never to be revived until change of administration in 1944.

With the advent of the C.C.F. administration, steps were immediately taken to implement the provisions and recommendations of the Martin Committee, and to make effective the legislation of 1940. The result — the present Larger School Units. Within six months after this government came into power, they had set up Larger School Units at Estevan, Swift Current, Herbert, Foam Lake, Saskatoon East, Biggar, Turtleford, Radville, Maple Creek, Kindersley, Langham West, Saskatoon, Prince Albert and Meadow Lake. Since June, 1947, we have set up 31 more Larger School Units, making a total of 45, or three-quarters of the entire province of Saskatchewan.

Now, the Liberals of that time started off on good legislation, but they did not carry it on — it was inactive — there was nothing done, and it was not until this government came in that they picked up what was really good legislation and carried it on to a successful conclusion.

Take the Saskatchewan Anti-Tuberculosis League. I think the previous government helped quite a lot in that. This League was formed back in 1929, by the government paying one dollar per bed for each patient in the sanatoria; and then the Act also gave the League something that I think should be changed, although it has not been changed yet — after getting this one dollar per bed from the Government, they are allowed to charge back forty percent to the urban and sixty percent to the rural. I do not think any League or anyone not elected by the people of the province of Saskatchewan should have the right to put on taxes against the people of this province. Dr. Ferguson at Fort Qu'Appelle has done a wonderful job. He has taken to heart the work that he has followed; but if Dr. Ferguson was to pass on out of the picture, I do not know where you would get another to take his place.

I would like to deal for a minute with the Cancer Clinic. Here, again, the previous government started something that they never finished. The Saskatchewan cancer program had its origin in the Cancer Committee of the College of Physicians and Surgeons back in 1929. The Committee recommended to the government that a Cancer Clinic should be set up in Saskatchewan — one in Regina to serve the southern part of the province, and one in Saskatoon to serve the northern part of the province. It recommended that the government purchase adequate supplies of radium, and assure adequate facilities were provided for the treatment of this disease. At the beginning, the two Clinics were situated in General Hospitals, but were not equipped with a full-time medical roster until 1939, when full-time medical directions was given. In 1944, free treatment for cancer patients was introduced. The whole Saskatchewan program, as it exists to-day, may be considered to be formed on two basic principles, centralised in the two cities, and free treatment. I must say there was no free treatment of cancer until this Government came into power in 1944. True, the previous government spent some money on cancer research — in 1938, they spent \$46,000; in 1939, \$48,000; in 1940, \$96,000; in 1941, \$63,000; in 1942, \$60,000; in 1943, \$69,000; and in 1944, \$45,000. In 1945, though, after this Government went in, we spent \$158,000; and in the next year, 1946, we spent \$374,000; in 1947, \$451,000.

The number of admissions to the Cancer Clinic was just about the same: in 1943, 1,600; in 1944, 2,000; in 1945, 2,600; in 1946, 3,200; in 1947, 3,697. Each of those admissions, prior to the present government going into power, had to pay a fee for this service, which has not been the case since this government came into being. It was a case of the former government starting something, and the present government seeing it through to a conclusion; so that, to-day, we have free hospitalization and free medical care for cancer patients.

The same thing applies to the Power Commission, which first came into being in 1929. In 1930 the Commission purchased the Canadian Utilities Branch at Watrous and Nokomis, with a transmission line serving ten towns and villages, at a cost of \$465,000. The Commission carried on until 1944. They then had 1,445 miles of transmission line covering 129 villages and towns, as well as Saskatoon, North Battleford and Swift Current.

When the Commission was handed over to this government on July 10th, the Commission came to us, being \$74,582 in the red; but then the C.C.F. Government came into power, and when you get a government that looks favourably on public ownership, the picture is changed. In 1946 we reduced the rate twice, and paid off the \$74,582 that we were in the red, and showed a surplus of \$414,282.64; and had 2,651 miles of transmission lines, serving 259 towns and villages, with a total of 45,084 consumers, and was on the right side of the ledger at the end of 1947 — not \$74,582 in the hole, but \$972,475.02 on the right side of the ledger. That goes to show you what can be done when you get a government that looks favourably on government ownership.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend a few minutes on my own constituency, which lies on the North Bank of the Qu'Appelle Valley for about 105 miles. I do not think we get very many complaints. Last year, we had, in the Melville constituency, 100 miles of highway regravelled — there is not very much to complain about there. This government said that if the Melville School District was prepared to take a vote, they would advance them some \$40,000 to enable them to have a technical school there. Melville has taken the vote, and it was pretty nearly unanimous. I am satisfied that we will have a technical school there before long.

Last year, we had our first chance to have a little bit of 'hard top' being done on No. 10 and No. 15 Highways, which I hope the Government will, in future years, continue on a little further.

I mentioned a year ago that we had in that constituency a very scenic part of the province, especially the north shore of the Qu'Appelle Valley, and I am still hoping that the Government will see fit to build a scenic highway right from No. 47 to No. 9, which can later be connected up with No. 10, which is the prettiest part of the province of Saskatchewan, and I am hoping that they will do that in the near future.

I am not a candidate for the next election. Our convention, which was handled the same as every other C.C.F. convention, is a democratic organization, and they have their choice for candidate a Mr. George Webster, a farmer of the Balcarres district. He is a graduate in agriculture from the University of Saskatchewan, and I believe they have a first class man, and I haven't a bit of doubt in my mind that the Melville constituency will return him to a seat in this Legislature.

I have heard so much with regard to fear — everything seems to be fear. Well, I have some fear myself; I believe we all have fear, but my fear differs to a lot of the other fears: my fear is that the people of the province of Saskatchewan do not have the fear they should have of the Liberals, to see that they do not get back into power after the next election and undo the things that this Government has done for the people of the province of Saskatchewan. That is not a 'bogey' fear — after we have seen what has been done with regard to automobile insurance, fire insurance, hospitalization treatment, cancer treatment, and everything else that is pertaining to the welfare of the people of the province; they want to have some fear in having somebody in this House that will not carry this on as it has been in the last four years.

