

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

FIFTH SESSION – TENTH LEGISLATURE

The House met at 3 o'clock p.m.

Thursday, March 11, 1948.

ON THE ORDERS OF THE DAY

Premier Douglas: — Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to draw the attention of the members of the House to something many of them may already know, and that is, that, yesterday, we had the sad news of the passing of Mr. Daniel McDermid Rankin, known by almost all of the people of Saskatchewan as “Dan” Rankin, who passed away yesterday at one o'clock. Mr. Rankin, as most members will know, suffered a heart attack a couple of weeks ago, last week was well on the way to recovery, but last Saturday suffered a relapse and passed away yesterday.

Mr. Rankin was a man who, during his entire life, had been closely connected with far and co-operative movements. The service which has him a bulwark of the farm movement in this province. All who have had any connection with the Co-operative Movement and the various organizations in the province that have made for the better conditions of the farming population are, I am sure, familiar with the work of “Dan” Rankin, and I feel that it is appropriate at this time to say a just a few words in tribute to him at the time of his passing.

One of the great things about the Farm Movement in this province is that it has revealed such steady and reliable and magnificent leadership. It used to be said, some years ago, that when farmers went into business, they could not run a business; that it would be necessary for them to get high-priced executives to run it for them. In the last twenty years the Farm Movement has demonstrated sufficiently to convince any person that they have been able to produce leadership from their own ranks, which has enabled them to run their business efficiently and well; and one of the men who has been a tower of strength to the Co-operative and Farm Movements in these last twenty years has been Mr. “Dan” Rankin.

Last night, I had the privilege of addressing the Canadian Congress of Co-operatives' meeting in Saskatoon, and there the expression of regret was widespread. They had come to count upon his wise counsel, upon his good judgment, and upon his stability of character; and the Co-operative Movement and the Farm Movement, and the people of his community generally, will be the poorer for his passing. I feel that when men like him pass away they have not really gone – that they have left behind them a work and an ideal and a vision that will long continue to haunt the minds and hearts of men, and that the work they have done will live after them.

I would like to express, on behalf of the Government, and of myself personally, our deep sense of loss at his passing, and pay a tribute to his very excellent memory.

March 11, 1948

Hon. L. F. McIntosh (Minister of Co-operation): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by our Hon. Premier, in paying tribute to one who, through the years, has built, within his own community, that kind and type of community life that goes toward establishing the sound principles of democracy.

In the field of co-operative endeavour, the late Mr. Rankin was among those who took a very active part in bringing into existence the first Co-operative Oil Refinery in the world. He played a very prominent part in organizing and launching the Sherwood Co-operative Association, which is one of the largest co-operative associations of its kind in the Dominion of Canada. He held an office in that Association up to the time of his death; and because of his very wide knowledge, and his understanding of the philosophy of the Co-operative Movement, he was elected by his fellow co-operators to the Board of the Saskatchewan Section of the Co-operative Youth. He was elected to the Board, and later appointed First Vice-President of the Federated Co-operative wholesale society — a position which he held up to the time of his death; and in recognition of his sound judgment and his deep and sincere co-operative philosophy, he was elected to the Board of Directors of the National Co-operative Union of Canada.

In every field and in every sphere of community and co-operative endeavour, his sound advice was sought by those who were building co-operatives in this province and in Canada; and I would like to express, on behalf of the co-operators of our province, our deep and sincere loss in the passing of one who, down through the years, has made a very substantial contribution. I feel that, some day, historians will sit down to write the history of great men, and when they do, they will not overlook the contributions made by such men as the late Mr. Daniel McDermid Rankin.

Mr. W. S. Thair (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my testimony, along with that of Premier Douglas and the Minister of Co-operation. The late Mr. Rankin was a neighbour of mine, a very close friend and associate, and for many years resided in my own constituency. His passing has been a very distinct loss to our community, and to our whole province. I pay tribute to his sterling character and his great integrity. His great contribution for a better society will not be forgotten. The whole province mourns his passing.

RE: MOTION (FOR RETURN) NO. 1

Hon. J. H. Brockelbank (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — There is no objection raised to giving the information requested, but there will be about 100 or more paysheets to be prepared, when they are prepared with a sufficient number of copies. In connection with the second part of the Motion, about claims for fire loss or damage, we cannot see to get any information or have

no idea of what is wanted there. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition, or any other member, for that matter, would like to go to the L.I.D. office to examine these payrolls and to make any notes from them which he wishes, that will be quite in order; but for the second part I would like some explanation. If the member wishes to leave the Motion, and the Assembly wishes to pass the Motion, we will get the information with all possible speed; but if he (the member) wants to get the information more rapidly, he could do so by seeing these payrolls at any time.

Mr. W. J. Patterson: — It would appear strange to me that there would be 100 payrolls in connection with the road work adjacent to three Sections. There might be, but that seems to be rather an exaggeration; or, if there are no claims for fire loss in connection with this activity, then of course the return will not produce anything.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — We can take it as if the hon. Leader of the Opposition were asking me a question there. There will be several payrolls, because the payrolls are made out for two-week periods, and this work may go into two or three two-week periods – there may have been two or three pages, and then when you multiply that by the number of copies to be produced, you are going to have a large amount to produce; but we will get it if it is wanted.

Mr. Speaker: — Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the Motion?

The Motion was agreed to.

BUDGET DEBATE

The House resumed, from Wednesday, March 10, 1948, the adjourned Debate 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 for Supply).

Mr. H. E. Houze (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, first I want to join with my hon. colleagues and other members, in congratulating the Hon. Provincial Treasurer on the fine presentation of the Budget, the other night. While probably this is one of the largest budgets that we have had in the province of Saskatchewan, I think, in spite of this, the actual debt of our province has been reduced to a considerable extent.

Farmers' debts have been reduced to the extent, since this government took over, of about \$230,000,000; our provincial debt has been reduced by about \$70,000,000; municipal debts have been reduced, since 1944, by approximately \$30,000,000. In this province, farmers never did hoard very much money. In good times they used their earnings to bolster up their farm equipment, keep it up-to-date, and, in many instances, built good homes which now, in many cases, are vacant owing to the influx of the people into the villages and larger farm units.

March 11, 1948

Automobiles, in many cases, were bought, which were needed, but we spent a lot of money on luxuries. In 1905, when this Province was inaugurated, people did not pay much attention to budgets. We had only about two or three things that concerned us very much – among them, schools and highways. In fact, up until the fall of 1905, we did not have a mental hospital in this province, and we didn't need one. At the present time we have two large institutions, both of which are pretty well overcrowded. Schools were mostly a local affair, and the highways appropriation was administered by Highway men; and it was not unusual to see a lot of highways built just prior to election date.

During this Session, I have listened with much interest to speeches dealing with a great number of things in this province; hogs came in for an important debate, as did fish, lumber, furs and grain. Very little was said regarding other livestock such as horses and cattle, which form an important part of the economy of this province; in fact, these things amount to about one-third of our entire income from agriculture in this province. Hogs have been on the agenda, and reasons have been advanced as to why farmers have quit raising them. I believe there is just as much money in raising hogs, to-day, in spite of the high price of grain, as there ever was before; but who is going to feed the hogs?

First: our people are not going to stay out on the farms during these bad winters, shut up for months at a time, feeding hogs over a long period, only find, when the hogs are ready to be shipped, that the gain they made over the price of the grain is taken from income tax.

Secondly: our rural population is diminishing, to a considerable extent, in spite of all we can do. People are moving in to more central points, and one reason is so that they can get their children to school. Schools, in lots of areas, haven't enough children there in order to keep them open, and people are at a loss to know how to get their children to and from school, because there are no horses left in many of those districts.

Thirdly: our farms are largely mechanized. You know yourself, Mr. Speaker, that farmers are, to-day, breaking their land with high-speed tractors; they move into town and practically live there all summer, and it is not unusual in the morning to see quite a flock of tractors heading out to do the day's work. They can ravel 25 or 30 miles per hour, do a day's work, and get back to town every night.

Fourth: we are at a loss regarding a long range agricultural policy. That is one of the important factors in connection with any industry that we go into – we must have some stabilization of prices and some security in connection with it. Why would any person attempt to feed hogs, when he can take a truckload of grain in to town and get a cheque for a thousand dollars, as many were doing, last fall, in connection with rye? Not many years ago, we were paying a bonus not to raise wheat, and at the same time

we were sending out grasshopper poison to kill the grasshoppers off that were doing their best to help us in our policy.

The Federal Minister of Agriculture must have known, last fall, about the grain, prior to August 1st. As you know, after August 1st, farmers were selling their coarse grain, and all at once the controls were taken off and these people lost a large amount of money – in fact, I believe the figure runs into about \$23,000,000. Surely, the Federal Minister of Agriculture should have had more foresight than to disturb the entire economic system at that time by these decontrols.

You will notice that, to-day, on the Winnipeg market, flax for May delivery is \$3.88 per bushel; for October deliver it is \$1.78, making a difference of over \$2.00 on every bushel of flax. I happened to be in Ontario, last fall, when this decontrol came into effect, and one firm there alone had seventy carloads of feed grain. They had a demurrage account with the railroad company of \$1,600.00 and, after that, figured they had still made in the neighbourhood of \$35,000 on the transaction.

Farmers, to-day, are demanding more stability of prices. It is quite unfair that hogs marketed last December should have a difference in price of \$8.50 apiece, as compared with those marketed in January. People who marketed their hogs at that time, I think, should be reimbursed, the same as we are advocating reimbursement of the grain farmer.

I want to touch briefly on some of the things that affect our cattle industry. We have, to-day, approximately one and three-quarter million cattle in this province. The average income from livestock and livestock products amounts to about one-third of our annual income, as I have said before. From Moose Jaw west, is where the bulk of our cattle is located. The land is not particularly suited to grain growing, in many cases, and it is more or less of semi-ranching country, with both small and large ranches. In spite of this, most of the best cattle in the province comes out of this district.

I would just like to refer to what happened, last fall, in connection with the Moose Jaw Feeder Show, and it was this: The first prize carload of calves came from the district of Mankota. They weighed 450 pounds apiece, and brought \$17 a hundredweight, or an average of \$78 each, and the mothers of those calves were never in a barn. They ran out, even last winter, down between Mankota and Val Marie. The first prize carload of yearling steers was also shipped from Mankota, and they averaged \$98 a head. The first prize load of two-year-old steers was also shipped from Mankota, on the same train, and they averaged \$125 apiece. It is felt by livestock associations that a great service could be rendered by looking after the health of our animals, and I am pleased to tell you that our Minister of Agriculture (Hon. I. C. Nollet) has been awake to this situation. Since 1945 we have put in the Statutes of this province The Veterinary Services Act,

March 11, 1948

whereby three or four municipalities can join together, and, with the assistance given from the government, employ the services of a duly qualified veterinary surgeon.

We have also given scholarships in order to increase our veterinary surgeons in this province. I believe that at the present time there are only about 44 actually in practice in this province, so we have offered scholarships to our young men, to go to Ontario and take up this veterinary science; and I am pleased to tell you that it is meeting with good success. To-day, there are more and more veterinary service districts being established, and more farmers are able to have the services of a duly qualified veterinary surgeon. After all, unless we have a healthy livestock population we cannot have healthy people.

Here, I would like to say something about some of the diseases which commonly affect our cattle population in this province, and also our poultry. We have at the present time set up a pretty representative group of young people, mostly graduates of colleges, and they can do a great deal to assist in the combatting of disease among swine and poultry, which are quite closely intermingled. A disease among our cattle, about which we hear quite a lot, is tuberculosis. In this province, tuberculosis is not of very great consequence. It is not since to have animals with tuberculosis; but our province is probably more free of tuberculosis than any other in Canada – in fact, according to the official record of tests, just a small fraction of one percent of our cattle go down, in the tests. We cannot say that in connection with Bang's Disease, which is a much more serious thing. This disease, particularly, affects human beings. I do not think we should become alarmed about this, however, because after all, only a small percentage of people actually contract undulant fever, and sometimes there is a little doubt about that; but where we do have it – and we are having quite an outbreak of that disease at the present time in Saskatchewan – is with the milk supplied to the children of the province. As you know it sets up all sorts of things, in the way of tonsillitis, sore throat, and many other ailments of children, which could be very well avoided if we had milk from those healthy cows.

Now, just a few words about the methods we should use to eradicate Bang's Disease. As you know, it requires the services of a qualified veterinary surgeon to take tests for tuberculosis and also in order to get the samples of blood taken from cattle; when we send it to the University, it cannot be tested there without being taken by duly qualified veterinary surgeons. I agree that there is not much to taking blood samples from your cattle if you think there is some danger of them being contaminated with this disease. In the first place, it does not matter very much how you take this blood sample. For instance, as long as you are thoroughly convinced as to what you are doing, have your container thoroughly sterilized, and then have any instruments sterilized, you can very well cut a little piece off an animal's ear, put a few drops of blood in the little

container, seal it up, number it and send it off to the University to be tested; but they will not test it at the University unless it is taken by a duly qualified veterinary surgeon, and the sample and the animal must be properly tagged. Now, I am not trying to create the impression that I want to do away with the services of veterinary surgeons in connection with this, but I think there is a lot of red tape in connection with ridding our province of this disease; besides, it causes tremendous financial loss to cattle owners. Now, this disease can be controlled by what they call calthood vaccination, which consists of having a duly qualified veterinary surgeon go and inoculate this calf between the age of eight and twelve months. Veterinary surgeons are very scarce, as I have mentioned before, and the farmers cannot do this themselves. Now, you say, 'why can't the ordinary layman administer this serum to the calf, just the same as he can take blackleg serum and give it to an animal?'

Well, two things enter into it. In the first place, this blackleg bacterium contains dead germs; in the other case, the serum that is administered to these calves contains a living virus, and if you should happen to have a cut on your finger, or happen to touch your eye with your finger while doing this job, you would contract the disease yourself. You might not get it as bad as you would through other sources, but you would have it, nevertheless. Thus you can see the risk people would be taking, or the drug firms, or the government, by sending out this highly potent stuff to laymen of the province to administer themselves.

In connection with poultry we have another situation – our poultry is very badly infested at the present time with tuberculosis. No one knows how much it is, but from reliable sources of information I have learned that the biggest single menace to our poultry population is tuberculosis. The same could be said of hogs, although this disease in hogs has jumped by leaps and bounds, and from 1910 to 1948 the percentage of hogs in slaughterhouses show 25 to 30 percent of tuberculosis germs in one connection or another. With hogs, you can be in the hog business one year and out of it the next; but in connection with cattle, it takes years to get into a good heard of cattle, but it does not take long to get out of them, as we well know.

I would just like to read a little article that I saw in the paper the other day, in connection with stability of the cattle industry, and this is what it says:

“During the last 45 years I have watched many livestock men” – (and by the way this was written, not by a livestock producer, but by one of the managers of one of our packing plants in western Canada) – “crumple up and pass out of the picture. They successfully fought the winter storms, and the droughts, but they could not fight the lack of market and security. I am not unmindful of the present major problems facing our federal ministers, and I have a profound respect for the sincerity and good faith of these men who have before them, at all times, the tragic picture of a sorely stricken Britain.

March 11, 1948

Taking a long range view, and looking to the future of this country, I ask you in all seriousness, must we have a war every twenty years to save agriculture in western Canada? Without a prosperous livestock industry this country cannot survive, and without an outlet for her surplus production, coupled with a stable and reasonable price, agriculture cannot survive on the prairies. The livestock men of Canada are making a monetary contribution to the world's welfare to an extent unequalled in Canada's history, and they are doing it at a heavy financial sacrifice. What will be the reward? Will this find contribution gradually be forgotten, and will their efforts sink into permanent oblivion, or will a grateful government say that you men are entitled to a guarantee of a reasonable floor price for your production in the years to come? If no such assurances are forthcoming, the present structure which you have so laboriously built will crack and crumble as it has in the past."

Mr. Speaker, our policy in getting into outlets has been one of encouragement to the livestock men of this province in general. In 1945 we cancelled some leases, and we are coming out with a much better policy – longer leases and more permanency than there ever was before. The cattlemen, I believe, should know where we stand, and this government assume a little responsibility, as well as the Ottawa authorities, in connection with this.

During this time, we have inaugurated a number of Calf Clubs in this province. We have continued giving assistance to them, as was done when the Liberal Government was in – we have continued with that assistance. Here is a little article concerning Calf Clubs, taken from an Australian farm paper called "The Land":

"Show me the boy or girl who has a calf, a sheep, a pen of poultry or a pig to exhibit at a show, and I will show you one who is far too busy ever to be found facing a Judge in the Juvenile Court."

We are trying to get our boys and girls interested in agriculture, and there is no better way of doing it than by encouraging the livestock industry and the Calf Clubs in this province.

Now, I would be remiss if I did not make some comment on our Horse Packing Plant at Swift Current. This plant, first of all, was started up with a view to getting rid of a surplus of horses in this province, both ranchers and stock owners were more or less concerned as to the solution, to get rid of that surplus of 'no-account' horses. At that time we had approximately 850,000 horses on our prairies in Saskatchewan. Associations were busy trying to find a market – they called a meeting of ranchers at Val Marie, under the chairmanship of George Newton, who was the first man to get the idea that we should start a horse

processing plant somewhere and get rid of those surplus horses. I am sorry to say he died a couple of years ago, but before he died he rendered a great service to the horse industry of this country. Well, this meeting was called, and shares were sold, but there was only a limited amount, and we had no capital. So the Horse Breeders, at their Annual Meeting in January, 1945, appointed two men to go to Ottawa and contact the Hon. J. G. Gardiner with a view to getting some assistance for the horse packing plant or whatever we might do.

At that time there was not much market for horses. We could not afford to ship them over, and it was generally felt that some kind of a processing plant should be started. The answer given to the two delegates from the Horse Breeders' Association, at Ottawa, was, "I wouldn't touch it at all. I wash my hands completely clear." The delegates came back, held another meeting in Swift Current, and it was decided to send a delegation to Regina to see if we could not get a little help, in some way, to get this plant started. This Government at once said, "If you sell shares to the extent of \$1.00, we will advance you credit for \$2.00 more and that will give you \$3.00." We immediately went out and sold a lot of shares, enough so that this Government guaranteed an advance for this Horse Co-operative Marketing Association of \$150,000, and I am glad to tell you that this commitment has been entirely met, and to-day the Horse Co-operative Plant in Swift Current does not owe this Government one dollar.

That was only the start. We had to have more money, and at that time Belgium became interested in our affairs. They sent a delegation over called the Belgian Economic Commission, and they said, "We will advance you \$150,000 credit out of the funds that are coming from the C.C.C. or UNRA" – I am not sure which – but at any rate we got a guarantee that we would get \$150,000 from them, and that gave us \$300,000. In fact, we had a little more, because people came and loaned us some more money, and this Government, for every dollar we got that way, guaranteed us two dollars more. The outcome was that we bought Plant at Edmonton for about \$40,000 and started to repair it. At that time we did not have the Plant in Swift Current.

The Belgian people got a little panicky. They came over here and wanted to see what was going on after they had guaranteed us \$150,000; so we took them to Alberta. They said, "Well, that is all right, your Plant is in operation here, but what about shipping us this meat?" We had to have the Plant inspected, to pass Government inspection, as far as human consumption of meat was concerned; we went to the Social Credit government in Alberta and said, "Will you guarantee this Belgian Economic Commission that we will supply \$150,000 worth of meat to them in return for this money they have given us?" They said, "Absolutely not! We are washing our hands of that!"

Well, we had to come back again to the Saskatchewan Government, and what did they do? They immediately said, "Yes, we'll give you a guarantee for \$150,000," and we got the money right away, and started our Plant.

March 11, 1948

Now, I would just like to give you a little report on what happened in that connection. At the present time, the Horse Co-operative Marketing Association continues to record marked progress in attaining its objective. You will remember the condition that existed a few years ago, at the inception of our organization, when the unwanted horse was only bringing one-half cent a pound.

The Directors of this organization hoped that we would be able to pay three cents a pound for these horses, and this hope has now become a reality. Up to the end of 1947, it had removed over 110,000 horses from pasturelands in western Canada, thus making available feed reserves. Horses handled by the Association for the last three months of 1945, when operations commenced, and for the whole of 1946, have brought a net return to horse owners, of interim and final payments, amount to \$2.85 per hundredweight, which is very close to the hoped-for price of three cents; while horses delivered in 1947 have exceeded it by almost three-quarters of a cent, and they were bringing the man who delivered them that year \$3.70 per hundredweight, with initial and further payments afterwards. Initial payments for 1948 are the highest yet recorded – two and three-quarter cents for top-grade horses, with freight paid.

Since the management started operations, to the end of 1947, \$2,500,000 has been paid to the horse owners of this province, and an additional \$275,000 has been paid in freight. There still remains \$1,500,000 which has been allotted to members, but has not yet been distributed in the form of interim and final payments. The payments will be made as soon as our financial position permits, and already payments of \$100,000 have been made covering all horses shipped to the end of May, 1946.

As an indication of the growth of this Company, the production sales have amounted to \$1,577,000, and the wheat shipped was pickled meat, canned meat and frozen hind quarters, giving employment to 400 men and women, and having paid \$1,170,000 out in wages. As previously stated, the Association has paid \$2,590,861; for the horses; members' equity amounts to \$1,697,240, and we have a net working capital at the present time of \$700,000 in the bank.

We have been forced, of late, to get out a Dominion Charter for this Plant, which is costing us some money; but in order to do business in the three provinces we had to take a Dominion Charter. At present the Plant is not shut down, but we are more or less restricting our operations, and are killing 100 horses a day, and canning another million pounds of meat.

At the present time, Belgium wants our products, as it is the best and cheapest food in the world, and the frozen meat shipments from here are thawed out and sold at a high price, as fresh meat. At present we have 3,000,000 tins on hand, not sold; but we are hoping that, with

the Marshall Plan going over, we will get rid of this surplus in a very short time. We have already shipped a considerable amount of frozen meat, and it is being well received in Belgium. The only difficulty we are experiencing with this, is in obtaining credit from other countries. In Europe we have, to-day, 25,000,000 kiddies, who are in concentration camps – orphaned children, most of whom are in the British Occupied Zone of Germany, but they are also scattered all over those countries. They have to have one good, substantial meal each day, and horse meat contains more food calories than the cheapest of any other product in the world. At the present time Belgium is the only country in the position to deal with us, and owing to the large purchases they made, last year, of cattle in Ireland, meat from the Argentine, and our products, they had to put a ban on the shipments, because all cold storage space in Belgium was filled to the roof, and the same way in England; and they had orders to get their meat back out of England, and have no space for it in Belgium.

Also, we have keen competition from the United States in connection with this market, and the Quaker Oats people are the largest processers of horse meat in the world. Belgium had to put a ban on imports of meat on account of the amount they had on hand, but we hope that this ban will shortly be removed. There you have a case of lots of meat, lots of money, people starting – all on account of the exchange of credit. England has no horses left for slaughter; they have slaughtered 60,000 horses around London alone, and they are badly depleted. Farmers over there have lots of money; labourers have money in the bank; but they cannot eat money, and they cannot get the United States' dollars. At the present time, the only people there who can get meat are the ones who have the money to buy it, and they are now eating a lot of whale meat.

I should not conclude my remarks without mentioning some of the accomplishments of this Government. Since we took over the reins of office, we have increased the services, with no particular increase in taxes – I mean land taxes. Last fall, I went to the trouble of going to several municipalities, and picking out different farms of an average size, to see how the taxes compared in 1929, with the taxes in 1947; I found in many instances that the taxes in 1947 were lower on this land than they were in 1929. We have built more miles of highway than did the last administration during their entire term of office, and our social services in connection with Old Age pensions, Widows' Allowances, Children's Allowances; Hospitalization of all Old Age pensioners and the Blind, Education, free Cancer Clinic treatment, surgical, diagnostic and X-rays, free medical treatment for the mentally ill, transportation, seed grain reductions, and all these other things have been extended.

I would just like to mention, for a moment, the difference in our policy in connection with seed grain as compared with years gone by. As you know, down in my country, in 1917, they had to supply seed grain. This was supplied by the Dominion Government because there were not many

March 11, 1948

people who, at that time, had the patent for their homestead, and this seed was supplied at a good big price, and that seed is still on the title of that land, from 1917. If you have occasion, to-day, to go and ask to have this Seed Grain Lien removed from your land, you get a bill back and it just amounts to three times as much as the original debt amounted to, and in no case that I know of have they done better than cut the interest in two.

For example: one man had \$125 of a seed grain lien on when he homesteaded. He tried to get the title last year, and it amounted to \$350. After a lot of dickering back and forth through his Bank, he finally succeeded in having the Dominion Government release the title for \$250.00

Our automobile insurance and fire insurance has been a decided success, and our Veterans' Land policy is much better, compared with what the veterans got before. I do not think any veteran need worry very much if he hasn't a few little things in his contract which my hon. friends to my left have been emphasizing. I do not think the Liberal Party will get very far with their bogey-man of insecurity that they are parading in this country. People have got over the scare that they got a few years ago, that we were going to take their land away and socialize it. The Premier has given this House the assurance that there is going to be no socialization of land; and if I thought there was, I would not be standing over here. I am sure that everyone will agree with me that, when the Premier makes a promise, that promise stays – because he has fulfilled the promises that were made in 1944 to the fullest extent, where human possible.

Now, I have heard a lot of titles passed around this House. I have heard the hon. member over here calling the Meadow Lake member the 'Pablum Boy' and I have heard the 'Fertilizer Kid', and a lot of other titles. We have also seen a display of the two old parties uniting together in perfect wedlock. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has joined in with the hon. member for the Mediterranean and they have been most sincere in their courtship this winter. It reminds me of a story I heard about a John Deere collector, who went out into the country to collect an old debt on a tractor. One of the things that he was always mindful of was that he must not go away, leaving his debtor in a bad mood; so this day, when he drove in to the yard, the lady of the house came out, and they shook hands, and he says, "That is a wonderful pair of pups you are raising, lady. What breed are they?" She says, "Well, that one is a Liberal pup, and this one is a Tory pup, but there isn't a bit of difference – they both suck eggs."

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

Mr. C. D. Cuming (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker: In rising to say a few words on this debate, I wish to join with other speakers who have preceded me, in congratulating the Hon. Provincial Treasurer for the fine budget presented and the very able manner in which he did so.

The Opposition, of course, have done everything in their power to discredit this budget, which, of course, is their privilege and duty in this House; but it has been very noticeable, all the way through the debate, that in their criticism of the increased cost, they are thinking all the while in terms of the 'thirties. It seems they had such an experience in those days, they just cannot get it out of their heads. I want them to know that we are living, to-day, not in the 'thirties, under a Liberal administration, but in 1948 under a C.C.F. Government.

Many members, in speaking on this debate, have made specific mention of their own home constituencies, and much has been said with regard to the northwestern part of the province. The hon. members for Battleford, and Meadow Lake, would have us believe that it is a very fine part of the province. Now, I do not doubt that such is the case; furthermore, I think it is a very good thing that we should discuss some of the local conditions in our constituencies, as effected by this fine government program. I find it of interest to listen to some of the stories or explanations of the conditions in other parts of the province. I think for a few minutes I will do likewise, and endeavour to give you a picture of how my constituency and my particular part of the province, the extreme southeast, is affected by the government program that has been put into effect.

We have an area in the southeast part of the province that is, of course, mainly agricultural. We have open plains areas, principally grain growing, from Weyburn east to the extreme part of the east end of my constituency of Souris-Estevan where we have park-belt country and a livestock country. We have the Souris River flowing down through that territory, with about 10,000 acres of very fertile soil, capable of being irrigated whenever we can get some action from the P.F.R.A.

In addition to this agricultural territory, we have, of course, the great deposits of lignite coal and the clay deposits. In brief, I would suggest that perhaps the result of the policies applied to industry have put the people of that particular part of the province in, perhaps, the most prosperous circumstances that they have ever been. In the last year, we have taken out about 1,500,000 tons of coal valued at about \$2,750,000. The much-discussed government Brick Plant has produced \$128,500 worth of clay products in the nine months ending December 31. We have there, as you are all aware, great potential power possibilities. With the present plan under construction completed, there will be a power

March 11, 1948

unit there capable of generating 10,000 kilowatts. This, as you know, will be used to supply power to all the southern and eastern portions of the province.

I wish to speak for a few moments, particularly of the development of the government clay industry at Estevan. I think this experiment has demonstrated that government ownership and control and operation in the interests of the people, can succeed, and has succeeded. As I say, we have had developments in that part of the province just when it suited private enterprise, in the past – when it suited their purpose to earn profits; because it was not sufficiently profitable to operate the Clay Plant, it lay idle until this Government decided to purchase it and put it into operation. Of course, stories have circulated as to the failure it has been. I have heard it said that there was not much clay there – and they can only tell that to those who have not been there; I have heard the story of how poor the products were, and so on; but I think the record speaks for itself at the present time.

During the last period of operation, we have had 80 to 90 men employed in that area on that particular operation. That has meant a payroll of a total of \$87,600 in wages and salaries. There has been a profit, in addition to providing employment for these people, during the last period, of \$14,000. My idea of the thing is that even had there been no profit, the project was a worthy one. It gave employment to 80 or 90 men, and the resulting payroll, in a town the size of Estevan, has really meant something to that town. As a matter of fact, when we look up recent statistics, we see where the town of Estevan has grown, since 1941, more than any other town in the province with the exception of Nipawin; and I would suggest that industry such as this is responsible for the growth of the town of Estevan. Besides that, the supplying of the product has been a great factor. We have had numerous brick buildings erected within the last two years, replacing the old frame buildings. On one side of one block in one street alone, eight brick buildings have been erected in the town of Estevan; so I think that record speaks well for itself. Right here, I want to commend the workers and the management of that Plant for their success. These people realize that, if they are to have steady employment a decent standard of living, they must be prepared to co-operate with the management in making it a success; and that has been made possible under government ownership, which was not the case previously, under private ownership.

I have a copy of a recent agreement signed between the Union and the management of that Plant, in which you might be interested, and from which I would just like to read a short paragraph:

“Recognizing the community of interest existing between Management and Employees in the efficient and harmonious operation of the Plant, and recognizing that this can best be achieved through co-operative effort, the Company and the Union agree to establish and operate a Joint Production Committee, to be known as the Labour-Management Production Committee.”

I think, Mr. Speaker, for that reason alone, within the last twelve months, this little industry has proved successful.

That principle could be greatly extended in that particular area of the province. I am thinking, in particular, of the processing of our coal. You see, we take out this lignite coal, which is very low in B.T.U.'s, and as such, cannot be shipped any great length to compete with the Alberta coal; but by processing the coal into briquettes we have a product that we can ship along distances and put on a competitive market. We have a briquette plant, of course, in the coal fields, operated by private enterprise. Private enterprise, as usual, has gone just as far as is necessary for it to make profits, and has let it go at that. The demand for briquettes greatly exceeds supply; by keeping the supply short, the price can be kept up on the product, thereby earning greater profits, and that is the policy of private enterprise. I think it is the general feeling, in that part of the province, that the rank and file of the people would like to see the briquette plant in the coal fields operated similarly to what is being done with the Clay Plant at Estevan; and, by the way, this is the briquette plant that was once the property of the Government of Saskatchewan, and was turned over to private enterprise for one dollar. I think it should again be back in the hands of the Government.

I would like to say a few words about the most important industry that we have in our corner of the province – about the working class people, whether they are working on the farms or in the mines or in any of the industries. In reviewing a speech made at Oxbow last November 14, reported in the Estevan 'Mercury' of November 20, I noticed these statements made by Mr. E. M. Culliton, who was addressing the Liberal Nominating Convention at that time:

“Labour can look forward to continued advancement in their rights under Liberal governments, rights which will be completely and utterly destroyed in a Socialist state.”

I would like to assure Mr. Culliton that he might be able to get away with making statements of that kind at the distance of Oxbow, but if he made those statements in the coal fields, they would certainly be challenged. I would ask him to consult with any of the leaders of the Labour Movement in that area, and see what answer he would get regarding that matter. If he is not prepared to do that, I would ask him to just watch the results at the next election.

Furthermore, I have noticed statements made from time to time by the hon. Leader of the Opposition regarding the situation in the coal fields concerning labour, commending previous administrations for their efforts in settling strike conditions. He mentioned, in one of his speeches that the strikes were handled successfully in 1939. I would just submit, Mr. Speaker, that those strikes were handled successfully – for the operators – but not for labour. These people have worked along with farmers in an effort to alleviate the conditions under which they have to

March 11, 1948

live, and by so doing have been instrumental in forming the government that is in power at the present time. They prefer encouragement, and security of protective labour legislation, to Mounted Police persuasion to accept the dictates of the operators, which was the case previously.

I just want to briefly give you something of the history of the Labour Movement in that particular coal field. I think it is something that everyone in this province should be familiar with. It has extended over a period of forty years, with these people struggling for security against the oppression of operators and governments unsympathetic to their cause. There has been a series of unsuccessful attempts to secure their rights, and to secure collective bargaining. On numerous occasions they have run into difficulties – operators have been unwilling to sit down and co-operate with them in setting up wage scales and better working conditions. As a result of men taking a stand, many have lost their jobs; on one occasion, union leaders were taken over the Line by thugs and threatened; on another occasion three men were shot down by the Mounted Police in the town of Estevan. That was in the strike of 1931. A lot could be said about the events which led up to these moves, but time does not permit. However, sheer union strength and war urgency were the mediums by which an unwilling government was willing to sit down around a table with the employees and the employers, as stated by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. These people did not sit down around a table until this Union, through forty years' struggle, had grown to such proportions that they were forced to do so, to appease these people. This is Mr. Culliton's "continued advancement in their rights under Liberal administration."

To-day, conditions are different. These people have been encouraged, because of the labour legislation brought down by this government, and are enjoying the highest standard of living in the history of the coal fields. They have their forty-hour week; they have their union established, and the union bargains for them. As a result of that bargaining, they have been able to increase wages from the one-time 17½ cents an hour to 94 cents an hour at the present time for underground workers. They have the benefit of holidays with pay, an improved Compensation Act, and all the other protection features given under this administration. Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, these people appreciate what has been done, and the most recent news that I have from that part is that already three or four unions are getting together to form a political action committee.

I have considerable concern for the plight that some of our Returned Men have found themselves in upon reaching home; and I want to commend the Ministers of Reconstruction for the very fine work that has been done, affecting my particular constituency, in an effort to aid these returned men. We all know how they went overseas and fought to protect what democracy we had here, in the hope that we could extend that democracy, and how they came back, only to find that there was not sufficient land for them when they wanted to settle on the land; business opportunities had been snapped up; jobs were taken up; and, perhaps worst of all, no houses for them.

I think that the provincial government Land Settlement scheme, the Veteran Land Settlement scheme, has been responsible for placing veterans on the land, who never would have had that opportunity if it had not existed. With regard to housing, it was only when our Department of Reconstruction was able to purchase the Airforce equipment and the buildings of No. 38 Training School at Estevan, that we were able to at that situation. To-day, we have 44 of these veterans and their families, housed at Estevan, in the housing that has been established there.

In addition to that, a very fine 50-bed hospital (which was not in use until our Department was able to secure it) is to-day being used by the St. Joseph's Hospital Association at Estevan. Even prior to our getting it, this hospital had been stripped of all its equipment, equipment that might have been, and should have been, left right there for the use of the local people; and that equipment all had to be replaced when we took it over. So, all in all, I want to commend the Government for the opportunities that they have provided for Returned Men – I think that has been a very fine act indeed.

Yes, we are told of regimentation; we are told about the government going into business, and all that sort of thing; but I have not seen any of that in my part of the province, nor have I heard of it elsewhere. It certainly does not exist in the Souris-Estevan area. True, the government has taken over the Brick Plant, and started up an industry that private enterprise did not see fit to operate; but in the town of Estevan, business enterprise has increased by leaps and bounds. We know that by my statements previously made with regard to the increase in population in the town of Estevan. So, as far as regimentation is concerned, or interference with business is concerned, it certainly does not exist.

Then we hear about all these terrible highways we have to travel on, as a result of this Government's activities; but when I leave Estevan to come in to Regina, I travel over 54 miles of blacktop highway, and about 60 miles of newly graded and gravelled roads, to get to Regina. When I do down to the Manitoba border, I travel over 25 miles of brand new grade. North from Estevan, there is 40 miles of new gravel. If I travel north or south from Weyburn I see new gravel. I do not know what conditions are elsewhere in the province, but if the hon. Leader of the Opposition would come down to the southeastern part of the province he would see that the highways are not so terrible. I think, Mr. Speaker, he is thinking again in terms of Liberal roads, and we still have some Liberal roads left. He has probably been travelling on all these Liberal roads! Given time, however, we will turn them into C.C.F. roads.

Here, I would like to pay tribute to the people who work on the roads. I have received wonderful co-operation from the District Engineer and the men employed by him. He has had an absolutely free hand in my

March 11, 1948

corner of the constituency, to employ whoever could get the work done, and that policy has produced results. I was surprised, last Spring, when the snow melted from the roads, to see how well they drained, due to the policies that are being practiced; and with a proper crown being left on the road, that the highways dried up without any particular deterioration last Spring.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, as time goes on, the electors are coming to appreciate this program more and more. I would like to refer to various phases of the program, but time does not permit; but I do want to mention the hospital scheme, which I believe is going over in a very big way, and I also want to mention the psychiatric training course that is being supplied to the attendants of the Saskatchewan hospitals. A friend of mine put it this way. He said, "If we are physically ill, or if any of our friends is ill, we would think it terrible if we had to depend upon someone to nurse them who had no training whatsoever, but that is what we have been expecting of those who nurse our mentally ill. We have been asking people who have not been trained, to take care of them."

That reminds me of a word of commendation of the work being done with regard to the Mental Hospitals, that should be noted. I found this in "The People's Weekly" of February 7, 1948, in a statement made by Mr. D. M. Lebourdais:

"Perhaps the greatest overcrowding in any Canadian Mental Hospital existed in the Weyburn Mental Hospital in Saskatchewan up to one year ago, the culmination of twenty years of neglect. At that time the Hospital contained 600 children who should never have been there at all, and against whose presence social workers and others had been complaining for years. The Douglas Government, however, has taken hold of the situation in a determined manner. Its first step was to make Mental Hospitals free to all patients; then the children were evacuated from Weyburn to a place especially prepared for them, and a new Hospital is planned for Saskatoon."

Now, that is a comment from someone outside the province, from a man who has made a special study of our Mental Institutions, and I think we should be very happy about such comment as that.

As I say, I believe the people are appreciating our program more as times goes on, and that, as we institute our social welfare measures, our labour legislation, our educational program, industrial development and all the rest of our program, we are building a solid structure, just as if we were building a structure of Estevan bricks. Right here I am reminded of a statement made by a friend of mine who went to the Coast, last fall, He was rather discouraged with conditions in British Columbia, after having left this C.C.F. province, and was wishing himself back. Here

is one of his statements. He said, "Were we there now, we would be listening to Jack Sturdy and Dan Daniels holding forth on the Housing Program, etc. Make 'em out of brick, boys! Then the Liberal boys can't huff and puff and blow them down."

In closing, I would submit that we are doing just that. Each phase of our program is building a structure that – no matter how the Liberals or the Conservatives or the Social Creditors, or what have you, huff or puff – will never be blown down. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the Budget.

Mr. A. P. Swallow (Yorkton): — I notice there are not many of the Opposition in the House this afternoon, so possibly I should not say much regarding them. We know that it is the duty of the Opposition to criticize the government's power; we notice that this Opposition does that. The thing that struck the younger members of this House the most was the lack of anything constructive. While it is their duty to criticize, I think it is also their duty to give us an alternative to what the government is doing. We fail to see that in the five Sessions during which I have sat here.