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

**Mr. F. Dewhurst (Wadena):** — In rising to take part in this Debate I, along with other members of this side of the House, wish to, first of all, extend my congratulations to our Provincial Treasurer (Hon. C. M. Fines) who has, in my opinion, brought down the best Budget Address that this House has ever listened to. It is true that I haven't been in the House the number of years that some of the others have, and heard as many Budget Addresses; but I have had the opportunity to read some of them, and the way the Budget Address was brought down, this year, by the province of Saskatchewan was a credit to any man. There is no wonder the financial critics of the East refer to the Provincial Treasurer of Saskatchewan as one of the most able and clever Provincial Treasurers throughout Canada.

Not only in this Budget has he made an outstanding mark for himself, but also in the way he has handled the finances of this province. When we turn back the pages and look at what Saskatchewan bonds were selling for a few years ago — selling at a discount, below par — and we see what

they are selling at today, that, in itself, should be enough recommendation for a Provincial Treasurer. Beside that, he has been able, through his steady hard work, to help bring down the debt of this province; and also devise ways and means whereby we are able to reduce the debt of the municipalities in the province; and, at the same time, we have provided increased assistance not only in one line but in every line of our social activities — in education, health, roads and numerous other things. I believe, in general, we can congratulate every Minister in this Government for the work that they have done. I intend to deal, to a fuller extent, a little later on, with some of the municipal work, and also with education.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, I was shown a copy of a hospital bill of a girl who is in hospital now in Regina. This girl is ten years old and has been in the hospital twice already, this year, and is now in the hospital for the third time. Her father was showing me these bills, and he said with the amount that would be charged against his daughter now, plus the receipts which he had shown me, that hospital would have cost him over \$800 if it wasn't for the splendid hospitalization scheme. He went on to point out how he would not have been able, in four or five years of work, at his average rate of employment, to pay that bill himself; and he hoped that, in the future, he would never have any of his friend or dear ones in the hospital but that he will be able to continue to pay his share of that hospitalization scheme so that he may be able to help others to receive the benefits which others are helping his daughter to receive at this time. Words like that, Mr. Speaker, coming to us from people who are in very meagre circumstances, are more highly treasured than gold, as far as I am concerned. To have the appreciation of people who know what it is to be hard up; to know what it is to fight for a living and a bare existence all the time, when they come to you and highly commend you for the work you are doing on the social aspects of their life, that does mean a lot.

In Saskatchewan we have had governments since 1905 when it first became a province: there was a government here before that time, but Saskatchewan was not a province then. In that 40 years, up to 1945, we have had only five years of prosperity, other than war — it was either war or depression. I think that any government that cannot provide security for the citizens, other than using war as a means of getting rid of over-production and unemployment, that government is not fit to represent any decent thinking man or woman, of any community, whether it be Saskatchewan or any other. In this province we have had 34 years of Liberal government, five years of a Conservative government, and we will so have had four years of a C.C.F. government; and I think that the records show, for the period of time this Government has been in office, that four years under their administration has far outstripped any preceding eight years in the province.

I would like to talk now on conditions in the North, for a few moments. The part of the country I live in, Mr. Speaker, used to be right on the fringe of the timber. I remember, as a lad, I used to be able to hear the whistles of the lumber mills as they were sawing lumber; the fringe of the timber was some five or six miles from my own home place, where I was raised; but, today, you will travel a long way before you will find any merchantable timber — as far North as you want to go there is very little left. When my parents, and others, settled in the district, it was full of fur of one kind and another, lots of game and lots of timber. Today, the sloughs and lakes have all dried up, the bush has disappeared and so has most of the game.

In the fall of 1939, along with several others, I took a trip to the Northeast part of the province, hunting. We journeyed through the town of Carrot River, and from there went east; we went east for over 60 miles, which was 40 or 50 miles past the settlement, and for about 15 miles we did not see any lumber that could be used for milling purposes. We went through a strip of timber east of Carrot River, where The Pas Lumber Company were logging, and went as far east as where the Sipanook Channel and the Carrot River join. We there crossed the Carrot River and went north, hunting along the Sipanook Channel. Years ago, that had been a real forest in every direction; you could see by the stumps remaining that there had been, at one time, lots of timber; but all that was left along there to mark the activities of human beings was a series of graves along the river banks. These were the graves of the men who had worked on the timber operations, helping to drive logs down the channel — many of them had given their lives in getting the timber out of that country. But, in giving their lives, they were giving their lives to free enterprise to make more profit for those who had, and little or no provisions were made for their wives or families, or the dear ones left behind to mourn them.

Last spring, I took the opportunity of taking a little trip around the northern part of the province to see a few of the things for myself. I took a trip through Prince Albert, and visited the different branches of the Department of Natural Resources, and as there were very few people there who knew me by sight, I had an excellent opportunity of talking to the employees to get their opinions on what they thought of things in and around Prince Albert and from there North. I remember quite well, one man, in particular, said that he had spent pretty near all his life in the Department of Natural Resources. He had made recommendations on several occasions on what should be done, but, he said, it was almost as much as his job was worth to make a recommendation to a superior. Now, he said, it is quite the other way, and has quite a job to get enough recommendations to hand in — the Minister tells them it is their job, working in the department, to have suggestions to hand on and to know what should be done, perhaps they will be accepted and perhaps not, but, at least, their opinion is wanted. That is something new for those employees working for a department of the Government.

I also took a trip through Battleford and went through the Mental Hospital there, and the one thing that was very noticeable was the crowded condition of that institution. In a room where there should be three beds, there were five; where there should be five beds, there were eight, and that was the general picture all through that institution. I must say that the cleanliness was very good and there was very good order around there, and most of the patients seemed fairly happy. A lot of the patients in the Mental Hospitals aren't all clean off their heads; there are a lot of those patients who go around doing everyday work, and to the casual observer you would not know he was an inmate of the institution.