When the C.C.F. were the official Opposition in this House, we know they criticized, all right; but we do know that all through the Session they kept bringing in, by Resolution and other means, the C.C.F. policy, and tried to get the government of that day to adopt the C.C.F. policy. If they had done so, possibly they would have been in power to-day.

The same thing is going on at Ottawa. The C.C.F. group there are bringing before the House of Commons, all the time, what they think is the policy for Canadians. We are told – I think it was two years ago, at the convention in Saskatoon, when a new Leader was elected – that they had adopted a new policy; but as far as this House is concerned, we have not heard anything of it. I think it is their duty, as Opposition, to bring that policy to this House and try to get this government to adopt it, if they sincerely believe it is in the best interests of Saskatchewan. That is one thing about the C.C.F. – they have never been ashamed of their policy!

It is hard for us here to understand the change in the attitude of the hon. member for the Mediterranean Area. I think we all remember when he came into this House, he indicated that he could support the C.C.F. in what they were doing. We know he voted with us; but there has been a great change in the hon. member since. He indicated at that time that the C.C.F. policy was much in line with the program which he outlined to the troops at the time of the election; and in all probability that is the reason he was elected. Now, the needs of the Veterans and the policy of the C.C.F., have not changed, but we do know that the attitude of the hon. member has changed.

March 11, 1948

He forgets that there are quite a number of veterans in this House, and I believe they are just as interested in the welfare of the veterans as he is. I believe that every member of this House is very much interested in the welfare of the veterans. When we support the C.C.F. policy we are bringing in legislation that is good for the veterans and all of the people; and when the hon. member votes against the policy, in this House, as he has done – if he votes against this budget, he is voting against bringing hospitalization to the veterans; he is voting against bringing better educational facilities to the children of the veteran; he is voting against automobile insurance, which also protects the veteran. I think we want to remember that one of the first beneficiaries under The Automobile Insurance Act was a veteran, who received \$1,000. I believe, for the loss of an eye, and who received hospitalization besides. This protects the veteran as much as it does any other citizen. He would also be voting against the work of the Department of Reconstruction, which is considered by all fair-minded people to have done more for the veterans under that Department, than has any province in Canada.

Now, I do not know what kind of veteran the hon. member is representing. The veterans I have met do not want to be considered as a privileged class. I think they want a square deal; but they want also their families to enjoy the same privileges that they well enjoy. I think that is what they fought for. I believe, they fought against special privilege classes, and I believe that, in doing what we are, we are doing it for the veterans as well as all people of the province.

We hear a lot about propaganda. All literature that the government sends out is considered propaganda; but it seems to me that if the Press were doing their duty, we would not have to spend so much money in the Bureau of Publications, to tell the people what this Government is doing, or any other government. I think it is their duty to inform the people of this province what a government is doing, regardless of what government it is. We spend a lot of money on newspapers, each year, but we do not get this information. This Government believes that the people should know their program. They should know what services they can expect. That is why the “Saskatchewan News”, which has been condemned by the Opposition, is telling the people what it is doing. It has explained the Health Units; has produced maps to show how the province will be divided into Health Units. It has explained the expansion of the Power Commission; the people to-day know where they can expect to get the power – the south, from Estevan; the northwest, from the natural gases, they hope; they have a map before them and know now it has been expanded. The hospitalization plan has been explained to them thoroughly – it was a new thing and had to be explained. This was not done through the Press, Mr. Speaker, it had to be done through these Government agencies. The Larger School Unit has been

explained. To give you an illustration: I read in our paper, or rather, in the nearest paper that we have, where we have a local column, where a young woman of our district had been speaking to The Homemakers, and she had given a talk on the Health Regions. The next month I noticed she had given a talk on the Larger School Unit, and I wondered where she was getting this information, and upon asking her, was advised that she was receiving 'The Saskatchewan News'. That is the way the program of this Government is being spread through the country. We know that the former Liberal Government passed a Union Hospital Act, but we did not know much about it; they passed a Larger School Unit Act, but they did not tell us much about that.

I can remember how, a few years ago that 'The Homemakers' went through the country, speaking on the Larger School Units. They did not hear about it from the Government at all. I think that is one reason, Mr. Speaker, why, when this government was elected, we had only 26 union hospitals in this province. To-day we have 68 union hospitals. It is because the people have been told what they can expect from the government, and what assistance they can expect, that they have gone ahead in this connection. I am going to give you some definite results from this information that has gone out to the people. At Theodore, where I live, we have never had a hospital. We are between Yorkton and Foam Lake, a distance of 80 miles, and some of the people had to drive 50 miles to the nearest hospital.

Through the information given to the people of that area, they learned that the Government would assist them; they assisted themselves; they got busy and decided to organize a union hospital. The responsibility or the initiative was not taken from the local people. They were told what assistance they could expect from the government if they did their part. They decided on the area themselves, the area that would be logically drawn to that centre. They elected a Board. Then, when the area was decided on, and a map sent to the Government, the Local Government Board advised them what they thought they could afford to raise themselves, by debenture and other means. We are not a wealthy part of the province and we could not build a hospital alone. The Government, through the Planning Commission, told this area what grant they would allow; and after they got all this information they went out to the people, through meetings, and told them how much it would increase their taxes and what they would have to pay.

Now, we had opposition to this – very little – but nevertheless we had opposition very much like that which we have in this House. We had reasons. I think we have the same attitude in this House from our Opposition, as demonstrated in the remark the other day from a member of the Opposition, that he hoped this government would "have their noses rubbed in relief again." That shows the attitude of the Opposition!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! May I correct the hon. member. That was not the statement.

Mr. Swallow: — Then I withdraw the statement.

Premier Douglas: — It was so reported in the Press.

March 11, 1948

Mr. Swallow: — Well, the record will show. This Opposition did not have much effect — as it does not have much effect on the people of Saskatchewan from this House. When the final vote was taken, 85 per cent of those who voted, voted in favour of the hospital. Great credit is due to those local people. The ratepayers were willing to pay their share to the Board who worked hard; great credit is due to all the organizations who supported it by raising funds to furnish the wards; and the Planning Commission supplied us with free plans and gave every encouragement. Material was scarce, but we received two carloads of timber from the Timber Board, a carload of brick from the Estevan Brick Plant — these things made it possible to build that Hospital. We are told this Government is centralizing the control in Regina. That is not true. The Board of the Union Hospital, in my part, has complete control and complete ownership of that Hospital. I want to give credit to the people who organized that Hospital, but that could not have been done if it had not been for the co-operation between the people and the Government. I think it is a true example of co-operation. Today, we have a good doctor — we could not get a doctor until we had a hospital; and you will be interested to know, Mr. Speaker, that that Hospital is serving a part of your constituency. We have a good staff, and the Hospital today is practically full.

In addition to all the services indicated in the Budget, there is an item in that Budget for \$300,000, which will help other districts, as we were helped, to build a hospital — to help them in 1948. I think that is the true principle of Socialism that we hear condemned so much — to help those who cannot procure those services themselves.

I have pleasure in supporting the Budget.

Hon. C. M. Fines: — Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, I am ready to go ahead, only I received an explanatory note from the Whip giving the order of the speakers — first, Mr. Cuming, then Mr. Swallow, then myself. Has that gentleman (Mr. Cuming) spoken?

Hon. C. M. Fines: — Yes, he has.

Mr. G. H. Danielson (Arm River): — In rising to take part in this debate, which I hope is nearing its end, I, in common with the other members of this House, wish to associate myself in extending to the Provincial Treasurer congratulations. He did an excellent job in presenting his Budget, and he is adapt at quoting figures and placing them in the right position in order to convey a very, very favourable picture. However, I am unable to congratulate him on the amount of money involved, and where he is going to get it, and I am certainly not in a position to congratulate the individual taxpayers of Saskatchewan, who will have to pay the amount required.

Before I continue with some of the things that I wish to say, I want to touch on a few things that have been said in this debate. I understood that on this debate no member could refer to anything that had been said before in this House. If that is the rule, it certainly has not been lived up to during the past few weeks, and if I should transgress that rule, Mr. Speaker, I claim the same indulgence from you that the other members of this House have received. I have no objection to the matter at all – I only want to point out that I think I should have the same liberty.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs made the statement, when he spoke in this House, in regard to certain road grants that had been given in my constituency during a number of years. I am not going to go into that particular part of it, because it is incorrect, but I just want to point out to him that, when he quoted me as having said that I had eleven municipalities in my constituency, that statement is far from being true.

As a matter of fact, there is one municipality quoted as being in my district, that has only half a section of that municipality in my district, and that is in a community pasture. Another municipality that is quoted as being in my district has just about two townships in my constituency; another municipality, only two-thirds of it is in my district; another, one-half. There are two municipalities that are entirely in my district; there is another, as I have mentioned, with only two townships in my district; there is another with two-thirds of the municipality in my district; and still another with two-thirds of the municipality in my district; and another with only one-third. In all, as far as I can estimate it, on the basis of nine townships to a municipality, I have about seven and three-quarter municipalities in my constituency.

Now, I do not know what the system of road grant is at the present time, because my constituency has hardly got anything, except last summer, when they were handed out on a basis which was anything but fair to the individual municipality; but before, when half of one municipality was in my constituency, half of the road grant for that municipality was allotted to me, and the other went to the other constituency, where a different representative was concerned. That was the system. Whether it is followed now, I am not going to say; but I just want to prove that the statement made by the hon. Ministers is absolutely incorrect, and there is not even a half-truth in it.

The Minister of Highways, of course, is telling the old, old story he started three years after he came into office – that the roads were all worn out when he came into office. Well, if they were, then he certainly has not done anything to improve them so far, in my part of the province. I can assure you that never in the history of this province have the highways in my district been as bad as they have been during the last two years, and particularly in 1947; and there is no reason why they should be that way.

There is nothing wrong with No. 11 Highway – it is a good highway, it is gravelled – it only lacks someone to maintain it; that is all. The best highway in my district during the last season was No. 19, which was

March 11, 1948

maintained by horse patrol, not by motor patrol – the best highway there was during the entire season. That goes to show there is anything but fairness, in regard to the freedom of everybody to do as they like, without any political interference. I have had some experience with these things – not personally – but people who were interested in it, and the public who are interested, have seen some of it. I remember in 1945, the District Engineer hired a certain individual who was appointed back in 1930 by Mr. Carl Stewart, the then Minister of Highways. He was retained continuously until he took sick, another man was put in his place for a short time, and then the Engineer wanted to put this man back on again. He even came down here to Regina and went to the Minister's office, and got permission to place this man, who was a firstclass man, back on the road. When the time came, he phoned him to go up to Saskatoon and get his maintainer – his road patrol. That was on a Friday. He came down on the Saturday afternoon and did a half-day's work, and on Monday morning he was fired. Why was he fired? Through political interference.

In 1944, another good man was taken off No. 2 Highway. He had the courage to come down here and go right to the Minister's Office and insist on finding out the reason he had been discharged. He was told to his face that it was because he was supposed to be a Liberal. Now, that is the political aspect of the Highways Department to-day.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — I can prove that.

Mr. Speaker: — You cannot make charges of that kind, as you know very well. You must withdraw it.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, I am just quoting what I know to be a fact, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — You cannot make charges of that character.

Mr. Danielson: — That there are power politics in the Highways Department?

Mr. Speaker: — You have made a specific charge against the Minister of Highways which I must ask you to withdraw.

Mr. Danielson: — I quoted what he told the gentleman when he insisted on knowing the reason for his dismissal.

Mr. Speaker: — You made a specific charge, and you must withdraw it.

Mr. Danielson: — All right, if that is your ruling, I withdraw, but I know that was the case.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — It is small wonder that we do not have more money spent on roads up in my part of the country than in many other constituencies; when we find that in two constituencies, in the 1947 season, there was \$811,067 spent. In the constituency where the Premier sits there was \$537,181 spent on new construction. No wonder that some of us who sit in the Opposition do not get anything, if it all goes to the man who has the power to get the money for his own particular Seat. And the records show that, absolutely. If the Minister of Highways were here, we could go back and quote the figures for 1946, and that would make it all the worse.

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — Were you opposed to hard surfacing in 1939?

Mr. Danielson: — You had better keep quiet.

Many things have been said in regard to the Power Commission. I think that is an excellent institution. It was started a long time ago by the Liberal Government. I was carried on, free from politics — that is why it met with success — it carried its own costs, it provided for extensions, took care of its capital investments, and all those things which a business organization should do — not like your Crown corporations, your tannery, your boot factory, your brick plant, and all those things that are not supposed to pay interest on the capital invested.

But what has been done in this House? Practically every one of you has tried to create the impression among the people of Saskatchewan that this government, by new construction and extension, has provided serviced for 45,087 retail subscribers in the province of Saskatchewan. Now, what are the facts? We asked the question here the other day, and we were given the figures: the total number of retail subscribers in the province of Saskatchewan is 45,087. In the companies which were taken over by the Government in the last three years, there were 22,489 retail subscribers who were getting service from these private companies — getting exactly the same service from them as they are getting from the Government now.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — For more money.

Mr. Danielson: — I'm not so sure about that. If you go out and see the taxes in the rural towns and villages in the province, you will find that they are not receiving these services any cheaper. I know this, because I pay my monthly account, and when I add the percentage now levied by the town, and when they pay five percent for collecting that tax, I question whether the charges are any less than they were before. After all, out of the 45,087 retail subscribers, 22,489 were receiving these services before the present government took over. That is all! They just took some of the public's money and purchased this corporation. I am not criticizing them for doing so — I am criticizing them

March 11, 1948

for trying to create the impression among the people of the province that this government is going on, by its own efforts, both in new construction and so on, spreading out the network, even to people who did not have it before – more services, to the extent of 22,489 subscribers – just because fifty percent of the subscribers in Saskatchewan to-day have these services exactly as they had before this government took them over. Now, that is another balloon busted. That is truth – not fiction!

The Minister of Natural Resources spoke here some time ago and made this statement as reported in the Press. I have tried to get a reproduction of his speech, but it is not available – to me, at least – and he said this:

“From 1939 until 1947 the government in power had provided \$457,000 for depreciation. Mr. Phelps said that had the Liberal Government set aside funds for depreciation from 1929 to 1939, the depreciation fund would have been built up to \$866,000 instead of being short now by about \$300,000.”

Well, let us keep the record straight again, Mr. Speaker. We are not trying to gloss over anything. If there is anything wrong, you have the record; but these sweeping statements do not go down here. They might get by out in the schoolhouse, but they are not going to go on the floor of this House, so long as I am able to talk.

The Power Commission started in 1930. The first full year of operation, 1930, they paid all the interest and established a reserve of \$600,000. Ten years after that, the total capital invested in the Power Commission was 8.3 million dollars. There was a \$440,000 depreciation reserve set up.

(continued on Page 27.)

There was a sinking fund of \$1,746,000, or a total of \$2,200,000 nearly 15 per cent on the capital investment. In December 1944, the capital invested was 9.4 million dollars – reserve depreciation was \$1,050,000; the sinking fund depreciation was \$2,270,000, making a total of \$3,320,000, or nearly 34 per cent of the capital invested. Then we come to December 31, 1947 (to bring it right up to date) and we have an investment of 21.5 million dollars and a reserve of \$5,750,000, or 27 per cent of the capital invested. In 1944, Mr. Speaker, the percentage was 34 per cent of the capital invested – that is a fact, and I want to keep the record straight. There was nothing wrong, so why all this camouflage, and all this bragging, trying to convey to the people that this Government did something they never did? They never did anything but take over the power company and carry it on like any other business concern. The ‘brains’, of the men running the Power Commission, are the same men who were with the Power Commission for many years. They are good men, my remarks are not intended to cast any reflection on them.

Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? What has the sinking fund to do with depreciation reserves?

Mr. Danielson: — For the hon. gentleman’s information, I quoted the Minister of Natural Resources – there is nothing there he can put his finger on.

We have heard on the radio, in this House, and on the public platforms, the wonderful contribution, the wonderful performance, of the Provincial Treasurer we have today. Well, I am willing to admit that he is a clever fellow – he is a good man, but he is not ‘superman’; he is not a bit better than you and I, Mr. Speaker. When you and I were on the farm and we couldn’t pay a debt we sometimes got a little reduction; but we didn’t advertise it at all – we just went home and quietly said nothing about it. This Government, on the other hand, when they are in the fortunate position of getting big write-offs, through the generosity of the Federal Government, they advertise it to the four corners of the earth, and try to make the people believe it is their work – that is what I take exception to. They try to give the impression to the people that they have paid this off; but they didn’t do any such thing, Mr. Speaker. Let us take a look at it. They said they reduced the Public Debt by \$70,000,000. On June 30, 1944, the Public Debt, including (mark the word ‘including’) contingent liabilities, was \$209,000,000. It is in the Journals of the House for 1946, page 162, if anyone wants to check it.

On December 31, 1947, Public Debt, including contingent liability, was \$146,240,000, a gross reduction from June 30, 1944, to December 31, 1947, of \$62,760,000, not \$70,000,000.

How was this effected? How was it reduced? As I said, it has been a custom with us for many years, when a man is unable to pay a debt to go to his creditor and suggest he cannot pay and propose a reduction. As a rule that is done, particularly in the bad crop districts; and that has been done to the extent of hundred of millions of dollars in this province, between individuals and corporations.

March 11, 1948

How was that reduction of \$62,760,000 in the Provincial Public Debt brought about?

Well, there were the relief debts owing to Ottawa that were covered by Treasury Bills of this province. These were cancelled, and in that case cancellation means that the Federal Government just tore up these Treasury Bills and said 'they are paid'. The amount involved in that cancellation was \$36,340,000.

Then there was the Natural Resources' Settlement, which passed through the House, a few days ago, and which had been left as an open question for the past fifteen years. There was a credit accruing there to this Government of \$8,031,000 which, added to the \$25,340,000 write-off of Treasury Bills, makes a total of \$44,371,000, automatically applied to this debt reduction. How much then is left of the total reduction of the Public Debt of \$62,760,000? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that there is \$18,389,000 left.

How was this \$18,389,000 paid, and where did the money come from? Well, let us look at the record. There is no mystery about this to anyone who follows up the Journals of the House and the Public Accounts.

The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, a group farmer organization that never bilked on its commitments, paid into this over the years 1944-45, 1945-46 and 1946-47, a total of \$2,416,000. The Saskatchewan Farm Loan Board (which is not doing business any more; they are only closing out their business), in those same years paid in, in principal (here again I am not quoting interest), \$6,625,000. The Telephone Department which, as I said when I started this talk, has always been able to take care of their commitments, take care of their capitalization, make up their sinking fund and have a fund for replacements, paid in during those years \$1,035,000. The Saskatchewan Co-operative Creameries paid in \$250,000. In addition to these, every year, payments are made to the Sinking Fund Account out of revenue. For the years in question, \$1,100,000 was paid into sinking fund. These items, Mr. Speaker, make up a total of \$11,426,000.

How much then remains to be paid out of this \$18,389,000? Just exactly \$6,963,000.

Now, in addition to these definite and specific payments the Provincial Treasurer had available for debt reduction, the Liquor Profits. His total Liquor Profits for three years, 1944-45, 1945-46 and 1946-47, amounted to \$18,480,000. Of this amount he took \$9,250,000 into revenue to balance his high expenditures, but even at that he had over \$9,000,000 left for debt reduction.

That is how the public debt was reduced by \$62,670,000, Mr. Speaker. No Provincial Treasurer or auditor could have done anything else under the circumstances, and there is not one iota of credit coming to him or to any member of this House for that reduction.

(The next following recording was inaudible, due to mechanical difficulties. Approximately two pages of text missing.)

March 11, 1948

(The next following recording was inaudible, due to mechanical difficulties. Approximately two pages of text missing.)