I was talking to the manager of the Irrigation Farm and he was telling me of one little incident that happened early last spring. One of the patients went from the farm to town. He went into the bank — the following day there was to be a sports day — and he wanted to see if he could get a little money to attend the sports day. Some of the attendants had noticed the man was missing and sent the wardens after him to bring him back. The man was quite peeved about it, as he said he had just about got the loan through from the bank, and the manager was quite agreeable to giving it to him — he didn't want very much, only \$43,000, and he could have had a good time at the sports day. However, he was taken back to the Institution; but this just shows that these people are not vile, or dangerous, the majority of them, and there are very few that have to be guarded very closely. There was one ward which I was shown through with some 40 or 50 patients in it; they had to have guards there at all times because these people were, more or less, of a violent nature and, naturally, the guards had to watch that they didn't abuse themselves.

It stuck me as rather odd, yesterday, when I was listening to the address by the Minister of Social Welfare. He was talking of the conditions in his Department pertaining to wards of the government and the plight of their conditions; and I noticed the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) sat there with a big grin all over his face — I think, Mr. Speaker, it would have been more fitting if he had hung his head in shame because of the conditions that were allowed to exist which the Minister pointed out, yesterday.

I would like to refer to a few of the causes in this province which makes harder times for the people. There is one case where a man brought in a car to be overhauled: it cost over \$240 to have the job done. He took his car out and having driven no more than 1,000 miles when a connecting rod came loose and went through the block which ruined the motor, and he had to go to considerable expense to have it fixed again. There had been no keys put in the connecting rod bolts and some of the bearings were never tightened on some of the other connecting rod bolts — they could be turned with the fingers. Well, I think if those things are going to continue we will have to have legislation brought down in this House for garagemen to guarantee the service which they render.

The other day, a friend of mine was telling me that a few years ago he worked for the Goodyear Rubber Company. While he was working for that company he was able to buy tires at cost. That meant that, for a number of years, it didn't cost him anything for tires because he bought four tires for \$13.50 — these were 600 x 16 tires; yet the cost of one of those tires to you or I would have been around \$24 - \$26. He was allowed to get one set of tires per year. He would run his car for one year on the set of tires and sell his tires for \$5 each, get a new set of tires and still be \$5 to \$7 better off by doing so. We heard some talk of members of this House being born barefooted, but it is conditions like this which keep us bare, not only at birth but afterwards when we have to pay exorbitant prices for the things we have to buy.

A few weeks ago we heard in this House an address by a Mr. Fisher, speaking on conditions in Europe — the plight of the children over there — and asking for aid for European children. That address was very touching and appealing, and I can believe, very readily, what he said on that occasion. But yet the Hon. J. G. Gardiner, speaking last October in Yorkton, despite all those facts says they are not as tough conditions as the Western plains was in the 'thirties. It took him a long time to realize that conditions in the 'thirties were pretty tough: the members in this House at that time told him how tough the conditions were, but he refused to admit it — now he says they were tougher than the conditions in Europe. I do not know whether they were or not, but I do know that they were bad.

We also hear a lot of criticism on Crown Corporations — that the Crown Corporations aren't giving big returns immediately, and so forth and so on. As in this House most of the members are farmers, I think they will realize that when a farmer buys a half-section or section of land, especially if that land is covered with bush, which the Northern section of the province all was originally, and when they buy the farm they hire the bush taken off it and break it up; work down the breaking and put the seed in. If they take an inventory on that farm, and farm operation, before they take off their harvest, they are definitely going to find that they have a big deficit. But if they take it after harvest, they find that their deficit is not so great — it takes a few years to get back what you put in. That is the same with the Crown Corporations: in order to establish these corporations you cannot expect, in the first year of business, to get back all you put in and leave a good big healthy return, because that just isn't possible.

A few days ago I happened to be having coffee with the member for Moosomin (Mr. Proctor), and he was telling me that when he went to law school he got \$15 per month. Well, I think he will realize, also, that he had to spend so much time and effort in order to build up his practice as a lawyer before he got any returns from his business. So it is just good common sense that we must realize that we 'can't have our cake and eat it too'.



We have heard a lot in this House about the roads in this province as compared with the roads in the States. I happened to be talking to one of the American tourists, last summer, and we got to talking on this line. I asked him if it was his first visit to Saskatchewan but he said it wasn't; that he had been here on numerous occasions before. He said it was true that the roads here were not as good as the ones in the States, but that was understandable because they get a lot of Federal assistance for their main roads; and he said this was a country with a smaller population with a lot of roads to build up and could readily realize that it would take longer for the roads to become the same as in the States, without getting the same assistance. I think any fair-minded tourist, or anybody else, will adopt the same attitude.

I also was talking, this last summer, to a man who was a pretty good friend of mine but, politically, he was a good friend of the last administration. I have known him for a considerable number of years, and he was known all through those years to be a strong Liberal. He told me that, a year ago, he took a 1,200 mile trip through this province; and he said, "if you and I want to be fair, we can honestly say that the roads are not as bad in this province as they were five or six years ago — we know they are not if we would only admit it."

I think that the way the Opposition gets things twisted around when they are talking about things is much the same as a little story I heard about what happened in the British army some years ago. One of the British officers thought he would like to see how a message would travel by word of mouth, so he lined up 100 men about six or eight feet apart and whispered a sentence to the first man; the first one was to whisper it to the second one and so on, and the last man was to bring back the message as he received it. The message as given to the first man was: "We are about to advance, please send reinforcements." When that message came back to him it came back as: "I am going to a dance, please lend me two and fourpence." The general rhyme sounds much the same, but the meaning is entirely different.

We have also heard a lot of the increase of taxes in this province. The Provincial Treasurer's Budget Speech has shown that the taxes to the rank and file people of this province have not increased; but, in taxes, it is not what they pay that counts; it is what we have left and what we get in return for those taxes. We should put ourselves in a position whereby we can pay more taxes and not less; by paying more taxes, if we could have more social services that will relieve us of expenses with the other — providing them on a proper provincial or federal basis, then we are so much better off, just as I mentioned earlier with the hospitalization case.

I was talking, a while ago, with a restaurant keeper in the town of Wadena, and he was telling me that he had just got in a shipment of coca cola; in fact he showed me his invoice on that shipment. The coca cola cost \$40, but the Federal Tax on it was \$20, make it \$60 for the drink and the tax; besides that he had to pay over \$20 more as an advance against the crates before he could even get the drinks. Therefore, it cost him over \$80 before

March 10, 1948

he could get \$40 of goods into his restaurant. Those are the things which make it harder for the smaller businesses to carry on; and, as this man pointed out, he couldn't see any place where the Federal Government were returning those taxes to help relieve the needs and sufferings of the people of this province.

Last summer, I was in an office where the man was an issuer of radio licences: it happened that the inspector had been around there checking up on radio licences and, naturally, there was quite a run by those who did not have their licence to get one before meeting the inspector. One man came in to get his licence, and the issuer thought he would have some fun with him and said: "Well, John, even if we do have a C.C.F. government, you still have to buy a radio licence". The farmer turned around and told the issuer in no uncertain terms that he needn't think, for one moment, that the farmer was that dumb, because the farmer knew just as well as the issuer that the radio licence was a Federal licence, and not provincial; and why blame the province for all the ills and grievances which one may have!

We have heard a lot about school taxes being increased in this province. It is true that school taxes, on the whole, are higher now throughout the country than they were back in the 'thirties. There are several reasons for this, and good reasons. Back in the 'thirties the teacher got little or no salary for their work, which made it cheaper to operate a school. Another thing, during the 'thirties a lot of the taxes were not paid, and they became back taxes. When the war broke out and people started to get a little more for their produce, they were not only paying up their present taxes but they were paying part of their arrears of taxes, each year; and while a school might have a tax of seven or eight mills, in addition they were collecting the equivalent of four or five mills in arrears of taxes, which gave them something to operate on. As the people were able to pay up their back taxes there were on of two things which had to be done; they had either to bring down the teacher's salaries and services again or the taxes had to be increased. So, whether we are in a unit or not, the taxes, comparing them now, for schools, have gone up to what they were in the 'thirties; but the units are helping to give far more value for money received.

I have here a few of the accomplishments of the Wadena unit, which takes in the greater portion of the constituency of Wadena. The unit has only been organized for two years. It was organized on March 1, 1946. Since that time, Wadena unit has erected four new one-room schools, and two two-room schools; two three-room schools; and also have added five additional classrooms to existing schools, making a total of 19 new classrooms in that unit.

They have, in the past two years, made 32 major repairs costing \$200 or more; they have made 57 minor repairs costing from \$50 to \$200. In addition to that, they have increased the efficiency of the schools by providing better library service, drinking water facilities, more sanitation and so on. They have, at the present time, a library in every school. It is true that they are not large libraries yet, but it is a start in the right direction. They have also negotiated satisfactorily a salary schedule with all their teachers. The mill-rate in the Wadena unit for last year (I do not know what it is for this year) was 15 mills rural, and 18 mills urban. The town of Wadena had come into the unit at their own request, by negotiation. The secretary of the town told me, just before I came down here, that he had expected their mill-rate would be about 22 mills in the town of Wadena for the coming year; but, he said, if they were doing the same on their own as was planned for Wadena, it would cost them 35 or 40 mills. While the units are making these progressive strides forward they are on a 'pay as you go' policy. They are not leaving a lot of debt behind them, and having to issue debentures, which was done by the small districts.

If we can keep on with this rate of accomplishment, in a period of eight or ten years from now we will have all the schools brought up to a first-class standard.

The Foam Lake unit, which takes in most of the rest of the Wadena constituency, is much along the same line as that of Wadena. They, also, have a record to be proud of. The Wadena unit does not have dormitories like the Foam Lake unit has — they have two dormitories, one for the girls and one for the boys — but both units provide assistance to students attending high-school, if they are more than four miles away from their home. They provide assistance by a grant of 50 cents a day to the parent or guardian. Those are things that we never had before, and things that any rate-payer in a unit can be proud of.

A little while ago, in the House, I asked a question on grants to the Rural Municipalities in the Wadena constituency. The answer, as tabled, is on the desks of all the members, and they can go over them and check the figures if they so wish. I asked what grants were given to 10 different municipalities from the fiscal years from 1937 to 1947-48, inclusive, and I find in the fiscal year of 1936-37 there were only two municipalities received a grant at all — the two of them together got a little over \$1,000. In 1938-39 — that was the election year — though it wasn't a Liberal constituency, there were four municipalities received grants, and the four of them together received \$3,300. It happens that one municipality got well over half of that — \$2,000.

There is a rather interesting story behind that \$2,000. I remember when the election was taking place in 1938, the reeve of that particular municipality used to be a Conservative, but he was then working

hard for the Liberals. I know two men who went to him and asked him why it was that he had turned away from the Conservatives to support the Liberals. "Well," he said, "It is like this, I can get far more from the Liberals by being a Liberal than I can by being a Conservative, so I thought by turning it would help the people of my municipality far more". So that year the municipality received \$2,000. For the four succeeding years it did not receive one cent, so I do not know how much he helped them then; but, nevertheless, he has still stayed with the Liberal party.

In 1941, not one of the ten municipalities received any money. For the first eight years of this list the ten municipalities altogether received \$11,284.90; but since this government came into office, the last four years, the grants they have received, along with the equalization grant established last year, was \$32,256.64 — almost three times as much in four years as they received in the previous eight. And yet we hear members of this House say that we are doing nothing for the municipalities excepting increasing the municipalities' burdens! I think those figures speak very capably for themselves, and I think it ill becomes any member to get up and say that this government is not doing anything for the municipalities, when different municipalities give the same report as my own.