Mr. Speaker: — I think the hon. member must take the hon. member's word.

Mr. Danielson: — All right, Mr. Speaker, I will take that statement back.

He is reported in the daily press as saying: "those who oppose the necessary administrative changes which will bring greater educational advantages to the boys and girls, can well be classed as scoundrels." That was his statement in reply to the criticisms from this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker: — No, no! That was not replying to anyone in this House.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — On a point of privilege, unless they class themselves as those 'with a political advantage'.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — There is no question what was said, Mr. Speaker.

A day or two ago the Premier made a statement on the floor of this House — I think it was only two days ago — and he said: "We, on this side of the House, were playing 'stooge' to those 'born with a silver spoon in their mouths'." That was his statement — I wonder if that is 'smearing!' What right has he to classify me as a stooge for any imaginary 'monster' organization, or anything like that? He did it!

I went out and listened to his speech a little while ago, and they have criticized the press; and their friends in Ottawa are not a bit better. The member for Regina is quoted as having said, in Bowmanville, Ontario, that the Prime Minister was a truly dishonest man — that is Mr. Mackenzie King! Scandalous and improper! Then he linked Mr. King with Premier Drew and Duplessis and all the rest; and he said this: "Some day Mackenzie King will be judged truly dishonest in the light of broken promises." That is what the Bowmanville paper is reported to have said. From the platform he said, when describing the critics of the C.C.F., including the subsidized press, as a 'bunch of rascals, curs and scoundrels.' After all, that word 'scoundrel' comes in in many places, and quote often, Mr. Speaker. That is the Member of Parliament for the city of Regina and that is something that I do not think any member on this side of the House has ever stooped to — the low-down level of doing anything of that kind.

Last year the Minister of Education, when he got up to speak, in criticizing the Leader of the Opposition, here it what he said, according to the press: "It is no more than once could expect from a political charlatan of the ninth degree." Well now, the Minister of Education is so well versed in these applications that he does not need to look them up in the dictionary; but I would ask him — maybe he has forgotten — when he gets home from his office to look up the dictionary and look up the definition of the word 'charlatan', and then he will be proud that he applied that definition to the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker. And it is a good example for the children of the province who he is supposed to lead.

March 11, 1948

Mr. Lloyd: — On a point of privilege. Has the hon. gentleman my complete statement there, that he might like to read to the House, for the record?

Mr. Danielson: — These things are on record, Mr. Speaker.

It has been said in this House, three or four times during the Session, and on the radio, in trying to cover up their own record in this province, there is a concerted effort being made by the Government and the supporters of this Government, to attack the Liberal Government in Ottawa. For the Liberal Government I do not hold any particular grief because I do not need to; they are well able to take care of themselves.

And statements have been made with regard to the tremendous amount of money taken out of this province which goes to Ottawa. Well, Mr. Speaker, as usual they are, absolutely without reason, so tremendously exaggerated that they are not worth paying any attention to. I have here some of the things that the Federal Government takes out of Saskatchewan, and some amounts that they put back into Saskatchewan. For one thing, they say that \$30,000,000 in customs duties are taken out of this province. If you take the last year's Budget you will find the estimate for the customs duties in the whole Dominion of Canada was \$237,000,000: the population of Saskatchewan is one-fifteenth of the total population of Canada, and if you estimate the customs duties on the basis of population, you will find, by a simple exercise, that the customs duties paid by this province amount to about \$15,000,000, not \$30,000,000. I want to point out that the customs duties in the province of Saskatchewan today, do not amount, by any means, to what they did ten or fifteen years ago when we paid duty on agricultural implements. There is no duty on agricultural implements today, and for that reason the customs duties collected in the province of Saskatchewan are only about half of what they were a few years ago. That is one of the reasons. But, the figure that was given out in these statements was approximately double of what the actual figures is. And the Dominion Government has paid into Saskatchewan hundreds of millions of dollars. \$231,120,000 is paid out, each year, in family allowances; \$21,500,000 of that comes to Saskatchewan. The P.F.A.A., is bringing into Saskatchewan, in some years, as high as \$14,000,000 to \$16,000,000. The grants for education grants to the returned men and all the other things that come into Saskatchewan, bring into Saskatchewan far more money than what is taken out, so far as the Federal Government is concerned. As a matter of fact, outside of Prince Edward Island . . . yes, I am sure, I know what I am talking about . . . they are the only province in the Dominion of Canada which gets more money from the Dominion Government than what they collect, and that statement is absolutely correct.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Oh, oh!

Mr. Danielson: — If you would take a little time you might study this thing and then you wouldn't say 'oh, oh!' You ought to know what you are talking about.

Every speaker who has spoken in this Debate has told us how far wrong we are, and how ill-informed we are, and what an injustice we are doing when we mention, in this House, the very grave danger that faces Saskatchewan from the infiltration of Socialism in the province. Socialism, Mr. Speaker, is the same wherever it is, and there is only one type of Socialism in this world and that is the Marxian Socialism. As a matter of fact, I would suggest to my friends over here, who admire Mr. Marx so much, that this is the 100th anniversary of the Marx Manifesto, and it would only be fitting if something, in this Socialist province of Saskatchewan as the beach-head of Socialism in this Dominion of Canada, could be arranged in the way of commensuration or celebration, in honour of this great man, Karl Marx, who has given to the world an ideology — a Communistic ideology — which has been put into effect, where the 'iron curtain' has descended on every country in the world where it is in complete control.

All the leading authorities on Socialism, Mr. Speaker, Laski — you all know who Laski is, he has been the chairman of the British Labour Party for many years and is a very highly educated man — Cole, and Shaw and all these men say that they are all agreed that Democratic Socialism (of course that word 'democratic' is a prostitution of the word, as there is no such thing as Democratic Socialism — there cannot be) cannot be achieved under our present democratic system. They are honest about it — every one of them. They say that any pretense that that can be done is just a sham. And we have plenty of examples of this in the world today. There is a great hue and cry from the Government benches when any member on this side of the House suggests that the core of the present C.C.F. party in Saskatchewan are not 'milk and water' Socialists, but are real Socialists — the Russian type, which are the only kind in this world today.

Let us go back, Mr. Speaker, and I think I can prove it to you, that in this Socialist party in Canada, and in Saskatchewan, they have that, and they are growing by leaps and bounds. When the war commenced in 1939, there were certain actions taken by the political parties to define their attitude toward that great conflict. We know what the C.C.F., the Socialistic party in Canada did; and I am not going to go into that at all — that was a matter for them to decide, and I am not going to even criticize it: but, Mrs. Grace MacInnis, who is the wife of the M.P. for British Columbia in the Dominion House, went over to New Zealand, and in the issue of the January 11 'Standard', the New Zealand Labour movement's organization, writes an article explaining the difference in the problems that face the Socialistic party in Canada — to compare their views and come to some unified decision on what attitude they were going to take to that great conflict. She said: "Most of this group could hardly be termed 'pacifist'; some were isolationists, holding that Canada is a part of the American continent and should remain aloof from European conflicts; others opposed partaking in capitalistic wars and waiting the chance to share in the revolutionary

March 11, 1948

struggle to follow. Pacifists, isolationists and revolutionaries are on common ground in their determination to protest against Canada's entry into the war." That is not my statement, Mr. Speaker, that is the statement of Mrs. Grace MacInnis – Woodsworth's daughter – and that is a true statement.

During the years there has been built, up through the records of the Socialist party in Canada, year by year, the fact that the party is derived from another party and that they are determined to do one thing, and that is to eradicate capitalism from this province of Saskatchewan, and from Canada as a whole. There can be no dispute about that statement, Mr. Speaker. I am not criticizing, I am merely mentioning it. When they have eradicated capitalism from Canada, Mr. Speaker, what is it going to be replaced with? Why, with Socialism!

Mr. Drew said this – and we all know who Mr. Drew is – “In every capitalistic country there is a relatively small group responsible to nobody but themselves. If you get power you must be prepared to use it quickly and ruthlessly to prevent the people from ‘gumming up the works’. There is nothing more dangerous to a social democratic party than to secure the power and then not put the policies into effect.”

In another place – in the Regina Manifesto – it states: “The C.C.F. is a federation of organizations whose purpose is to establish in Canada a co-operative commonwealth in which the principles regulating production, distribution and exchange will be supplying human needs and not the making of profits.”

Mr. Cole, the mentor of Mr. Coldwell – he is the man he suggests on Page 10, of the ‘Handbook for Speakers’, that he would like to see appointed as heading the Planning Board, in the province of Saskatchewan, whenever the C.C.F. get into power. And he said this: “We cannot put limits to the pace at which we will have to proceed once we set our feet along the way, nor can we put limits on the degree of dictatorial power which under stress of emergency of socialistic government we may have to assume – it will be best, as soon as Parliament has conferred on the government the necessary emergency powers for its parliament to meet as seldom as possible, leaving the Socialists to carry on.” That is Mr. Cole! This explanation of Socialistic doctrine is used through all the Handbooks for Speakers, and every place else.

Mr. Weaver, one of the outstanding Socialists in British Columbia, in 1943, said: “We ought to remember that the constitution of the British North American Act was not made to bind the C.C.F. We are not concerned with the capitalistic constitutions and the sooner we can wreck them the better.”

In 1935, J. S. Woodsworth spoke in the city of Winnipeg and he said, “The doctrine of the C.C.F. was the doctrines of the United Front, or communist, and all that keeps us apart is the difference of tactics and the suspicion of insincerity.”

We will come closer to home, Mr. Speaker. We have in ‘The Commonwealth’, published in the city of Regina, in the November 1 issue of 1944, headed “Political Science Corner”, and here we have the president of the C.C.F. in the province of Saskatchewan, Dr. Carlyle King said: “When the Bolshevik group seized power in Russia in 1917, that he suggested calling the party Communists and his suggestion was adopted. This difficult history points to the chief difference between the Communist party and the Social-Democrat party of Europe and America. It is a matter of the best methods to be used in achieving Socialism – the objective of the Communist is the same as the socialist.” That was Carlyle King, the professor at the University of Saskatchewan, and today the president of the organization that produced this socialistic government in the Province of Saskatchewan!

Mr. Speaker, one of the fundamental paragraphs in the Regina Manifesto says that the C.C.F. Government (this is Mr. Coldwell) ‘will not rest until it has eradicated capitalism, and established a complete program of socialistic planning.’ Again, Mr. Speaker, I ask, what have you got when you have done that? Socialism! The purest, ‘Stalin’ or ‘Marxian’ – there is only one, and that is what they aim to establish in the province of Saskatchewan and the Dominion of Canada.

I have another one here. All these stories are not going to be questioned by my friends on the other side of the House. Mr. Speaker, I think some of the members, and probably some of the ministers, were in Ottawa to meet Mr. Strachy when he came over in June, 1946. The question arose and a correspondent quoted a passage from a book written by Mr. Strachy around 1932 under the title “The Common Struggle for Power”, which predicted the fall of capitalism and the rise of Communism all over the world. The passage reads: “Communist theory and Communist methods are the only ones which apply to the social conditions of nine-tenths of the inhabited globe. If this is the case, we may be assured that in a very short time this will apply to all countries such as us in Great Britain.” People asked if he were of the same opinion today, and he said he had, in part, lost faith in the Russian Communist Party. Then they asked him whether he thought the Russian government was a real Communistic government: (I want the House to get these words because I think they are significant) Mr. Strachy insisted on answering, but some of his advisors would have interrupted him, and he said: “The Russian government is not a Communistic government – I have no doubt that the Russians would say that themselves. It is a movement that has not progressed to Communism but is practicing Socialism.”

March 11, 1948

That was Mr. Strachy, a Minister in the British Government! And you say you are just the same as they are.

I have here a quotation by Sam Carr – I do not know whether my friends know who he is or not but he wrote this when he was the editor of a magazine called ‘National Affairs’. On page 172, September 1994 issue, he said: “Thousands of Canadians, who in the past 25 years have devoted their lives to the creation in our country of a strong Marxist party – the Labour-Progressive party – born in the midst of a great war, was established by the founders of the Socialist doctrine. All the experience of its founders, many of them participants in hundreds of battles to ‘get’ capitalistic exploitation, pointed to the fact that only the eventual Socialist transformation of Canadian economy, and the abolition of all exploitation by man, can bring about a truly great and independent Canada. Without equivocation or nebulosity the first convention written in the L.P.P. program (get this): “The aim of the political movement of the working class is the establishment of a Socialist Canada, created as a class by the capitalist system itself; the most significant product of a capitalist society . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! It has been the custom of this House, and I have followed it, to allow a great deal of reading of extracts, but I think the hon. member will admit that he is, more or less, transgressing beyond the acknowledged conduct of the House.

Mr. W. J. Patterson (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, what is the objection to the member reading an extract if he quotes his authority and the date?

Mr. Speaker: — I am not objecting to the hon. member reading extracts but to the voluminous extracts, without any speech at all.

Mr. Patterson: — Is there any rule as to the extent that extracts may be read, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: — I can’t quote the rule, but it is the accepted procedure in any House that the reading of extracts shall not be carried to extremes.

Mr. A. T. Procter (Moosomin): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would point out to you that I sat in this House when Mr. Stork read extracts for nearly two hours and it was ruled admissible.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Look what happened to him!

Mr. Procter: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, he read, learned, and left the Party.

Mr. Speaker: — As I say, I cannot quote any particular point of order but I think it would be conducive to better conduct in this House if we did confine it somewhat.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here for the last 10 days and listened to this Debate (speaking to the point of order), and I know that I have not transgressed the rule here, this afternoon, any more than have the other members. I am sure I talk a good deal more than I read. I haven't very many, but with your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I want to finish up in just a few minutes.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I seems a long time.

Mr. Danielson: — I know you don't like it, but I can't help that.

I have here something by John Strohm, who travelled through Russia for 4,000 miles. This article is copyrighted and this is what it said: "This brings us to Communism which those Soviet officials say flatly that they don't have." Yudin, one of the master-minds of political theory says it is this way: "The Soviet Union has Socialism, whose slogan is 'to each according to his ability; to each according to his work.'" In other words, you get paid for what you do, that is why an unskilled worker gets \$24 a month while a socialist gets \$700 a month plus a car and a house. We are just working this the direction of Communism," said Yudin. "Under communism the slogan will be 'each according to his ability; each according to his needs.'" And he points out: "It will require a vast stockpile of goods, enough cars, beefsteak, and refrigerators for everyone. There is only one country in the world, today, with enough goods and productive capacity to become communistic over night, and that is the United States."

Now, that shows again that there is only one Socialism; and I think the clearest example of what this comes to is the fact that, in every country where Socialism has started, when the right time comes there is a hard core of 'extreme' incorporated into the Socialist party. In every place in Europe it has been proven. In Czechoslovakia, or any of those other countries, there was no majority there, but what happened? They got into power by getting Cabinet positions and control of the police; and who supported them? It was the Socialist party, Mr. Speaker; half of them went over to them, and that has been the history in every nation in Europe where this ideology was imposed. Law, order and the courts have been replaced with the concentration camps and the firing squad. Here is a list of the nations: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, East Prussia, Poland, Albania, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria Czechoslovakia – and Finland is on the list, and many others. That is the pattern; and I say to you that the time is coming now when the people of Saskatchewan should awaken, because we have had a clear indication that there are members in this Government who are willing to take the attitude of supporting these things, which are not for the good of Canada.

We have Ministers of this Government criticizing the actions of the United States and every other nation who has set themselves to keep out and push back the wave of socialism which is overrunning the countries of the old world. The Minister of Natural Resources spoke in British Columbia, on June 6, 1945 . . .

At this point the House took recess until 8 o'clock.

AFTER RECESS

When I concluded my remarks at six o'clock I had endeavoured to show that Democracy and Socialism could not operate and work successfully together. I had also clearly established – in my mind, at least – that Socialism is the same thing whether it is in Russia, in Germany, in Great Britain, in Canada, or in the province of Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Does he seriously believe that the Socialism in Great Britain is the same as National Socialism in Germany?

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, in one sense, Mr. Speaker. In the sense that it indicates in its demands, if it is going to work successfully, dictatorship is implied and the state itself becomes the master of every individual and his business and his life. There is no question about that.

Mr. Speaker, in 1946 in the House of Commons, Sir Stafford Cripps said: “No country in the world, so far as I know, has yet succeeded in carrying through a planned economy without compulsion of labour. Our objective is to try to carry through a planned economy without compulsion of labour.”

Today – not ten years ago – 750,000 British subjects in Great Britain are subject to compulsory labour laws: and that is carried out today. Sir Stafford Cripps saw that back in 1944. They called it ‘planned economy.’ What is ‘planned economy?’ Well, that is Socialism and it has never been done without compulsion. We have it in Saskatchewan today! We have it in Northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker! I heard, during the last day or two, from a man who is very vitally interested in the little remnant of what is left of ‘free enterprise’ in Northern Saskatchewan and that is the only solution to the fishing mess up there, today, is to eliminate the only free enterpriser in Northern Saskatchewan today, and that is the Waite Fisheries – that will be the next step. That is what faces you! There is no half-way to stop Socialism, it has to go all the way, there is no question in the world.

Let us look at Saskatchewan at the present time. The people of the North who are fully socialized, and if there is anything left they will be in the near future, what are they going to do? Are they going to sit there and watch the Central part of Saskatchewan operate under a free capitalistic economy? Oh, no! they will say that you people down there helped us to get the ‘yoke’ on our necks, and you are not going to escape, we are going to see that you ‘take the medicine’ too. That is what the result will be; and you know it is going to be that way.

The Federal member for Assiniboia made a speech on October 17, 1946, and he said: "It is becoming necessary to use more and more dictatorial measures in order to maintain the advance of our system by which we can build an order which will exist in complete harmony with Russia."

Hon. T. C. Douglas (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. The member for Assiniboia has officially denied ever having made such a statement.

Mr. Danielson: — He has not . . .

Premier: — Mr. Speaker, I have the floor, I rise on a question of privilege . . .

Mr. Danielson: — He has no right to get up on a point of order and take exception to anything I have said. He is absolutely out of order on this point.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member rose to a point of privilege. Will you speak to your point please.

Premier: — Mr. Speaker, the point of privilege was that my hon. friend has just quoted a statement which he has attributed to a member of Parliament from this province, said statement having been officially and categorically denied by said member; he having pointed out that at no time did he ever make such a statement, and claims to have been misquoted. My hon. friend ought to know that, if he doesn't.

Mr. Danielson: — That is not point of order at all. He has no right — he is out of order, Mr. Speaker. The fact remains that Mr. MacCullough has not denied this statement, and you know it.

Premier: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. My hon. friend says 'he has not denied it, and I know it.' I know the opposite, I know that he has denied it because I was present when he officially made the denial in his own constituency.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, I repeat that he has never denied it; he has tried to place a different interpretation on it.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member is out of order. By implication he is saying that the Premier is telling an untruth.

Mr. Danielson: — No, I didn't say so.

Mr. Speaker: — But you did.

Mr. Danielson: — He expressed an opinion, and I am just as entitled to my opinion, Mr. Speaker, as he is.

March 11, 1948

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. Premier did not express an opinion; he took it on his own authority to make a statement.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. On what authority did you permit a member of this House to take upon himself to make a statement for a member outside of this House.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. Premier rose on a point of privilege and takes the responsibility on his own shoulders.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, that does not nullify my statement. After all, I have no right to get up in this House and speak for anyone who is not in this House.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has been doing nothing, all afternoon, except speaking for other people.

Mr. Danielson: — This statement stands, Mr. Speaker.

I want to quote the Premier, and he can deny this if he likes. He said on April 3, 1946, in the debate on The Automobile Insurance Bill: “We are into a fight with capitalism in which we will give no quarter and accept no quarter – we will not rest until capitalism is finally eradicated in this province, or until we are defeated.”