We have heard a lot of talk about Communism and of the Socialist members of this House being Communists. There is only one way, in my mind, Mr. Speaker, to stop Communism — it is not a cause, it is a result; and the easiest way to stop it is by removing the cause. All this House has to do, or any other democratic House, is to make democracy work; to give the people true freedom and that is not just allowing them to vote every four or five years. They want freedom from fear, so that when they are sick, or in a position that they cannot provide for themselves, they know they are not going to be destitute. If we do the things that are right by the people of this country, or of any other country, then Communism will just die a natural death; but any country that fails to do those things and always attacking progressive ideas in order for the people to bring in progress they go to extreme on the 'left' and, therefore, they have to resort to force. I think those are things that we should always bear in mind.

There are considerable other matters I would have liked to have discussed on this Debate, but they have been discussed at some length by other speakers before me, so I think I will support the Budget.

**Mr. A. C. Murray (Gull Lake):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to do the same as previous speakers and congratulate the Provincial Treasurer on the way he presented the Budget. I am going to try and take very little time of the House, as we seem to be having a kind of marathon speaking

tour here; but I would like to touch on a few things that have taken place in the Budget — some of the changes, and a few of the things which affect the constituency.

I would like to mention a few of the things, in passing, which will be of great benefit to the people of this province. By the increase of \$5, with the province paying \$35 to the Old Age Pensioner, and charging nothing back to the municipalities, as is done by the provinces on either side of us, Manitoba and Alberta, we are now paying our share of a \$50 pension, and it is now up to Ottawa to come through with their part of the pension bringing it up to \$50 for the Old Age Pensioner.

Also, by changing The Automobile Insurance Act, increasing the benefits of the automobile insurance, we have, Mr. Speaker, been saving the people of this province a considerable amount of money in the automobile insurance we are giving them. It costs motorists \$4.50 or \$6, plus their \$1 for the Driver's Licence, and make it what we call a 'four-point' policy; compare that to the other provinces on either side of us — to Manitoba, Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia. The Opposition will tell us we have compulsory insurance because you pay for insurance as you buy your licence, but they also have compulsory insurance in the provinces that I have just mentioned.

cont'd on page 30

I have here in my hand a copy of an insurance policy issued to a motorist in Alberta, and in figuring up what it cost that car owner in Alberta to get practically the same, not the same — I will have to correct that — it is not the same, because here in Saskatchewan, under the insurance that we pay, everyone that rides in that car and every pedestrian on the street is insured. In Alberta this insurance policy is what they call a ‘five-point’ policy. Deducting for fire and theft, \$6.50, practically everything else is the same excepting that they do not cover the people as we do here, it will cost you in Alberta approximately \$34.61 according to this policy issued by a line company in Alberta.

The Opposition might say that this is not a compulsory feature; but I have here a clipping from the Regina ‘Leader-Post’ a few days ago. It states: “In British Columbia, 50 to 55 per cent of the people carry insurance on their cars”. After this was brought in a few days ago in British Columbia, they estimated that 90 to 92 per cent of the people that are motorists will carry automobile insurance. So, if you are going to drive a car in one of those provinces you are pretty well compelled, if you intend to continue driving, to take out insurance at a higher rate than what it would cost you here in Saskatchewan.

I would like, at this time, to mention a few of the things that I think will be of great benefit to the constituency that I represent. I am sorry to have to report that part of the Gull Lake constituency has had a partial crop failure this past year — not all the constituency but part of it. Being a constituency that stretches over 135 to 140 miles in length, it naturally takes in all types of soil and, as the weather in this past few years has been rather streaky, there are some parts that had a fair crop. But there are parts of the Gull Lake constituency that have had three years’ crop failure.

That constituency is also a large stock producing area. It has some very large ranches and ranchers that are just in stock producing and not grain growing.

The policy of the federal government, this past fall, affected the Gull Lake constituency as it did most all other parts of the west, in stock raising areas, especially the small rancher or the farmer and rancher combined. In our part of this province, a great many feed stock during the winter, and they had to ship grain in. The federal government changed their policy and in some cases that grain was never taken out of the elevator, because the stock men could not buy the grain at the price it was at that time. It is true that, after it had had its little flurry on the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, it did drop back down; but the stock men in most cases unloaded their stock because they believed that the price was going to stay up the way it was.

I would like to refer to an article — I believe this article has been read in this House before — by H. H. Hanham, President of the Canadian

Federation of Agriculture. What he had to say on that I believe fits pretty well over the Province of Saskatchewan as a whole. This is what he had to say, last fall, on decontrol of grains by the federal government:

“Nothing that has happened in many years has stirred farmers and dairy farmers throughout Canada to such a high pitch of resentment as this recent action of the dominion government in the removal of ceilings and subsidies from coarse grains at this particular time. The government’s action has cut the feet from under the best stock program we ever had in Canada; a program that not only achieved the greatest production of livestock, dairy and poultry products in our history, but, what is more important, established some degree of stability in the whole agriculture program and offered hope for some permanency to this stability in future.”

I think Mr. Hanham quoted it very good and fitting western provinces.

I was back to the Gull Lake constituency over the weekend, and I can tell you something that was quoted by the member for Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs) that affects the farmers and has them worried right now, possible as much as the stock situation, and that is the new income tax forms. I do not know if all the members of the Chamber have seen the new income tax forms that a farmer has to fill out now. I am told by some of the people that have made those forms out for the farmers, that they will have nothing to do with them this year. One man that has done that for years for the farmers said that he cannot make them out. He said that, if we had to charge a farmer what it would cost to make those out now, the farmer would think that he was robbing him. Another gentleman that has been doing this, told me, last Saturday, that he did not know whether he would be doing that work this year or not — probably not.