Voice: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Danielson: — My friends over there say ‘hear, hear!’. There are many people in the province who will be interested to know that, Mr. Speaker. They are admitting that this Government has a mission, and that is to drive all vestige of the present economic system out of this province. What is it going to be replaced with? Why, with Russian Socialism! The same as you have in Saskatchewan today. You can laugh all you like – I know you do not like to hear these things – but that is what you are going to replace it with.

It is very interesting to follow the line, Mr. Speaker. We have a statement coming from Tim Buck; then it goes into the Manitoba legislature; then it comes into the Saskatchewan legislature, and then it goes some place else. And in a few days, the Labour-Progressive Party has a convention in this province (it all happens within 30 or 35 days), and they passed a resolution. The play was then taken by Reconstruction Minister J. H. Sturdy and Agricultural Minister I. C. Nollet in condemning the imperialistic trusts growing out of United States’ foreign policy. Where does it come from? Well, there is no need to ask that question; it is plain where it comes from. These fellows who associate with Tim Buck and his friends are ready with all these words of praise and glorification when they get someone inside what they call the Democratic Socialist Party.

What a misnomer, Mr. Speaker! There is no such thing as a Democratic Socialist Party. There can't be. It has been proven conclusively that there can't be. All we have to do is see what is going on over in Czechoslovakia, in other nations of Europe, fourteen or fifteen of them, which are behind the 'iron curtain', where the concentration camp and the firing squad have replaced the courts of justice and the rights of democracy. The same thing follows every place – someday, the 'iron curtain' is going to drop over this province of Saskatchewan. You bet it's coming.

What do we find in the province, insofar as the creeping paralysis of Socialism is concerned? We say that the northern part is socialized now. What is happening on the prairies? Well, Mr. Speaker, we have the old use-lease system in the province of Saskatchewan now, which was offered to the people in 1934. No one need ask any questions after listening to the Minister of Agriculture, a few days ago. He told us that all the troubles, all the sufferings, of the farming population in this province were due to one thing: to the fact that, in years gone by, farmers had title and equity in their own farms, and they could mortgage their land. Had they not been able to mortgage that land, they would have not had any mortgage to pay, and everything would have been lovely. That is one of the things that is very clear, today, and that, coupled with the fact that the Government is refusing to sell land and give title to land today, is a clear indication of what the trend is in Saskatchewan.

Another thing, today in Saskatchewan, as I said, you have something which shows in which direction we are travelling. In Russia, after the first Great War, all the large estates were seized and they were divided up, and the returned man was placed in colonies, or in groups, here and there all over the Soviet Union, on collective farms, exactly the same as you have in Saskatchewan today. You really haven't a co-operative farm set up any place by this Government; and the best proof you haven't is the fact that no co-operative organization in the province (and I think if anyone should be an authority on this subject it is the largest co-operative organization in the province); they will tell you, quite frankly, that this is a collective farm. That is what they did in Soviet Russia; they placed these fellows in small groups here and there and, by 1941 or 1942, the whole nation was collectivized, as far as the farming industry of the country was concerned. They went one step at a time, and finally the step was taken which finished the plan and, as I said, 'the yoke was on the peoples' neck' – they were divested of all ownership of the land and were fully collectivized, or socialized as we call it in Saskatchewan. We use a nicer word in order to fool the people, and the farmers, into giving their support.

I have here the whole description of what took place in Russia – it is identical to the one followed in Saskatchewan. We have a collective farm at Matador, one at Carrot River, and here and there all over the province. They told the returned men that they were co-operative farms (which is not right, of course) and if they wanted to go into farming they would have to accept that particular type, or system, of farming – they had no other choice. You might say it is not compulsory, but, nevertheless, this direction of agriculture will continue for a few years if this Government should stay in power, which I am absolutely sure they won't.

March 11, 1948

They may deny this, Mr. Speaker, but as early as 1944, maybe earlier than that, they had a school in the city of Saskatoon, with Mr. Colin Cameron of British Columbia as teacher, to teach the candidates and workers for the C.C.F. for the 1944 election. In the 'C.C.F. News' of Vancouver, January 27, 1944, he said this: "The first impression gained of our Saskatoon comrades, and one which was reinforced throughout the school, was their willingness to discuss any proposition objectively and quite without prejudice; with some trepidation on the criticism of the C.C.F. official position with regard to the place of the family farm, and suggested that such a position was an illogical one for Socialists to take and carry, and that, in actual practice, we should sooner or later have to accept the idea of collectivism in agriculture, and in other lines of production. The discussion that followed gave evidence of a great deal of thought on this matter among C.C.F. farmers in Saskatchewan, and the good humor and courtesy displayed between those of opposing views was an outstanding example of democracy in action. When a little opposition was voiced" (now don't forge this, Mr. Speaker) "to the principle of collectivism, several members pointed out, quite rightly, the difficulty of presenting the idea acceptable to the majority of the farming population, and also the social and administrative problems involved."

You have the thing right there. As I said, it is in accord with the 'Regina Manifesto' – there is no question about that. The C.C.F. news of Vancouver also said this: "If socialism is to be the society tomorrow, the family farm will fail to meet the demands of society, and the farmer himself will realize that he is perpetuating an anti-social factor, accepting the benefits of social production and co-operation and every other part of the economy." There you have it again – these are the official words of the man who formed the policy of this party; and it is denied, today, that they have any such ideas.

There is one who was ever franker than the others (Mr. Bowerman) and he said in the House of Commons, Hansard, February 21, 1948, "We are driven to this conclusion" (this was during the Throne Speech Debate); "the only thing which will solve our present social and economic problems is absolute Christian socialization of the means of production and distribution of all the necessities of life." Mr. Gordon Graydon, progressive-conservative, asked if that would include the farmer, and Bowerman replied that it would include everybody.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these things are not accidental. They show that there is a predominating sense and understanding, and a foundation laid for that.

The Premier was speaking in Yorkton, I think it was, when he had that famous debate with the leader of the Liberal Party and he asked him about this, and the Premier said that the C.C.F. convention had not asked for nationalization of the land.

Premier: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. My hon. friend has taken in hand to quote me and quote me most inaccurately, he hasn't even quoted from the press. I do not know whether he is carrying this in his head, but the only statement made by me on the nationalization of the land was: The C.C.F. policy was made by constituency, provincial and national conventions, and at those conventions the C.C.F. policy laid down was that that policy was opposed to the socialization, or nationalization, of land. That is the statement I made.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the Premier said, but the press report has simply this plain statement: When Mr. Tucker asked him he said the C.C.F. convention had not yet asked for it.

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. member read the quotation please?

Mr. Danielson: — I will accept his statement. If he says he didn't say it, that is all right with me. But, nevertheless, there is no question in my mind, Mr. Speaker, hidden as it may be and held in the background to not worry anybody or rouse anything on the part of the people of this province, but in my opinion, (and I have a right to my opinion), the policy of nationalization of the farmlands of this province is in their minds and plans — the socialization of everything in the province of Saskatchewan; there is no question about that. When you have eradicated capitalism, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing left but another economy system which will not tolerate private ownership and private control of any property — that is the position. So I would say to you that the farmers of Saskatchewan should be very very careful. Now is the time for them to take stock of the situation and see what this thing is leading to, and I am sure that when the time of the election comes around they will act accordingly, and it will be the end of the C.C.F. land policy in this province.

Well, I am not going to keep the House very much longer, but I just want to say a few words more in regard to the Budget, and the tax that this fourth Budget, presented by this Government, has had on the farmer of Saskatchewan. There is not a farmer today (regardless of what the Premier or the Provincial Treasurer says; if you listen to them, it is remarkable; there must be some mysterious method not known to anybody else except this Government), who is not paying more taxes. The Premier said — when he spoke in the House, two or three days ago — that the taxes paid on gasoline were less than they were before he came into power. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Gasoline Tax in this province has been increased 43 per cent: it was seven cents, it is ten now. A boy with a motorcycle used to spend \$6 a year (paid to the Government), but today he pays \$21 — I wonder if he thinks he isn't paying any more tax.

What about the compulsory Automobile Insurance? There are thousands and thousands of farmers in this province who are compelled to pay that tax. It gives him no benefit and he would never take it out otherwise.

Hon. Mr. Phelps: — You are compelled to make your P.F.A.A. payments too, aren't you?

March 11, 1948

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, but we get the benefit. There is a difference there, and I want to point it out. This is a Government where you pay in and get nothing back – just like the fishermen; one got one cent and another got nothing.

Hon. Mr. Phelps: — They seem to like it in Long Lake, anyway.

Mr. Danielson: — So far as the taxes are concerned, what about the farmer who drove his truck for 10 per year and today is paying \$45 and \$50 per year? Doesn't he pay any more taxes? What about the farmer – thousands of them – who have notices from the Minister of Natural Resources telling them that if they do not pay up a certain amount of money, on April 31, they will lose all their mineral rights to the Crown. Isn't that taxes? What about the man who pays three times as much school tax? The most part of it (not altogether, I am going to be fair in this) is used directly for the policies of the Government. Doesn't he pay any more taxes? These clever men with figures cannot make a farmer believe something when he has to dig down in his pockets and give the money to the Government – he knows he is paying more taxes. All the smoothness of talk is not going to help this Government when the time comes.

I could stand here for an hour and mention that there isn't a solitary thing – not a licence, or fee, or permit necessary in Saskatchewan today, that hasn't been doubled and trebled, to what they were before. And they have the audacity to sit here and tell the farmers, and the members of this House, that a man who pays ten cents a gallon today, and paid seven cents four years ago, isn't paying any more taxes.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — What about the Ottawa Government?

Mr. Danielson: — I am glad you mentioned that. When the Ottawa Government placed three cents on farm gas, they came through with a subsidy on crude oil, which meant six cents to us on the refined product. The farmers of Western Manitoba, all of Saskatchewan, and Alberta, all benefited three cents a gallon more than he paid in taxes.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Why did they take it off then?

Mr. Danielson: — It was taken off when the war was over. Then you weren't satisfied; you were greedy enough to slip in there and take it up, and soak it out of the farmer. You did it, not the Dominion Government, and the hon. gentleman knows that what I am telling him is the truth. The Premier stands there and tells us they do not pay any more. Well, it is a remarkable system of striking a balance this Government has. I am afraid it is exactly the same as the Provincial Treasurer's reduction of debt which we dealt with this afternoon. So far as taxes are concerned, the farmers, every man and woman in Saskatchewan, and individual in Canada, has reached that decision regarding this socialistic Government.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think I need to say to you that I am going to oppose this Motion.

Mr. A. W. Embury (Area 2, Mediterranean): — Mr. Speaker, the rule in this House seems to be quite hard and fast in this Debate that a member should start off by congratulating somebody on their speech, and it is a very nice thing to be able to do. As the hon. Premier has said in his speech on this Debate, everybody, so far, on his side of the House anyway, and even some on this side of the House too, have congratulated the Provincial Treasurer on his Budget Speech; and that remark of the Premier is one of the few accurate statements that the hon. Premier made during the course of his observations. I may say, Sir, that I agree with because I take it that it includes the Provincial Treasurer who did nothing if he did not congratulate himself.

A humble solider, Sir, coming into this House, to see and hear . . .

Government Members: — Humble!

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER!

Mr. Embury: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was wondering when your honour was going to call for some order. During the speech which my hon. friend from Arm River made a short while ago, when so many of the hon. gentlemen yonder were interrupting him — out of order — and persisted in doing so for something like an hour before dinner, and after dinner, this evening, it is interesting indeed to see your honour take the part of the speaker for the time being.

As I was saying, a humble solider coming into this House to see and hear all this political ammunition being expended and fired off in all directions, can consider himself very lucky indeed, so far, to have not been hit by some of them; and, in this Debate, apart from what the hon. member for Swift Current was inspired to say, yesterday, I have, so far, escaped unscathed, I believe. That is only by reason of the fact, I suspect, that I have not spoken yet. Any critic of the Government immediately becomes the target for some of the more bitter and aggressive Socialist agitators who swarm on the benches yonder. I have said that the people on that side of the House have ventured to suggest that the people on this side of the House have some personal motive, or some political motive, for their criticisms, and I think it is also fair to say that the people on this side have accused the people on the other side of the same thing. It has all been very enjoyable to us, who have not been in the direct line of fire, so far, to see this conflict go on. But recently, the debates in this House have made it appear that it has become rather a 'tough league' to serve in, in the last couple of days; and I may say that my first impression of that came from the hon. Premier, when he was speaking in the House, on Tuesday of this week, on this Budget Debate.

Like the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. A. T. Procter), Sir, I do not want to repeat any of the technical criticisms of the Budget, that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has so ably made, and presented to the House on the Monday after the Budget was brought down by the Provincial Treasurer. Certainly there is nothing that I could add to the technical criticisms of that speech which would add to the knowledge of the House, but I do wish to say that I associate myself with the hon. Leader of the Opposition in his criticisms of this Budget, and I do congratulate him upon his effort to bring to the knowledge of the House, and to all those

within the sound of his voice, something of the issues which are involved in the Budget before us.

Premier: — ‘Barkis is willing!’

Mr. Embury: — I see the hon. gentlemen are going out of order again, Sir, and I must say that I have every sympathy with you in your endeavour to keep order in this House, when the members act as they do when a critic of the Government is attempting to give voice to such things as he may have, however honestly, felt. I think that there was a good example, Sir, of the difficulty which you must have by the interruptions and lack of order which the hon. member for Arm River has had to put up with during his talk today. However, these hon. champions to the rights of free speech yonder, may pride themselves, I hope, in having effectively disrupted the more effective parts of his criticisms so as to negative them as much as possible.

I was interested very much in the hon. Premier’s reply to the criticisms made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition – a very diverting reply it was. He still seems to be under the impression, in spite of all anybody can try and do to tell him otherwise, that the criticisms of the Budget could be summed up in the title of the song, ‘You can’t have her, I don’t want her, she’s too fat for me.’ That is the way he takes it, and that is diverting enough. As a matter of fact, a budget of this size, brought down by any government, which was not dedicated to the task of eradicating capitalism from Saskatchewan, would not cause very much anxiety because, for the time being at least, the revenues are there; but when a Socialist government, which had dislocated so much of our industry in Saskatchewan, brings down so large a Budget, and on top of that proposes to administer the expenditure of millions more, outside the Budget, at the whim of a group of ‘back-room boys’, and experts under the Government Finance Corporation – I think they call it – the problem is not so much one of size but becomes a question of intention. I think, Sir, that a better song title would be ‘Don’t fence me in,’ because that expresses the fervent prayer of all the free and enterprising people in the province of Saskatchewan.

It was that fear, or anxiety, that impelled me to take a stand against this Government, last year. I may say, quite frankly to the House, that had there been no substantial grounds to believe that such was the Government’s intention, I would have been supporting the Government to this day, as I did for two years after I came home from overseas. Make no mistake about it, Sir – I know that the hon. gentlemen like to interfere, and make interjecting remarks, to try and take the speaker from the train of his thoughts, and for the purpose of interfering with what he has to say, but I say this, and I know it to be true, that I know veterans and soldiers much better than most of the members in this House, particularly insofar as World War II is concerned. Very few indeed of the members of this House were overseas in World War II – most of them, like the hon.

Premier and the hon. Provincial Treasurer, and others, were back home in Saskatchewan plotting the campaign for Socialist triumph while their betters were fighting abroad for the security and safety of this House. And I say this to the hon. gentleman, that I do not feel I have to take second place to him in expressing what I know to be the views of the men, when I say that when the men were overseas (and you can take this for what it is worth – it is an entire and frank statement) they held no brief for the Liberal Party, they held no brief for the Tory Party – as a matter of fact, they held no brief for any political party. It is equally true, Sir, that if the opinion, on a political question, of the men were taken when they were overseas in 1945 upon any political party, I would say that the hon. Premier's party, and the party in office in this province at the moment, would have had the support of the men to the tune of two out of three votes. I think that is true – when they were overseas; and, furthermore, I was one of them. I do not say I would have voted for them, but I had every sympathy for them. I did not realize, and neither did they, from where we sat abroad in foreign lands (which most of you don't know anything about), that this Government was dominated by a group of implacable and uncompromising Socialists. They were a group who have demonstrated quite clearly that they are determined to organize and establish, and control, all our established institutions, and all of our resources, so that they could be controlled under the dictatorship of a totalitarian political philosophy of Socialism. That is a very serious matter – it may not seem so to you people who laugh and think that this matter is not one which the people of the province of Saskatchewan should consider very closely, and the implications which it holds for us in the future, with the examples we have before us in foreign countries of all kinds.

I do not suggest lack of good faith among the gentlemen opposite, but I do suggest lack of understanding.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Oh!

Mr. Embury: — Well, I know, my friend the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who has made his pro-Russian speeches in the House before now, likes to guffaw and interject; but I say, of all the members on the benches yonder, he is the typical example of them all, who has done more to expose the intentions of this Government than any man in the Cabinet. The wonder is that his colleagues are prepared to sit with him. I would suggest that a great many members of this House do not realize yet the full extent of what this Government is planning.

I am going to attempt – and I realize it is rather a hopeless task, as several speakers on this side of the House have tried to do so – to try and tell you how I reached that conclusion, having come here with an absolutely open mind on the subject, and prepared to string along with these people if it was possible to do so; and the House knows it – I sat here for two years listening to them. I am going to try and tell you how I reached that conclusion and, in doing so, I do not want you to think that any one point that I am going

March 11, 1948

to make to you tonight, by itself, persuaded me; but taken collectively and progressively, over the years, it is not possible for any reasonable man to come to any other conclusion. Believe me – and when I say this I know that I speak with a wider knowledge of the veterans than any one of the caucus-bound utensils of the Socialist plan in this House – know my veterans far better than they do, because I had an opportunity to serve with them, and further . . . Oh yes, the hon. champions of the right of free speech over there would like to interrupt . . . insofar as the Socialist Party in this province obtained the support of the armed services vote in the last election (they were called the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation – there was nothing Socialist in the title; we were a long way from home and didn't realize what they were up to), they got it under false pretenses. Like most of the men in this province, in the bad years of the depression, in my twenties, I did not give much thought to the rise of Socialism in Saskatchewan. Very few of us who served in the armed forces realized that our Socialists had been launched upon an instrument so dear to the hearts of Socialists all over the world, upon a document called 'a manifesto' (nobody but a Socialist would use the thing). Very few of us realized that our socialists carry on their politics in a manner so dear to the heart of the Socialists in Russia, and all over the world, on a 'party card' system – you don't find people in democratic politics worrying about a 'party card' in Canada, until the Socialists arrived, copying their friends who love Karl Marx.

Very few of us realized what the implications of that plan was and, to be quite frank with you, I didn't at all; but when I came home and took an opportunity to read this so-called 'Manifesto', this formidable document put out by Cominform and Comintern and CCFers, and Socialists, wherever you find them all over the world, and I started to consider the implications of a 'party card' system of politics. I must confess that I felt a few early misgivings about our Socialists although I did not think of them as being Communists at that time, because they hadn't started to republish Communistic literature at the public expenses when I first came home. They hadn't been here long enough – they did that later. I did think that one should watch out and see the possible ramifications involved in the legislation that they brought down. The first bitterly contested Bill, or Amendment, that I heard in this House was brought down in the Second Session of 1944, but there were some Amendments brought down to it in 1945, which was my first Session in the House and I listened to the debates and took no part in it. The principal objection made by the gentlemen to my right was that the Minister, under that Bill (I think they were referring to the Bill passed in the Special Session of 1944), had the power to compel any number of School Boards to come under the Act, whether the people in the area wanted to come under it or not.

That is a fair way of expressing the objections which were made to that Bill. Furthermore, I heard my hon. friend for Moosomin (Mr. A. T. Procter), who objected very much to Sec. 77 (1) of the Bill, under which the Minister could appoint a supervisor under the Act and give him any duties which he saw fit. Using that Act the Minister could pretty well dominate the schools in the province.

Hon. W. S. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — Would the hon. gentleman permit a question? Would he repeat what he said about the powers given to the Minister under Sec. 77. I think he is speaking without knowledge whereof he speaks as there is no such section.

Mr. Embury: — I have read the Act and I daresay the Minister has also, and he knows that he could appoint a supervisor or superintendent. I will read Sec. 77 (1) Using that Act . . . I haven't the Act before me but I have read it . . .

Inaudible interruption . . .

Premier: — You'd better get the fellow who wrote the speech.

Mr. Embury: — These champions of free speech do not like to have a point made against them – they hate it! I assure you that nothing gives me more pleasure than to show them up, and to bring out, point by point, the Socialist plan whereby they hope to gain control of education in the province.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Will the hon. gentleman permit a question?

Mr. Embury: — No. I would like to tell the Minister of Education that when I have finished saying what I have to say he can ask me a question.

Mr. H. O. Hansen (Wilkie): — I wish you were on the air.

Mr. Embury: — Well, we are not on the air so we will be all right, won't we?

The criticisms made by my hon. friends of the Liberal Party in this House were – and I think the hon. Minister will have to agree that they were – right, in using that Act the Minister pretty well dominated the schools in the province, and the teachers too.

March 11, 1948

I quite agree that the Minister of Education, before that time, had a very considerable measure of control. I think there was an extension of his power over the schools and also that it was more widespread and direct; and that the planning for the schools was done at a higher level than previously. I think that is a fair statement of the criticisms which were made, and a fairminded critic reading the legislation, at that time, would agree with me.

As I have said, when I was interrupted by the gentleman trying to ask me a question about something or other . . .

Premier: — Which you would not answer.

Mr. Embury: — I will answer it. You will get a chance to ask it all right, but I do not propose to be interrupted.

. . . he could compel the rural populations to accept larger schools and, generally, could plan from Regina.

People who worry about Socialism, as I do, and a great many honest critics of this Government do, (I know you are most intolerant to critics who are quite as honest and sincere as any of you), they find that when a Socialist interests himself in high-level planning of education that it is a matter for some concern. I suggest to you that it was a significant thing, and I am going to tell you why. The hon. Minister of Education at that time, I remember quite well, justified the measure by a lot of talk about the teachers' low salaries, and poor school facilities, and the fact that the teachers and the children were suffering — that they were not getting the attention they wanted which, of course, the House, on both sides, desired that they should have. But all of the improvements which the Minister of education said he was designing, by legislation, could have been simply met by increasing the grants to the schools they started, and by assisting the school boards to pay larger salaries — there was no reason for a Larger School Unit to effect any of the improvements which the hon. Minister said he was endeavouring to make. As a matter of fact, if this Government had put as much money into the schools, and into the improvement of the schools, and the increasing of the teachers' salaries, and the provision of libraries and all the rest of it, that it has put into wool factories and shoe factories and bus lines, and heaven alone knows from one day to the next what else, then we would have been getting better value for our money.

Furthermore, if this Government had done that they would have been doing something which was this Government's business, and they would not have been doing what was none of this Government's business at all.

We have heard a lot from the Socialists about their altruistic ambitions with respect to improving the lot of the school children, and the teachers. Everybody recognizes the problem which this country, with its enormous spaces and sparsely-settled population and rigorous climate, has had to face with regard to providing adequate facilities for school children in the rural areas. But the people who live out there know more about it than the hon. Minister who sits here in Regina. Give them some money and they will manage all right; but do not waste the money. That is the point.

Today, Sir, as a result of the Government's policy in this regard, I have heard it said very widely, and I am sure that the hon. Minister has too, that municipal school taxes have risen tremendously. (I do not hear any of them rise to quarrel with that statement.)

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — I will, if the hon. gentlemen will permit me.

Mr. Embury: — Do you deny that?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — I deny it as a general statement. There are many areas in which municipal taxes have gone down considerably.

Mr. Embury: — I wonder where they are: perhaps he will tell me some day.

I say this to you, and I am quite sure, that if the hon. Minister insists to the public of Saskatchewan today that the school taxes have not gone up there would be very few people who would agree with him. I give you that as my opinion whether it is yours or not.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, may I make my position clear on a point of privilege?

Mr. Embury: — Has he a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker?

Premier: — The Speaker will determine that, not you.

Mr. Speaker: — State your point of privilege.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — My statement, which I made in reply to the hon. member's challenge was: that there are many areas in the province in which school taxes are not increased, and there are others in which, though they are increased, they are not increased because of the Larger Unit.

Mr. Embury: — A very interesting point of privilege. I suppose he is going to be allowed throughout my remarks to get up and make a speech in the middle of mine under the guise that it is a point of privilege. But that was not a point of privilege, I suggest to you, Sir. However, in reply to it may I say this, if I am allowed to proceed further without the champions of free speech yonder . . .

Premier: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. My hon. friend has frequently complained about people interrupting him. He challenged the Minister of Education, and said 'no one opposite has objected to that', and challenged him to reply.

Mr. Embury: — Did I use the word 'challenge'.

Premier: — And he said no one opposite . . .

Mr. Embury: — Order, Sir. Has he a point of privilege?

March 11, 1948

Premier: — Mr. Speaker, I am pointing out to your honour that if my hon. friend is being interrupted it is because he invited interruption, and because he took silence as meaning general consent, and it left the Minister, or some other member of the House, no alternative but to rise. My hon. friend should not keep crying then, like a little boy running home and complaining.

Mr. Embury: — Well, let me know when I can go on.

Mr. Speaker: — If the hon. member will leave the conduct of this Chamber to me I will try to do it.

Mr. Embury: — Well, I hope you will . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Without your instructions.

Mr. Embury: — Well, I do hope you will, Sir, because, if I may suggest it, it is very difficult for critics of the Government to get their fair criticisms spoken in this Chamber. As an example, as the hon. Premier said a moment ago, he was supposed to have a point of privilege, but he had no point of privilege; he just wanted to get up and make a speech.

Premier: — Mr. Speaker, I certainly have a point of privilege now. My hon. friend is imputing motives. I had a point of privilege. I objected to an hon. member casting reflections on the other members of this House. I objected, as leader of the Government . . .

Mr. Embury: — That is not a point.

Premier: — My hon. friend does not know the first thing about parliamentary procedure – he probably learned most of it in a law school, and they teach no parliamentary procedure at all.

As the leader of the Government I am charged with defending the personal rights and privileges of the members of this House, and drawing . . .

Mr. Embury: — Has he a point of privilege, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: — Yes.

Premier: — I am seeking to point out, Sir, that no honourable member can cast aspersions on members for interrupting him when he himself has invited them to interrupt him if they do not agree with him.

Mr. W. J. Patterson (Cannington): — Do you rule, Sir, that that is a point of privilege?

Premier: — It is not a point of personal privilege, it is a point of general privilege.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member did invite the question. The hon. member directed a question to the hon. Minister of Education.

Mr. Embury: — No, I did not, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: — Then I did not understand it.

Mr. Embury: — May I go on now? I do hope you will be able to keep order. I suggest that any lack of order in this place is through no fault of mine. As a matter of fact, you know they always throw sticks at the fellow who is making criticism of them. One always finds if you are making any sort of a criticism that is ‘getting home’, they all start throwing sticks at you. But the best apples are found under the tree with the most sticks under it, and I am quite sure that I do not mind in the least being interrupted, because when I do manage to get that reaction from them I know I am starting to get somewhere.

Well, here we go again! There’s the ‘orderly’ man over there – the man who loves order; the man with the loud laugh.

Now, Sir, if I may return to the general tenor of my remarks before I was interrupted by at least two Cabinet Ministers, including the Premier, – I am quite flattered to have them jumping up and down like that and trying to stop me from what I am trying to say – but the point I was trying to make, Sir, was this: it was not necessary to impose a Larger School Unit to do the things for education that the Socialists say they were trying to do. It was not necessary to do that. We all wanted these matters improved, and by reason of our more buoyant revenue’s we are in a position to do something about it. All you have to do is pay. I suggest, in bringing that in, and I must say I agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues, that they did not really want to help education when they did that; what they really wanted to do was control the situation.

Stemming from that, in the very early days of 1945, this high-level planning, we soon heard, was replaced by the text-books being used, and an attempt being made to convert the adolescent mind to Socialism and discontent. You all recall the criticism of the Government that were made at that time and, in particular, they criticized the texts being used, ‘The World of Today’. That came under discussion, and it was alleged (and I may say that I agree with the allegations) that that text was calculated to achieve the end of warping the adolescent mind in the schools; and it is exactly what you would expect persons who were bent on the imposition of totalitarian Socialism upon any population to try and do.

It was in 1945 and 1946 that we found the Minister of Education circulating his pro forma to obtain information about the children, and about their homes, so that the Minister could help them – so he said. And I put this to you, Sir, in all fairness – I am the parent of two children myself, and there are quite a few like me – that the Minister is a Socialist, and Socialists in other lands have done far too much to warp the minds of the children for me to view any activities of any Socialist in this country with any sort of equanimity – and I object to it, and with me are vast sections of the public.

March 11, 1948

In 1944, Sir, they brought down the first Trade Union Act, and, since then . . . the hon. gentlemen say ‘here, hear’. The hon. gentleman for North Battleford (Mr. A. D. Connon) gave me some fatherly advice the other day – very poor fatherly advice it was too – he likes to repeat telephone conversations of people who ‘phone him up’. I wish I could tell you some of the conversations I have had although they haven’t mentioned you.

However, there was a great fanfare of Socialist agitation, along with the introduction of the Bill, and some of the Amendments, which the House will remember, about the brutality of the police in Regina, and the Regina and Estevan riots and something in Saskatoon. The hon. Minister of Labour really excelled himself one night the way he talked about the brutal, vicious, illegal murder of a man called McNair.

Hon. C. C. Williams (Minister of Labour): — I did not . . .

Mr. Embury: — Oh, didn’t you? Well, the gentleman not only did it, Sir, but he rose in the House shortly after to say he did not. We had an hon. gentleman, that night, who first of all did it – and we all heard him – and then goes on to say he didn’t, and now I suppose he expects the public to have confidence in him.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. This is a question of ‘threshing straw’ which is a year old. The manager of this particular railroad, Mr. McNair . . .

Mr. Embury: — Sir, has he a point of privilege?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Williams: — . . . by his own gangsters, I might say. And I would like to say further . . .

Mr. Embury: — I object. Order!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Embury: — Are we all right now, Sir? I hope we are because, you know, like most Socialist agitators they always jump up in the middle of another fellow’s speech, and you can’t stop them. They just make a noise; that is all they have to do.

However, I am talking about the amendments to the first Trade Union Act, and the amendments which were introduced afterwards. We had this wonderful Socialist agitation accompanying it from the Minister – he talked about the murder of McNair, and I think his actual words were that not many laboring men would be sorry that that happened. If you will recall, those were his exact words – I remember writing them down when he said them, and I accused him of condoning a wicked murder at the time. He got up and said he didn’t, at that time. Well, your honour was good enough to rule that I had to withdraw the word ‘applaud’ so I do not use it tonight; but I did not have to withdraw the word ‘condone’. But, anyway, he said he didn’t; but the whole House heard him.

We had a Minister who not only condoned it but then got up and said he didn't, when the whole House heard him, and how anyone could have any confidence in him I do not know.

But couched in the first Trade Union Act was a first attempt to give a provincial board, appointed by this Legislature, the powers, indeed, of a Court of King's Bench, to decide matters – contentious matters and almost litigious matters, between subject and subject. It was not a matter of administration, Sir. It was a matter of deciding contentious issues which is very different indeed, and, as a matter of fact, if any of you are interested you could read the learned judgment of the Chief Justice of this province in defining responsibilities of government boards in that behalf. But this set of Socialists tried to give powers to a provincially-appointed board to decide contentious matters, and then to give their decision, and to give their personnel, or chairman, the power of a court of the land.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — They have done a good job of it too.

Mr. Embury: — Yes? Oh, well, that is a matter of opinion. It might look all right to the hon. Minister, but it does not look all right to anyone who has to come before them, and I will tell you why, Sir.

It was never the intention of this Legislature, I am quite sure, that the administration of that Board should be biased. It was the intention of the hon. members, when they debated this Bill, that the Board would function within the four corners of its statutes, impartially. I am sure we all intended that. But this Board went forward into its duties, and in the Speers' case, which anyone can read if they want to, were found to be biased in their administration. They were not only found to be biased in their administration by the courts – the courts were entirely right – but they were found to be biased by a great many other people who had the misfortune to appear before them.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — Can you prove that?

Mr. Embury: — Yes. I can produce you the judgment in the Speers' case, and which you should have read if you were on your job, which I do not suppose you were. In any event, right in that judgment was the finding that that gentleman's board was biased, and it was not only found to be biased by the courts, it was found to be biased by a great many other people who had the misfortune to appear before it – and I do not overstate the case when I say that. But that is not all. Counsel for that same board came before our courts, in the fullness of time, and pleaded for them to be biased! I suggest to you, Sir, that when it comes to deciding the issues which must be decided between subject and subject throughout this country, no matter who its rulers are, that a bias should be farthest from the mind of any judicially-minded person. The hon. Minister is not a judicially-minded person, I suggest to you – he does not know what fairness is, and he does not know how wicked a bias can be.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — On a point of privilege. The hon. member said I do not know what fairness is. I take exception to that, and I would ask him to withdraw it.

March 11, 1948

Mr. Embury: — I will withdraw it. But, in any event, his board was found to be biased by the courts — it was still composed of the same people, still had the same notorious complexion, there was no change; but then nobody but a Socialist would dream of such a thing. That is the essence of Socialism with a vengeance.

These so-called Democratic Socialists first turned their attention to The Election Act in 1945 — it has been quite interesting what they have done to that. They reduced the voting age to 18 years, and I, personally, and others with me, considered that in the light of what we knew, and suspected, of their reported attempts to bring politics into the schools, particularly the high-schools, and that text, which I have mentioned. Talk about education; you know the adults were not left alone either. We had the Adult Education, which had previously been administered under the University, in a much lesser degree than the Socialists started in on it, but they brought it under the administration of the Minister of Education, I think, in 1945. Under the heading of ‘Adult Education’, they retained a man who is quite widely known as a Communist, a man by the name of Watson Thompson — they had to let him go a little while later because he got too hot for them — and they employed that man to put out a sheet called ‘The Living Newspaper’ — they put it out every two weeks or so, and I used to read it — and it is my opinion that it contained the straight Communist ‘party line’, which is just what one would expect from a man like Watson Thompson.

At about the same time, Sir, a Mr. Dyson Carter . . . I am telling you why I would not have anything to do with this Government; I am telling you why you forced me, and every man like me, away from you in this province . . . but Mr. Dyson Carter (oh, yes, the hon. gentlemen think this is worth while, but that man is an acknowledged Communist). What pride can you take in your Government, spending your money, publishing the literature of an acknowledged Communist in the Dominion of Canada, the Province of Saskatchewan, or anywhere else, as a public venture? Do you think that is funny? Do you think that is worthwhile? You do, eh?

Premier: — Mr. Speaker, Is it not customary to address the Chair?

Mr. Embury: — If you do, for my part, let me say that there are very few people who go with you along those lines. Very, very few people will endorse you when you did that, and you have yet to give an explanation of it.

Premier: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I suppose. The hon. gentleman does not like me to pursue this. He has been accused of it about four times across the floor of this House — he has spoken for hours, and most divertingly, but he has never once tried to justify, or explain to us, or any of the public, why it was that he, under his Minister of Education, should undertake the task of publishing Communist literature at public expense, and mailing it out, and we paid the postage.

Premier: — I could give you the explanation, but I could not give you the power to understand it.

Mr. Embury: — I do not suppose you could. I would like to give the hon. Premier a little power of understanding because . . .

Premier: — Don't bother, you cannot spare any.

Mr. Embury: — Mr. Speaker, you were supposed to keep order in this place. If the hon. Premier will be patient, and silent, I will try to do my best for him and tell him how much I, and the public, resent a Government activity of that sort. He thinks it is funny – it is not funny, it is a very serious matter indeed. It may be funny to him, Sir, but it is not funny to anyone else.

Premier: — Do not speak for the public.

Mr. Embury: — This is what they did: they took this man, and paid him, and printed his stuff and put it out. That was not all; that is only part of it, and people should study it. In 1945, the Government brought down The Crown Corporations Act, which we criticized on all sides. It enabled a designated member of the Executive Council to buy shares in any company, and the Lieutenant Governor in Council, to go into any business that the Lieutenant Governor in Council thought proper. I think, although I am not sure, that their commercial activities are so complex and so numerous was the Bill under which they went into a number of industries, including the Fish Board, and one thing and another. That may not be the one, but I am sure they were into some industries before they had any statutory authority at all, but I think that is the one they attempt to justify it under. Actually, I doubt if there are very many men in the House who know just which Statue it is under which the Government is carrying on these very widespread industries now – I doubt whether the hon. Minister does – I know one Minister carrying on activities who didn't seem to know what he was doing. We will come to that next maybe; but I would love to have a debate about it.

Under this Bill the various industries were set up, and I can assure you that it was a matter for study for any person trying to keep an open mind in their view of what this Government was doing. The hon. gentlemen here do not realize that it took some time for the people to get wise to this Government. It certainly took me a little while, anyway.

I think the next highlight of their efforts was the Bill to attack the insurance business. It was quite clear from that Bill to anyone who read it and knew the insurance business, that the Government intended to dislocate that whole trade, and having decimated it to take most of it over by compulsory measures, or otherwise. They have, indeed, by 1948 gone a great distance to accomplish that very thing. It was on the debate arising from that Bill – I think it took place on April 3, 1946, that the hon. Premier made his now famous declaration 'we will not rest until capitalism has been eradicated from Saskatchewan', and he could not have made it against a better background than the proposals contained in that Bill. Of course, he was only quoting from his 'manifesto' that he loves so much, when he made that statement.

During the year 1946, Sir, we had the spectacle of the notorious Shumiatcher – who is holding up the wall over there – a present occupant of the Lieutenant-Governor's office and premises, in this very building, appearing before the People's Forum in Regina, in December, and advocating Article 12, sub-paragraph (20) of the Constitution of the United States of Soviet Russia for the edification of his audience on that occasion. I think he used the word 'need' for local consumption, but broadly, and generally, the principle was just the same.

March 11, 1948

This fellow is on the Government payroll, Sir, and I must say that it was an interesting thing for the people to see the Premier's neighbour from the Legislative Buildings go down and interest himself in persuading members of the Regina public to embrace these extreme and extraordinary views. You people may like that sort of thing, but I tell you that if you do you are in the minority.

Voice: — We like it.

Mr. Embury: — Up in Morse they may like it – or whoever it was made that interjection over there. They may like it up there, but they do not like it here, and they never will. They will like it less if it is ever foisted on them.

In the consolidation of The Rural Municipalities Act of 1946, they were discovered (although I do not recall any debate having been directed toward it prior to that time, whether it was the Minister's fault or what, I do not know) to have included Section 198, which was designed to encourage the contribution and membership of all ratepayer farmers in the rural districts, in the United Farmers of Canada. And you will recall that during 1945, 1946, 1947, that organization attempted to organize strikes at the harvest time. That provision in Section 198 was very highly criticized, I think you will agree, and the purpose of it was that any 25 ratepayers, as I understand it . . .

Hon. J. H. Brockelbank (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — That is not correct.

Mr. Embury: — As it stood in 1946 I believe it is correct.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — No.

Mr. Embury: — Well, I stand corrected; but it seems to me – I do not want to be unfair and misquote the thing – that Section 198, as it stood in 1946, as consolidated, provided that any 25 ratepayers could bring it in by a petition signed by 25 of them, and then all of the rest of the ratepayers would become members of the United Farmers of Canada, if the council made the payment provided for in the Section – \$200. It is not compulsory there; but if they did, then the ratepayers would become members. But the intriguing thing about it, Sir, is that a petition of 25 members could put this thing in, if the council paid the \$200, then all the ratepayers became members of the United Farmers of Canada; but the point I am seeking to make is this (and I suppose the hon. gentleman will say I am wrong again, although I just read the Section – if I am wrong I will be happy to be corrected) that it took 40 per cent of all the ratepayers to get out again. That was the difference. That is where the people complained. The point is that they weighted the thing in favour of an organization of all the ratepayer farmers out in the country.