The form, which I believe has been shown in this House, stretches out about four feet long, and you will agree it will not fit into a typewriter. These gentlemen say that they have to write that out by hand, and it will be impossible to do it for the same charges as what they have been doing it for in the past, and also the questions that are asked. Unless a farmer is a good bookkeeper he may make out the first one; but he is going to get caught in the next two or three years with that same type of form, because, if he does not keep his capital separate from his income and balance that each year, he is going to be in trouble with the Income Tax Department. In visiting the constituency I found that that was the biggest holler right now, and I am sure that that will continue to be so until after the end of April when the farms has to have their forms in to the government.

Another thing I would like to mention that I believe the people of the Gull Lake constituency are very favourable to and that I think are the agricultural representatives. I believe they are doing good work. They have set up agricultural committees and I believe they are of assistance to the farms in their work and will continue after they get somewhat more acquainted with the work they are supposed to do.

Mentioning the Department of Highways, we have not had as much highway in that constituency as we would like to have, but what highway we have had built by this government, by the Department of Highways, we can say is good highway. I am sorry to say that there was a contract let in that constituency, last fall, and no work started on it. So that 'has gone by the board.' We did not get as much work done on the highways as we had hoped to get done.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, and mention many other things. One other thing that I would like to mention that affects especially the south part of the constituency, is Air Ambulance. It has come up to that part of the province a great many times, not because we have not got hospitals — we have plenty of hospitals and we have some good hospitals; but in emergency cases that the doctors feel they cannot handle and the hospitals cannot look after them, they are brought into the larger centres. It is very pleasing to have people come up to you and tell you that, if it had not been for the Air Ambulance, they would not be alive today. I want to pay a tribute, too, to the people that fly that Ambulance; they take their chances. I know in one case where the pilot told the doctor he should not go, that he was taking a chance because the weather was not very good and it was getting late. The doctor told him it was up to him but the patient would not live until morning. The Ambulance left, and landed in Regina, and the patient was back in about three weeks, hale and hearty and able to get around. It was an emergency case, and had to be looked after at once.

I could go on and mention many other things that affect the Gull Lake constituency, but I am going to pass on from that. I want to mention something that has been mentioned in this House several times today, and that is what the Opposition have had to say about us on this side of the House. They have called us Communists; they have inferred that we have Communists among us. I want to tell them that I have no more use for a dictatorship such as they represent, than I have for the dictatorship of the left. The type of government that they represent is what breeds Communists. I just want to read an article here, Mr. Speaker, and I think it fits very well into what I am talking about:

“We live in such a maniacal world that it is useless to prophesy, but one must wonder why the Asiatic, the Europeans or the North American would want to fight for the ownership of a graveyard — for that is what the world would be. Nor could the clash of arms decide the basic issue of Free Enterprise versus Communism. That ideological conflict will be determined when the free democracies of the world have succeeded or have finally failed to unite in giving to the civilized peoples a decent, secure and hopeful life.”

The writer of that article in Maclean's Magazine is Beverley Baxter, a very reactionary Tory, on a visit to the United States. I think that gentleman is changing his views somewhat to what they have been. I do not usually agree with what he has to say, but if anyone has not read that article in Maclean's Magazine, March 1st, I would advise them to get and read it to get an idea of what he thinks is going on in the North American continent today, and it is not very favourable to people that think they are living in a democracy.



Now, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition have said that they do not believe in controls. They believe all controls should be lifted. I think, a few days ago, the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), whom I see in his seat, stated that he did not believe in controls by a government. He believes the government should get away from controls. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the government gets out of controls, we still have them; not by the people or not for the people, but by monopoly enterprise. I have here in my hand a list of companies in Canada, and we have some of them that have their factories here and take their money to the United States — they have their head office there — I think the contract would be considerable greater, but I am going to give you a few figures of what happens when a government gets away from controls and leaves it to monopoly enterprise. That is what we have today; not free enterprise, we have monopoly enterprise. As the comparison in the percentages between the profits of 1945 by some of these companies and 1946, I have the figures here and will just give some of the percentages. Simpsons — I think you all know who that is — 156 per cent greater profits in 1946 than in 1945; Dominion Stores, 150 per cent, Loblaw's Groceries, 139 per cent; some of the food companies: Canadian Bakeries, 85 per cent — is it any wonder that we are paying more for a loaf of bread now than we were a couple of years ago? Now going farther down on the list: Borden Company, 62 per cent; Silverwood Dairies, 101 per cent. I think this will affect the most of us in this building that wear good shirts, Tooke Brothers, 222 per cent; National Hosiery, 522 per cent greater profit in 1946 than in 1945; Monarch Knitting Mills, 309 per cent; Regent Knitting Mills, 394 per cent. Is there any wonder that the clothing is costing us more now than what it used to?

A name was mentioned here, yesterday, by the member for Lumsden (Mr. Thair), the H. R. McMillan Export Company made 90 per cent more in 1946 than they did in 1945; and the Canadian Western Lumber, 122 per cent. Now we come down to a company that we, as farmers, have to buy machinery from: the Cockshutt and Massey-Harris, 34 per cent greater profit. Is it any wonder that we have to pay considerable more for a combine or a tractor, today, than we did a year ago! They have been going up by hundreds of dollars.

I mentioned that we are controlled by monopolies and cartels. Some two weeks ago, I saw in the 'Leader-Post' an advertisement where a company were showing pictures over in Eaton's store — the Aluminum Company of Canada. I was interested in that article some years ago, and thought that I would like to go over and have a look at the pictures and see how aluminum was made; I thought that was what it was. I took the time to go over, and I did not like what I saw there, Mr. Speaker. All I saw was some nice pictures down at Shipshaw, the building of the Dam; and a gentleman with a loud speaker telling the people that they had built this Dam during the war to help the war effort, without any subsidy from the federal government. Well, I might have and I believe I would have, if I had the figures — I had read them some years before — I think that I would have interrupted his little tea party right there; but I did not have the facts. I have been thinking about that since then. What they were trying to do was to build up the prestige of that company across Canada. I have been told since that that gentleman was

March 10, 1948

speaking to different organizations here in the city, trying to tell them what wonderful things the Aluminum Company of Canada had done in the war effort. So I took the time to go down to the library, Mr. Speaker, and read and hunt up some of the material of what went on in the case of aluminum here in Canada and across the world.

I found that during the war the gentleman said they got no subsidy from the federal government. Well, back in the records, I found that Shipshaw received a write-off of three-fifths of their building plan, which amounted to \$154,000,000; and they received another write-off and bonuses amounting to \$23,000,000, making a grand total of \$177,000,000. Then that gentleman comes up here and tries to tell the people of Saskatchewan that they had never received any subsidy from the federal government.

Also, to go back to the records, in evidence that the Aluminum Company had given, they could produce aluminum at 8.93 cents per pound; and what did they get during the war? The Government of Canada paid them 16 and 17, mostly 17 cents per pound. A lot of that aluminum went out of there at 21 a pound — in U.S.A. dollars — that is, shipped to other countries.

It was proved, in committee at Ottawa, that they could produce for 8.93 cents and only working on out-of-date equipment and only producing part time. But what were they doing even back in those few years? I found, in hunting back through the records, that four-fifths of aluminum of the world went to build Hitler's machine. If any of the members of the House want some interesting reading just go back through some of those records and you will find what monopolies control Canada, especially a cartel such as the Aluminum Company.

You might wonder why are they able to get such concessions. I have heard said that these large companies used to hire a lawyer to lobby for them. Then they got a better idea; they put their lawyers in the House of Parliament. But the Aluminum Company of Canada, they have a better idea; they put them in Parliament and they put them on the Board of Directors, so that they have an interest in it. I have an article here and in looking over the Board of Directors, I find Hon. Leighton McCarthy of the Board of Directors. I wonder if he has anything to do with giving that company such a favourable deal during the war: Also, this company has 22 subsidiaries. They operate in 50 countries throughout the world. If anyone can tell me that that is not a monopoly, a cartel of the most vicious type, I would like to know what cartel is.

We have in this House taken considerable criticism from the Opposition. They had no foundation for their criticism; they offered nothing constructive, but they just want to criticize. They remind me of a cartoon I saw a short while ago in some paper, of a store with a buggy whip hanging out and the storekeeper standing there and he was wondering why the sales of buggy whips had dropped down because he is making just a good a buggy whip as he ever made. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the Opposition is back

as far as the storekeeper. They do not know that the world has moved on. They do not know that monopoly enterprise is out, and the cartels have moved in and taken over free enterprise.

The member for Moosomin (Mr. Proctor), a day or two ago, went over the members of the Opposition, telling what they had come up from, what they had started with, the kind of families that they were raised from; all poor people. Possibly some of them are not too wealthy today. But still it is unbelievable that people of intelligence as they should have, still continue to support a system such as we live in today, a system that depends on booms and loss, depends on war for prosperity. It is a pitiful condition when the only time that we can have prosperity is when we have a war, or just previous or just after. We have to sacrifice men, women and children, and if we have another war it will be more sacrifice, I believe, of women and children than happened in the past war. It is regrettable that people of this day and age cannot open their eyes and see what it going on around them and begin to wake up and work for the people of Canada.

We in the C.C.F. have been working to make a better Canada, and we will continue to work. We believe that our support will continue to grow because the old capitalistic system, now that monopoly and cartel enterprise have taken control, today is outworn; and we believe that the C.C.F. will continue to grow and will work for the betterment of the people of Canada. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the motion.

## SECOND READINGS

### **Bill No. 73: An Act to amend the Surrogate Courts Act.**

**Hon. J. W. Corman (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, this is a proposed amendment to The Surrogate Courts Act. As the Act stands now, anyone dying outside of the province, where letters of administration have been taken out, say in Ontario, in coming into this province to have those letters resealed, as it is called, is able to apply in any judicial district. I do not think that ever was the intention; one district court judge has held that that is the case. It means for instance that they could all go to Moose Jaw or all go to Regina. The amendment we are asking for will provide that in such cases — in cases of resealing — it shall be done in the judicial district in which the deceased had profited. I would move second reading of this Bill.

The motion for second reading was agreed to.

### **Bill No. 74: An Act to amend The King's Counsel Act.**

**Hon. Mr. Corman:** — Mr. Speaker, this Bill will be considered at more length in Committee.

This is a proposed amendment to The King's Counsel Act. Now that is the Act which prescribes the conditions under which the Lieutenant Governor in Council may appoint barristers to be King's Counsel. The Act was amended in 1945. Prior to that time the Lieutenant Governor in Council had the power, with certain exceptions, limited exceptions — one was that a man must have practised ten years — had the power "To appoint from members of the Bar of Saskatchewan, residing in the province, such persons as he deems fit to be, during pleasure, provincial officers under the name of His Majesty's Counsel, learned in the Law." Practically an unlimited discretion to the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Now in 1945 that was amended to provide that no appointment should be made unless it was first approved by a Committee consisting of the Attorney General, the two Chief Justices and two benchers of the Law Society. The Bill before the House does not change the principle introduced into the Act by that amendment, as far as the general profession is concerned. The purpose of the amendment, however, is to leave with the Lieutenant Governor in Council the prerogative to appoint barristers who are members of the Public Service without going to that Committee. That is the essence of the amendment. Now there are a number of reasons for that; no doubt questions will be asked in Committee; I do not think I have to go into them all, but I would like to point out that, in the first place, barristers in the Public Service are, in the true sense of the word, King's Counsel, since they act for and on behalf of the Crown in their whole practice of Law. In other words, whether appointed or not, they are, in effect, in reality counsel to the King or to the Crown.

Another reason is that this Committee setup cannot have much personal knowledge of the ability of barristers or law officers in the Public Service, simply because they do not appear before them in courts as the ordinary practising barrister does practically every day.