Now, while all these things were going forward the Government was observed, widely observed, that they were absolutely tireless in their efforts to Socialize the co-operatives and the trade-unions, and they did this by heaving Government expenditures for propaganda purposes. They bought a printing press. They even tried to get into radio, so I am told, although that time they didn't make it.

It was during the Session of 1946 that the Socialists amended The City Act, and they thereby changed the constitution of the Board of Police Commissioners so that the District Court Judge is the only independent, member of the Board of Police Commissioners – the other ones were the Magistrate and Mayor.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Will you permit a question?

Mr. Embury: — No, I won't. I will when I am finished. Don't worry, I know they do not like this. Every time they get a point that is going to hurt them, they begin to shudder.

Premier: — Brave man!

Mr. Embury: — You always get the reaction when it starts to hurt; they start to make a noise. That is Socialist style order.

Premier: — We have enough nerve to answer questions.

Mr. Embury: — He will get his question in – I will answer it when I am finished. But just listen to my point, Sir; you won't like it – you probably helped to plan it, or if you did not you are a mere spokesman for those who did. Here is what they did: prior to that time the District Court Judge was the only independent member of the Police Commission in the city; with him sat the Mayor and the Magistrate neither of whom were independent, one was an elected member and the other was an appointed member. Now, there was no public outcry back of the thing at all; there was no public pressure or abuse which anybody noticed except the Socialists.

Here is what they did: they amended The City Act so that the District Court Judge no longer sat on the Police Commission – and, mind you, the Police Commission controls the policy of the city; make no mistake about that. They changed the District Court Judge – these clever socialists; these noisy people over here – and they replaced him by an alderman who was elected. Shades of Czechoslovakia! You see what happened! They were at the whim of an election – that was the plot, I suggest to you. Later, we saw the Socialists doing all they could to have the Socialists elected in the city municipal election. Again, our notorious Shumiatcher was caught red-handed on election day, in Regina, in 1947, working for the cause, (during office hours, too, by the way. However, I don't suppose he would do as much harm to the cause down town as he does up here); but had he been successful, with the aid of the hon. Minister of Reconstruction and Rehabilitation, in their efforts to influence the municipal election, and to elect Socialists and their Socialist friends, did it ever strike you, Sir, that they would have completely controlled the police in this city? Did you ever think of that? Who, then, Sir – we talk about the brutality of the police and all the rest of it – is going to protect the public from the ravages of a socialist-inspired and agitated riot? Talk about Czechoslovakia! You don't have to go outside Saskatchewan to see what these people are trying to do. That is what they did!

March 11, 1948

Now, I say to you in all fairness (if I can make myself heard over the voice of the hon. Premier, who does not want me to be heard – or Hansen over there, the gentleman from Wilkie who was called a Communist, the other day, and it took him twenty-four hours to get in here and deny it) . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member knows that he cannot address another member by his given name.

Mr. Embury: — Yes. Well, the hon. member for Wilkie was called a Communist, the other day, and it took him twenty-four hours to come down here with a prepared, written statement, hidden behind newspapers, to deny it.

But I know these Socialist agitators so well. We have heard them so often, during the last three Sessions, and the bits of this one that have gone by. They always like to interfere when it starts to hurt – that's the point. Now, that hon. gentleman from Wilkie, who was called a Communist, the other day, and who took twenty-four hours to come in and deny it, is a man who does not like to hear us say these things; but he knows, and I know, that there was no public outcry for any such change or amendment to The City Act. None of us realized that there was any harm being done because the District Court Judge sat on the Police Commission – he was a safeguard against unruly characters – he was a very useful and helpful one in the sane administration of the Police. Nobody heard it suggested that that should be done, and yet, without any pressure from the public at all, up popped our Socialists and put that amendment through. What for?

Hon. I. C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — According to plan.

Mr. Embury: — According to plan? That is what I suggest to you. Yes, the hon. Minister of Agriculture says it is an 'embryo' plan, but I can tell you that is what they did, and we solemnly debated it in this House. Nobody in this House has got up and made a pro-Russian speech quite the equal of the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Nobody has! As a matter of fact, from one end of this country to the other, that will be known before you go back to the country.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We'll be glad to take it back to the country.

Mr. Embury: — We are more indebted to the hon. Minister of Agriculture than we are to any member of this House for disclosing the true intent and purpose and colour of himself and, of course, the colleagues who sit with him in the Cabinet of this province. If they like that sort of colleague they are all tarred with the same brush – and a most unfortunate brush it is, at a time like this. The hon. gentlemen cannot tell me anything about himself, after that speech of his, last year.

Premier: — He cannot tell you anything, period!

Mr. Embury: — I don't think that gentleman can tell me anything, anyway. Certainly the hon. gentleman will have to talk more sense than he has so far for me to listen . . .

Premier: — Or to understand.

Mr. Embury: — But that is a point worth making – that there was no public outcry for it, nobody recognized a public abuse; but up popped our brave little Socialist planners and put that amendment on the books. I suggest to you, it was so that the framework or the background would be there when the time came. That is my suggestion.

Now, to go on to another point, Sir: early in the Session of 1947 the Socialists brought down a new Public Service Act, and under Section (54) – which was negatively worded – the effect of it was to remove an existing restriction and to bring the whole of the Public Service into politics. That is my suggestion. Anyone who wants to read Section (54) may do so. I read it yesterday, and it states in effect that civil servants were now allowed public authority, allowing certain restrictions which I suggest to you, in practical application, would have no actual effect at all insofar as restrict them from acting during office hours or after hours was concerned. We have an example of it in the case of Shumiatcher who was downtown in the middle of the day on Municipal Election Day, working his head off.

So I say to you that Section (54) of the new Public Service Act of 1947 simply has the effect of bringing the whole of the Public Service into politics. Again there was no public outcry; there was no pressure that anybody could observe; there was no demand for it, or abuse, that anybody recognized, asking for that; yet up popped our little Socialist planners again, and in went that Section bringing the whole of the Civil Service into politics. I think that was a most unfortunate thing, if not a wicked thing. To-day, even in the city of Regina, you will find the wives of some of these unfortunate civil servants, going around canvassing for the CCF, probably in the hope that their husbands will not lose their jobs. That is an iniquitous thing. That is Socialism at its very wickedest – to bring the public service into politics like that is to put that man in a position where he feels, rightly or wrongly, that he must go into politics or to assist in politics, and his wife must help in politics, in aid of the government. They think they are bettering themselves – they are protected. I say that is wrong, and that is not all of it, Sir, because during those very years and up to to-day, they have increased the numbers of the civil service enormously. Can't you see how this Socialist plan can be put across? Can't you see that, with all these plans, this thing is going to work for total Socialism? If you cannot see that, no matter how many times you have been told – oh, I know the hon. Minister of Agriculture believes in it in a pro-Russian way – but the rest of us do not, and these are most important matters, for they make their steady encroachment upon the safety and integrity and freedom of our people.

Voice: — You are speaking for a lot of people!

Mr. Embury: — Well, you will be surprised at the next election, I hope, as to just how many people!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — It is you who will be surprised.

March 11, 1948

Mr. Embury: — Well, I do not know whether I will or not, but time will tell. Certainly we will have to do better than this sort of thing.

Premier: — Try it! We invite you to try it!

Mr. Embury: — Now, I do not want to go on, although I could go on . . .

Premier: — Please do!

Mr. Embury: — Well, of course, if you would like to hear me repeat it – but you have heard a great many more arguments than these, to try and bring to light the plans which this Government has, and which its ‘backroom boys’ apparently seem to embrace. They are objectionable to free men, Sir, and I do not say that in a political way at all. I say it with absolute sincerity, that I regard it with very grave alarm.

I know they have brought the agricultural industry under the ‘commissar’ of agriculture over there. They use the veteran as a Socialist ‘guinea pig’ and so on. I will not repeat again, what you will hear so often, about the pro-Russian speech which the gentleman made. I want to be fair, but the hon. gentlemen who sit over there get very few marks for fairness, when they are criticizing anyone on this side of the House; but I would say that anybody who had as narrow and warped a view of fairness as they have, certainly should not be listened to when it comes to judging that sort of thing. I will grant to any man that this Government has hidden its Socialist plans beneath a layer of benevolent, helpful and progressive legislation – there is no doubting that. A great deal of your legislation has been well worthwhile; but it is the bitter, unpromising process of the Socialist plan that I object to. There have been many worthwhile things done by this Government, and I have no quarrel with it at all. I tell you this, that if you had just restricted your plans to that kind of government, and left Socialism alone, you could have endured forever; but it seems you have missed your chance to be of real service to this country, and you have done it by allowing yourselves to be led astray by a set of Socialistic extremists. It is no wonder that men like the hon. member for Moosomin speak of the Socialists as he does; and I agree with him, when he describes you Socialists, entirely. I do not mean to associate myself with this recent unpleasantness, but I am referring to his very able address to the House the other day.

I say to you that when we have to watch the bitter, uncompromising progress towards control of essential institutions in this country, I think the hon. member for Moosomin is quite right in taking the firm stand with you that he did. I do not suppose it would be possible for any man to speak with the voice that he did, or with the understanding that he did, when he was addressing the House upon this debate, and I must say that I associate myself with him in his remarks, entirely.

Before I sit down, I would like to say a few words about the speech of the hon. Premier, the other day. I have not bothered to trace all the developments in this House, but, knowing as I do some of the hon. gentleman who sit in the CCF caucus, it has been downright surprising to me, and to a great many other people, to see that you would allow this plan to go as far as it has without trying to put a stop to it. That is the surprising thing.

It was for trying to point out these very things that the hon. member for Moosomin had his honour and his integrity attacked so viciously, if I may say so, by the Premier on Tuesday of this week. A more bitter and vicious thing I have never heard. Many of the hon. members have been taken in by speeches of the hon. Premier's like that, and I suggest to you it is not fair. The real Socialist plan which I have attempted to describe is well-hidden by men like that. He is a very, very talented Socialist speaker indeed. I have heard Socialists talking in Hyde Park, only they do not time their breathing and their phraseology in quite such a clever way as he does. He has the same general line of talk, of course; but in England they keep them in Hyde Park – they don't let them into the Parliament Buildings. In all, a few jokes and a little evasive content, and then a fighting peroration – that sort of characterizes every speech I have ever heard him make.

Premier: — At least I don't get someone to type it out.

Mr. Embury: — I have become quite accustomed to it, and I suppose the hon. members of the House have, too. Speakers in Hyde Park are more sincere than the hon. Premier, if I may say so. They do not seem to have practised their technique so much. I often wonder what school of Socialist agitation he must have studied, or how he learned it, or how he must have practiced it up. I notice he went down to California, last year, for a couple of months, and I rather fancied he was down there on a refresher course. Anyway, California is the hottest place for Communism in the United States; it is the sort of place you would expect him to go for a refresher course for a couple of months.

Now, we have listened to the hon. Premier defending his Government in that kind of a speech on Tuesday. Of course, he did not say anything about the Socialist plan – they never do, these clever Socialists – especially around election time. We listened to him, and, first of all we had the usual treatment of tête-a-tête and an easy chat to put everybody at their ease, and so on; then we had the usual misleading comments about the Budget, with a lot of statistics on other provincial budgets (net budgets, too). He did not help us much about the criticism that the hon. Leader of the Opposition had made – that the Government Finance Office was controlling many millions of dollars of this Province's assets outside the budget entirely – he did not say very much about that, but he did say that in Ottawa, during the war, they formed Crown corporations even within departments. In reply to that, I ask you to remember that that was done during the war.

Premier: — And is still done!

Mr. Embury: — Well, it was done during the war. We are in an economic crisis, perhaps, now; but I do not know of any that is still being done. The ones he

was referring to were during the war, I suggest. Furthermore, since that time they have means by which they can make a very thorough inquiry into their affairs, and they have done so. That was during a time when the Premier ought to know more about what was going on than I could, because he was sitting back here in Canada, planning this Socialist victory in Saskatchewan while the rest of us were overseas doing our job. Anyway, he does not try to explain this business of Dyson Carter; that is, he just goes on, not really answering the criticism made at all.

There was one other point which the hon. Premier made, and that was something to do with the Communists being in support of the CCF in this election. I do not think that is a matter of importance, one way or the other. I do not think any of us object at all to the communist who admits he is a communist, so long as we can recognize him. That is no worry to anybody. But the public of this country has driven the Communist underground, and that is where he does his best work to-day. I repeat, it is not the man who admits he is a Communist that we are worrying about, at all. It is the Communist who bores into public life and spreads Communists propaganda wherever he goes, and denies that he is a Communist the whole time he is about it – that is the man we want to get hold of.

The hon. Premier can read Communist advertisements to this House until he is black in the face, but it will not change the essential problem, as far as the safety and integrity of Canada is concerned, for the future. Everybody knows that the Communists supported the Liberals the last time, and I have sympathy with the honest CCF'er who is tangled up with the gang this time – they have no use for Communists; but it is the people within the CCF who are doing the very harm that we suggest should be cleaned out, if the public is to have any faith in that movement. The Premier, as I say, can read Communist advertisements to this House all he likes, but he will never remove the public doubts arising as a direct result of your own Party's activities.

Premier: — You read that sentence before.

Mr. Embury: — After the hon. Premier had finished reading us the Communist advertisements, and generally skirted around, not answering any criticism at all, we were treated to his attempted justification of his Socialist intervention into the fish business in the north. The hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. L. M. Marion) had gone to the trouble of explaining to the House that he himself was a northern trader, but that he was lucky enough to reside just outside a zone in which trading with what he lovingly called “Uncle Joe” (referring to the hon. Minister of Natural Resources) was not compulsory. A very fortunate thing, apparently, it was that he was not in that zone. The hon. member for Athabaska said that he did not mind a Marketing Board, provided it was not in the business on a compulsory basis, with the purpose of making a profit for the Government. That was the point he made, and I think he made a very good point indeed. The hon. member for Athabaska also said, “the difference between, say, the Canadian Wheat Board and a Socialist board was that the Canadian Wheat Board passed all of its profits back to the farmer.”

Premier: — Are you sure of that?

Mr. Embury: — Well, I am quoting the hon. member for Athabaska, and I may say that I have far more faith in him than I have in the hon. Premier.

Premier: — I have no doubt.

Mr. Embury: — I don't know why anybody would not. In any event, he said that the Fish Board, on the other hand, paid four cents per pound for Grade "A" frozen whitefish to the fisherman, and then sold it at thirty cents a pound or whatever it is in Chicago, and put the difference in its pocket, less administrative expenses. That was his point, and a very good point, too.

The hon. Premier, applauded all around by friends of the Socialist Party, though he could answer that by leaning well across his desk and saying: "The hon. member for Athabaska does not dare say he is not in favour of a Marketing Board." But I say to you — that is not an answer to the criticism, but it is the typical sort of evasive answer you may expect to get from the hon. Premier; a pretty fair sample of Socialist persuasion.

Another most ridiculous explanation offered to the House by the hon. Premier on Tuesday, was when he started to tell us about the butcher with the gravel contract. I do not know much about it, but I made a few inquiries, and it might interest the House to learn what I found out. I am informed, Sir, and I believe it to be true, that this good man is a full-time employee of the Army & Navy Super Market as a butcher — that is what he does for a living. He is not a contractor, and knows nothing about the contracting business. I do not think he even owns a wheelbarrow, unless he has a garden.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — He's not the only one!

Mr. Embury: — Oh, I know you are not going to like this, but just be patient, just be silent, and I will get my side of it off my chest and then you can have a go at it when I have finished. I repeat — he is not a contractor and he does not know the first thing about the business. He does not own any gravelling equipment of any sort or description.

Hon. J. T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — Are you making that statement?

Mr. Embury: — Yes, I am. This gentleman did not even have a \$100 company, like Mr. Deis is supposed to have had. The hon. Premier said that he was one of a number of men who got into a Co-operative to build roads. That is what he said, and I must say, if this be true, that the contract was not apparently made with a Co-operator, because the answer to the question on the Order Paper indicates the contract was made with Mr. Schan; but the hon. Premier led us to believe that this good Mr. Schan had joined together with some other public-spirited men to co-operate, to fix the roads in this province by getting a contract to gravel bits and pieces of it around and about Moose Jaw, Waseca, Minton, Holdfast, Chamberlain, Aylesbury, Vonda — about 65 or 70 miles of roads, I think, is roughly what he got — this public-spirited co-operator. Well, I will say this much — it was a very laudable ambition for these gentlemen to try and improve the roads, considering the state they are in, but I must say that, insofar as

the hon. Premier would have us believe that this honest Mr. Schan was doing it without any profit – simply for the purpose of improving the roads, or some much benevolent motive – he is stretching it a bit, and it is rather difficult for the House to follow him in that.

Premier: — Difficult for you.

Mr. Embury: — Well, I know – but most people do not do that sort of thing, especially if they are employed butchers. However, that is not all. I am told that, in addition to this good Mr. Schan's high talents for co-operation on all these lines, and his qualifications as an unequipped, road-gravelling contractor engaged as a butcher, that this Mr. Schan also had the perspicacity to be the President of the East End CCF Association in Regina. Of course that is a remarkable coincidence; but then, people like that are always co-operators with a high motive, especially when the hon. Premier is talking of them.

If Mr. Schan was a co-operator, and if he got any man together at all, to gravel the roads, then certainly some of them who were engaged in it did not even know that Mr. Schan was in the deal at all; and if what I heard is correct, and I suggest that it is more correct than what the hon. Premier told us, this amiable Mr. Schan was co-operating all right – but he was co-operating with his banker, and with his elders and wisers in the CCF Party; and if there was any co-operating done by him apart from that, it was only after somebody threatened to sue him. That may be your type of co-operation; but I say this to the hon. Premier: when I noticed a motion on the Order Paper – yesterday, I think it was – asking for the return of certain correspondence relating to this good, co-operating Mr. Schan, the best way for the hon. Premier to let the House have the full information would be for him to table that correspondence so we may all have a look at it.

Mr. J. T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — It will all be tabled.

Mr. Embury: — If it is not tabled until next Session, as happened to one Return that was asked for over a year ago – if that Return does not come down, you can take it, Sir, that at least some of us will believe that you have something to hide. We will put it that way. Now, that is all I am going to say about Mr. Schan.

We were entertained next by the hon. Premier, before he sat down, with a most strenuous attack upon the integrity of the hon. member for Moosomin. Oh, I know he said he was not going to do it, but he went ahead and did it anyway. Apparently that hon. member for Moosomin resents it very warmly, and I do not blame him at all. As the hon. Premier did when he attacked the integrity of the judges, of course he said he was not going to attack the integrity of the judges; and he said the same thing about the hon. member for Moosomin. He said: "Oh, I would not suggest that the hon. member knew anything about it – Oh, no!" Then he went onto say this – that "the public's money was being taken into the Liberal campaign funds to the tune of nearly \$70,000" – and he said, "either the hon. member for Moosomin was very inept or incompetent or the hon. member for Moosomin knew of it and made no complaints."

Throughout his speech the hon. Premier had clearly indicated, what the whole House knows so well – that the hon. member for Moosomin is neither inept nor incompetent, nor is he dishonest, as the hon. Premier knows even better than I do. But that is what he said, and that was after the preface, “Oh, I would not want to implicate him with it,” and following it up with that sort of thing is clever Socialism. That is the clever argument of a clever Socialist.

Premier: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. My hon. friend is apparently quoting me, either from his rather poor memory or from a press report. The record is in my hand – the transcript from the dictaphone record. My hon. friend claimed the privilege of reading, but he is quoting inaccurately and erroneously.

Mr. Embury: — He certainly did say that.