The third reason is this: it is my intention to use the officers of the Crown — the law officers — in court, to use them in litigation more than has been the practice in the past. There are two reasons for this. In the first place, before you can properly advise on Law, you should have some practical knowledge of procedure in the courts. Another reason is the question of economy. We realize that, in some cases, we must employ outside, but there are cases that can be handled by our own law officers and it is the intention of this government to use those law officers more than they have been used in the past. I might say, within the last three months, two of our law officers have appeared before the Supreme Court of Canada on behalf of the province; and I might say that others will be appearing before the Privy Council. We have three appeals before the Privy Council. Two have originated recently — The Farm Security Act and The Trade Union Act; and we have an old appeal: the International Harvester Company is appealing from a decision of the Supreme Court of Canada against an assessment of Corporation Tax. We have to be there, and some of our law officers are going over to appear in those cases. I might say, in conclusion, that to give the Lieutenant Governor in Council power to make these appointments without limitation and without restrictions, there is nothing revolutionary

about it. In Great Britain the appointments are made without any Statutes; it is absolutely discretionary. There they are made on the recommendation of the Lord Chancellor. In this province we have no Lord Chancellor; they only have me, so they are made on the recommendation of the Attorney General. But I might say that in Great Britain, Ontario, Quebec and in Prince Edward Island, the Lieutenant Governor in Council is left to use his own discretion in making these appointments. Now we are only asking that we be given that discretion as far as our own law officers are concerned; and I would like to point out again that this Committee we set up to pass on the qualifications will remain, and it will still have to pass on the qualifications of members from the general profession before they can be appointed King's Counsel. I move second reading of the Bill.

The motion for second reading of the Bill was agreed to.

**Bill No. 75: An Act to amend The Interpretation Act.**

**Hon. Mr. Corman:** — This is a proposed amendment to The Interpretation Act. Apparently a little mistake was made in the consolidation of this Statute in 1943. Prior to that some words were left out, Mr. Speaker, as contained in the Bill, which will be explained in Committee. I would move second reading of this Bill.

The motion for second reading of the Bill was agreed to.

**Bill No. 71: An Act to amend The Forest Act.**

**Hon. J. L. Phelps (Minister of Mines and Resources):** — I just want to explain to the House that the only principle involved here is one to add a certain part of land to the Cypress Hills provincial park, which came into the possession of the Department during the past year, and which we believe would be ideal to add to that particular provincial forest. Also to add similar lands in the Fort a la Corne provincial forest, and which have been exchanged during the past two years; to exchange certain parts of land in the Manitou Forest, take one part out which is on one side of the railroad track and belongs to a farmer; exchange that for one that, in our case lies on the outside of the track, which would be much better for both parties concerned — that is an exchange.

The other is to provide for a new provincial forest to be called the Meridian Provincial Forest. Mr. Speaker, that comprises the land that has been recently taken back to the province, comes under provincial control, from the National Park which formerly was administered by the federal government. By agreement they have turned this land back to us, and a very large proportion is now being made into a new provincial forest called the Meridian Provincial Forest. There will be one House Amendment, Mr. Speaker, also amending the Pasqua Provincial Forest boundaries. That will be introduced in Committee. I move second reading of this Bill.

The motion for second reading of the Bill was agreed to.

**Bill No. 72: An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation (Accident Fund) Act.**

**Hon. C. C. Williams (Minister of Labour):** — This Bill provides for six improvements in The Workmen's Compensation Act, and I will just briefly enumerate them:

1. To transfer railway employees who are working as locomotive firemen, wipers, hostlers, watchmen and coal passers, from The Workmen's Compensation Act to the Workmen's Compensation Accident Fund Act.
2. It will raise the ceiling of earnings on which compensation may be paid, from \$2,500 per year to \$3,000 per year.
3. It increases the payment to widows from \$45.00 per month to \$50.00 per month.
4. It increases the payments of orphans from \$15.00 to \$25.00 per month.
5. It provides for payment of a clinical or disability rating to employees, despite the fact that their earning capacity may not have been impaired.
6. It gives the Board power to add to industrial diseases to those referred to in Section (2), and I think the details can better be discussed in Committee, Mr. Speaker.

Therefore I move second reading of this Bill.

The motion for second reading was agreed to.

**Bill No. 68: An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Corporation Income Tax Act.**

**Hon. C. M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer):** — We have nothing to do with this; it is clearly the federal government. All we do is to pass the Legislation for it. But these are a number of amendments that they have asked for their Legislation, which we have to pass through this House. After I have had a chance to talk to the Income Tax officials in Regina, I will be in a better position to explain the details. I expect to have one of the officials with me when we put them through in case there are any questions. I move second reading of this Bill.

The motion for second reading was agreed to.

**Bill No. 77: An Act respecting Certain Contracts for the Sale of Certain Farm Implements.**

**Hon. I. C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — In moving second reading, Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to explain that the purpose of this Bill is to

legalize the annulment of a previous order-in-council that placed on classified jeeps as a large farm implement, and as a consequence of that it would be necessary to enter into a Form A contract between purchaser and seller of jeeps. In the recent years the need for the jeep is not as great with the implement situation improved, and, in addition to that, it is generally felt that the jeep is not adapted to heavy draft farm work; and of more importance still is the fact that there is a good deal of confusion surrounding the definition of a jeep. It is defined in accordance with the Revenue Branch, as being a motor vehicle, and the federal authorities classify it as a truck, and the transportation companies, I believe, classify it as a motor vehicle. As a consequence it was felt that the order-in-council made previously, under which the jeep was to be sold under the Form A contract, was not necessary and only confused the whole issue. A subsequent order-in-council rescinded the previous one, and this Legislation gives full approval to the cancelling order-in-council. I might say that there are only a very few contracts that have actually been entered into, and this will have the effect of legalizing those contracts; but hereafter it will not be necessary for the jeep to come under Form A under The Farm Implement Act. I move second reading of this Bill.

The motion for second reading was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock p.m.