Premier: — Well, what I said is recorded here on the disc which is taken off the dictaphone. That is why we have a record here, in order to correct people like my hon. friend. I am quoted as saying this:

“My hon. friend, yesterday, talked about a butcher getting a gravel contract, and I want to say to him that while this thing started under the Provincial Secretary in 1940, when the Provincial Secretary went into the Service; the Tax Commission was transferred to the Department of Highways over which my hon. friend presided.”

Then I said this, and this is the part my hon. friend is quoting:

“My hon. friend either did not know this was going on, in which case he was either inept an incompetent, or he did know, in which case he was a party to depriving the Saskatchewan Treasury of money which went either into the Liberal Party or into someone’s pocket. Now I want to say, in all kindness to my hon. friend, that most of this went on in 1940, 1941 and 1942, and I can quite believe that he knew nothing about it.”

That is the transcript, but the press left that sentence out, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Embury: — That is the point exactly, – that the hon. Premier did again what he does so cleverly as a Socialist – as he did in the case of the judges, when he said he wouldn’t dream of attacking their integrity, but went right on to do it. So, in the case of the hon. member for Moosomin, he said he was either inept or incompetent or else he knew about it, and then he went on. Everybody knows the hon. member is neither of those things. As a matter of fact, the hon. Premier spent certain portions of his speech complimenting him on his ability; so that everybody knew that he was not inept or incompetent – so the inference is left, quite clearly. Of course, the hon. Premier does not consider that a smear! He does not consider that to be a clever, effective destruction of a man’s character, to be resented by any honest man. I think it was one of the

March 11, 1948

wickedest things I have heard said by any man; and I must say, as I have said before, that I do not blame the hon. member for Moosomin for being very much annoyed about it, either.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — You are not saying much for the honesty of Deis.

Mr. Embury: — I know — you may endorse that sort of thing, you may embrace it, you may sit with it. God bless you! You are welcome to do it — nobody else wants it.

Premier: — May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Embury: — When I am finished, yes.

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — It will be too late then.

Mr. Embury: — The hon. gentleman, during the last ten minutes, has spent more time on his feet than I have. He does not like this, I know. You can always tell when it begins to hurt with a Socialist; he starts to jump up and down and try to interfere and close off those arguments if he can. That is very small credit to them, indeed.

I may say this about the Acme Dye and Chemical Works — while I know nothing about it, and care less (it has nothing to do with me) — I did hear the hon. gentleman suggesting that I do have anything to do with the Acme Dye Works. In any event it is the truth that I know nothing about this Company and care less, whether those who love to smear their critics would say otherwise or not. But I did hear the hon. Premier's statement in respect to it yesterday, and I suggest to you that there was a great deal the matter with that statement as told to the House, and I am going on nothing else, for I know nothing more about it. Here is what he said — and a very peculiar thing too. The hon. Premier came in here yesterday, or rather day before yesterday, 1948, presumably having available to him this information ever since 1944. Since 1944 up to now, posing as a champion of public morality and all the rest of it, he did not do one single, solitary thing about this dreadful piece of information — not solitary thing — until Tuesday of this week, 1948, when the CCF (if I may suggest it) were found to pretty well clogged up with Communists. He brings it up then, trying to get public attention away from himself.

The hon. Premier said a number of peculiar things on Tuesday last, in connection with this contract. He said this Company got away with \$69,160, (I am quoting the figures for the newspaper, so correct me if I am wrong), they got away with that much public money and, he said, the Government were paying \$5.80 per pound for the dye to which he refers. He also said: "if you add up all the figures I think that we bought 28,981 pounds." He did not tell us how much the Acme Dye Company was paying, though, during 1942. He knows what he is paying now; but he is accusing the Acme Dye Company or somebody of being improper in their relations with the Government. From the figures the Premier gave us, and dividing one into the other — and I am not very good at arithmetic, I am afraid — it seems to me that he reckons they were making \$2.34 per pound at the time of the sales he referred to, between 1940 and 1942, by way of profit

on each pound of this dye, in order to make up the total of about \$70,000. Now, Sir, if it should happen that the Acme Dye Company were making much less than that per pound (I do not know what they were making, but if it were any less than that) then the hon. Premier is quite wrong when he said that approximately \$70,000 of public money went into the Liberal campaign funds or into somebody's pocket, to the hon. member for Moosomin's knowledge. Quite wrong. I do not know what their overhead was, I do not know what they paid the wholesaler – the hon. Premier did not tell the House, and I doubt whether he knows, but he said it anyway.

Another thing I find very difficult to believe about this statement, Sir, is this: Why on earth did this iniquitous company, with all this on its conscience, come back to the Socialists in 1944 and make bids to them at \$5.00 a pound? If they had all this on their conscience, do you suppose they would draw attention to themselves, and invite the scrutiny that the hon. Premier has given to it, Mr. Speaker? I doubt it.

There are several more things, and most unfair things, took, that he said, and most peculiar things. The Premier said (and I suggest it is typical of him, too) that they bought 17,000 pounds in 1942. Then he said: "They must have been expecting something to happen." The implication was that they were going to be defeated in the election – but the election was two years away! I suggest this to you, that 17,000 pounds in 1942 does not mean at all what the hon. Premier intended the House to believe, or in fact intended everybody within sound of his voice – while speaking on the radio – to believe.

I suggest that in 1942, when the Americans had come into the war – even if the hon. Premier had not – that the prospects for a shortage of materials and supplies was very, very acute indeed. Furthermore, I suggest that if this Company had been trying to wring the last dollar out of the deal, if they had been trying to take the public money unreasonably, they would have sold more dye closer to election time than they did. But two years elapsed, during which time the hon. Premier does not tell us what they bought at all. I am taking it, from his statement, that the 17,000 pounds' order in 1942 was the last order made, and that two years went by during which none was sold at all. And the hon. Premier invited the House to believe that there was something mysterious in that!

Now then, let me suggest his to you: that in 1942, the prospect for wartime shortages – true, that is a matter of levity for some of the hon. gentlemen yonder – but as a matter of fact, most people who had any sense of responsibility at all knew that there was a very likely prospect of a lack of aniline dye, or whatever it is, at about that period, and it might easily be a very sensible thing for the Government to do. I wonder, for example, what this Government has ordered through its purchasing agency to-day, for this same sort of dye? I think it is conclusive that if you had seen a number of heavy sales of this commodity to the Government within two years prior, or right close to the election, that there might be something in it; because it would prove, first of all that the supply was available, and then possibly would quite clearly imply that they were trying to sell a large bill of goods to the Government, his arguments and his evidence and his figures to the contrary, absolutely.

March 11, 1948

Now, as I have told the House, I do not know anything more than what the Premier told us, and I care less, but I say this: I hesitate to take the statement of the Premier, given to the House yesterday, on this question, and I have told you I have two or three reasons why I have some doubts in respect to it. Until I can find out exactly what did happen in that matter, I suggest to you that the statement we have had so far is not particularly reliable.

I will give you a sample of reliability, Socialist style. Here in my hand I have a hospital admission discharge record. This is rather difficult to demonstrate to the House without your being able to look at this form also. It comes in four pieces, between three levels of which you will see carbons, fixed in there. That document is signed, right where you see my finger, through these carbon copies, by every patient leaving a hospital. This is administration, Socialist style! Up where my thumb is, in very small type, you will see this: "Mark an "x" in all boxes." That refers to these various portions of statistics which you can probably see. "You are making four copies so press firmly, using about a 2H pencil on a hard surface. Be sure to answer all questions. Have patients sign both original and quadruplicate (white and pink) copies." Now, that is the only hint you get – so that the unsuspecting patient signs there; and what he can see, when he signs there, is simply a number of statistics with which he would no doubt agree. Yes! This set of instructions indicates that the other three colored copies are 'copies'. They referred to them as quadruplicates, white and pink.

Now, the first copy, the original, states that it is to go to The Director, Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan, Regina, so away it goes; the next copy (so-called copy), the duplicate, to the Director, Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan, so away it goes; the next so-called copy is the patient's case record, and things start to get a little interesting at this point, because it is not a copy at all, for this so-called copy number 3 is something that you see for the very first time. This is the Socialist way of doing things. Mind you, if anybody else tried to do business this way they would be in cells – in jail – and rightly so. Down here, unbeknownst to the victim, it says this: "I hereby agree to assume responsibility for the payment of hospital charges not covered by The Saskatchewan Hospitalization Service Plan or any other agency." That is the copy of the agreement – not on copy one, or on copy two – the hon. Premier ought to have a look at that, I believe it comes under his administration. That is the sort of thing you bump into when you start dealing with Socialists; and I say this to you, I don't stand here . . . Oh, he thinks that funny – that is the sort of thing that would amuse the hon. Premier, but it does not amuse any other person with whom he has to deal . . .

Premier: — No, I do not think that is funny – I think you are funny.

Mr. Embury: — That is a great joke to him . . .

Premier: — No, no! You are the joke. The argument is pathetic.

Mr. Embury: — I know it is always very funny when it hurts, with you. I have seen you laugh — the more telling it is, the harder the Premier laughs because he hopes that his caucus-bound friends will be relieved by that; but I can assure you, that sort of thing is no laughing matter to other people who are not as interested in the welfare of the Socialists in this province as he is.

I do not stand here, on any o f these issues, to please forgiveness at all for any Liberal in the province . . .

Voices: — Oh, no!

Mr. Embury: — It has nothing to do with me, but what I do say is this: None of these straws, or red herrings, that the hon. Premier wishes to draw across the trail of the issues of to-day are going to be effective. The people of the province should understand, and understand quite clearly here and now, that no government, be it Dominion or Provincial, can bring upon its people, to whom it is supposed to administer, the misery which this Government can bring upon its people if it is allowed to carry out its announced plans.

I will not support the motion.

(Debate continued, next page)

March 11, 1948

Hon. J. H. Brockelbank (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — I want first of all to pay my compliments to the Provincial Treasurer for the Budget and the manner in which he presented it to this House. I want also to say to the House that, though this is the largest Budget in the history of the Province of Saskatchewan, it is but a measure of the service that is being given to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

I remember, Mr. Speaker, in about 1935, Dr. Uhrich, who was then the Minister of Public Health in the Province of Saskatchewan, at the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities' Convention — my hon. friend from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) will probably remember this — stated to those people at the convention — the councilors at Saskatchewan — “What Saskatchewan needs is state health, and this government will bring state health.” In 1935, what did they do? But more than that, in 1942, at the Liberal Convention in Saskatoon — no it was the Liberal Council at the Bessborough Hotel — we get this headline in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix: “Dr. Uhrich Tells of Health Record.” Maybe that has something to do with why they lost the election. You cannot give health services for nothing; you cannot give grants to municipalities to help them to give health services; you cannot give free treatment to old age pensioners, to mothers' allowances cases for nothing. My hon. friends opposite seem to think that you can.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that the hon. member for the Mediterranean Area decided to beat a strategic retreat just at this moment. He was going to answer some questions . . .

Mr. Danielson: — You did not ask them.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — But they were like Dr. Uhrich's promises of 1935, and, you know, one good thing about those promises the Liberals used to make to us, they could use them over and over again; they never used them up; they were always good as long as the people would believe them. But I do want to make a few comments with regard to the hon. member's statement — the hon. and gallant member from the Mediterranean Area. He referred to what he said was the not very reliable statement of the Premier — I am not surprised at him saying that . . .

Mr. Danielson: — You should not be.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . The part that I was surprised at was that he said: “I do not care, I care less about this thing.” I am surprised to hear any member in this House say that they do not care whether some big company got away with \$70,000 or not; I am surprised at that.

He tried to do some figuring, rather unsuccessfully, that this company got the dye shipped direct from Chicago to Regina. That company should have been able to buy it from the manufacturers in Chicago at the same price that we could buy it. Whether they did nor not, I do not know; but they should have been able to buy it at the same price or cheaper, and, if they did so, they should have made a profit of \$70,000 or thereabouts.

There have been a lot of things blamed on the war; but in 1942 the Liberal Party in this province was on pretty shaky ground. They knew that they should have an election, and they were scared to jump in. They were afraid the water was pretty cold – it was cold, too. In 1942, 17,000 pounds would have made about \$50,000 profit (not bad), with the possibility of an election coming in 1942, which was four years after the previous election. They did not get up their courage. My hon. friends sitting over here, in 1943 voted in this House to extend the life of the Legislature to six years. They finally had to go.

I do want to make a comment with regard to Section 198 of The R.M. Act. My hon. friend said that any 25 local rate-payers could bring a municipality into the U.F.C. if the council made the grant. Any 25 rate-payers could not do any such thing. It had to be, and still has to be, 25 rate-payers who are bone-fide paid-up members of the U.F.C.

Mr. Danielson: — That is still worse.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That is a different thing altogether.

Then they may petition the council and then after that the council may make that donation to the U.F.C. and have the people enrolled. After they are enrolled, then not even 50 per cent of the people do not want to be in it, but if 40 per cent signify their intention – less than a majority – that they do not want to be enrolled, then the council must not make any further contribution on the strength of that decision.

The trouble is, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friends who sit on your left, have absolutely no faith in democracy. They do not believe in giving any power or responsibility to the elected representatives of the people. They would like to leave, in the hands of the judges, or someplace like that, all of the responsibilities. That is quite evident in the next subject which the hon. member dealt with. But compare this Section 198 with what is in The City and Town Acts in regard to the Chambers of Commerce! My hon. friends sit there, and they never say a word about that; but the City Council of Regina, Moose Jaw or Saskatoon, or the Council of any town in the Province of Saskatchewan, without any petition from their rate-payers can make a contribution to the Chamber of Commerce or the Board of Trade, and everyone knows that, today, the Chamber of Commerce is fighting tooth and nail on the side of reaction; that the Chamber of Commerce in Canada is in politics head over heels. Everyone knows it, and there is no provision for a petition to stop the Council from making that contribution.

Mr. Danielson: — Can you not do it?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — If my hon. friend thinks that Section 198 is wrong, I think he first should move an amendment to The City and Town Acts with regard to the Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Danielson: — That is your business.

March 11, 1948

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, I want him to do that. If he believes Section 198 is wrong, let him first deal with these other things which there is no control of at all, or else put them on the same basis where there will be some control. “What is sauce for the goose is not sauce for the gander,” especially if it happens to be my friend’s gander.

Now, with regard to the Board of Police Commissioners in the city, the old situation was that the Board of Police Commissioners consisted of the Mayor, the Magistrate and the District Court Judge, in those cities where they had a Board of Police Commissioners – they did not have a Board in all cities. Some places, in small cities, the police were directly under the Council, and, according to my hon. friend, that is terrible. He wanted a judge, not responsible to the people of the city at all, to have control of the administration of justice and the police forces of that city. We believe that the people themselves should have control. That is why the Act provided now that the majority of the police commissioners are elected by the people, so that the people, if they want to have justice properly administered, have the power to do something about it. Under the old setup they could not do anything, about it. They had no voice in it because they had only one representative on the police commission. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that to leave the control of such an important service in the hands of people who are not responsible to the citizens, is definitely a Fascist trend. We want to keep control of these things in the hands of the people.

My hon. friend also objected, as did the member for Moosomin (Mr. Procter), to the East End buter getting a contract, but apparently it was all right for a West End lawyer to be in the dye business.

I would like also to say a few words about this Communist question. You know, Mr. Speaker, the Communists have done so much dancing around, during recent years, that they have been every place except the Tory Party. That is one thing they cannot go for.

Mr. A. W. Embury (Mediterranean Area): — We do not mind the ones that admit it.

Mr. Danielson: — They have found their proper home now.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I hold in my hand a copy of the Canadian Tribune – this is the Communist paper in Canada – Saturday, May 5, 1945. There is an article here entitled “Who Are the Splitters”? by Leslie Morris. This is what Leslie Morris says:

“It is not a bit of use simply blaming the Liberals, as some do, for this disunity. The CCF has made it a thousand times more difficult to compel electoral agreements with the Liberals, and to force the Liberals into liberalizing their policy, than need have been the case. Every time Ted Jolliffe or Coldwell say there is no difference between the Liberals than the Tories, they further divide the progressive movement and make infinitely harder the job of forging a new set of political relations to correspond with the actual relations arising out of the war.”

That was in 1945, when the Communists were with the Liberals. The Communists were violently opposed to the Liberals in the middle of the war, then at the end of the war they were all with Mackenzie King and his great war effort; and they have now made these statements about their going to support the CCF. But there is this one difference: that neither the Social Credit Party nor the Liberal Party has ever made clear their stand when the Communists were making love to them. None of them disowned the Communists. They were working right along in the elections with them – appeared on platforms, and all the rest of it.

You see the people have been divided on politics, purpose by divided. Big Business and the people that control Big Business and get the favours, they do not care what political party is in power, so long as it is one of the old political parties that they can control. That is not a new thing. Away back in 1911 there was a lumber company up at Crooked River; there were two brothers, the McDonald Brothers, in that lumber company. They were a pair of great old Liberals, but, in 1911, the Liberal Government in Canada was defeated. The government at Ottawa controlled the timber at that time. Here is a letter from Hector to his brother D. N. McDonald, dated September 26, 1911. He mentions that the Liberals were swept out of office, and then a little postscript is added, “If anything, we are Conservatives now.” There is no difference between them, Mr. Speaker, that is quite true.

Some words have been said about political patronage. Well, if there is anybody that should keep quite about political patronage, it is my hon. friends that sit opposite here, because they are certainly experts at it, and have been experts at it in the past. You know if anyone got a contract from them, that contractor was not even free to hire the people that he wanted to hire. He had to hire the people that the M.L.A. or the M.P. (Liberal) told him to hire. Here is a letter written by the contractor, to a man who was asking for a job, and the contractor says: “I am in receipt of a letter from J. A. MacMillan, M. P. for Wadena, in which he requests that I put you to work in the North Battleford Mental Hospital.” This was in 1938. He says: “It is impossible for me to do so at the present time as my contract calls for all local help being employed, and Mr. Gregory is checking me very close on this same thing.” Mr. Gregory was not going to let Mr. MacMillan get away with any of his patronage.

Then we come to another question that has been raised, about the civil service. I want to remind this House again about some of the things that I found when I took over in my Department, and here are two letters written by G. J. Matte, the Commissioner of the Northern Areas Branch, to an L.I.D. Inspector; one of the letters telling him that Doug Munro – Anyone know who Doug Munro in Regina is? I think he is a pal of Archie McCallum’s . . .

Mr. Patterson: — Schan!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — No, he is not a pal of Schan’s.

The letter states that Mr. Matte wanted the inspector to come in, and charge his expenses in the usual way, to see Doug Munro the Liberal organizer.

March 11, 1948

Here is another one in which Mr. Matte writes, and he says: "C. R. MacIntosh of North Battleford (M.P.) was in my office a few days ago and asked me to endeavour to obtain some information for him as regard to the polls in L.I.D. No. 525." Then he goes on and asks this fellow to kindly send in the information. He says: "You should have no difficulty in obtaining this by getting in touch with our local friends."

Mr. Danielson: — What's wrong with that.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — What's wrong with that my hon. friend says; this man was getting \$3,750 a year and expenses.

A Voice: — What for?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — For political purposes is what he was getting it for, chiefly. He was head of the Northern Areas Branch and here are some of the excerpts from letters of one of his inspectors — Oscar J. LeFrancois, who is still up in the Shellbrook constituency. This was written from Meadow Lake, addressed to Mr. Matte, and he says — this was in 1943, there might have been an election in that year, you know — "If there are no prospects of an election, I would recommend that relief be practically discontinued although I am sure that relief will be needed the last two months of the summer, at least."

Here is another one he writes, and who does he write this one to? He writes this one to the Hon. Hubert Staines, Minister of Education . . .

Premier: — Is that "cesspool" Staines?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . July 13, 1942, and he says to Mr. Staines: "While you are visiting your constituency in the month of June, in the company of Mr. Matte, I promise you a periodic report on the political report therein, as well as to give you the reaction of Mr. Boucher's visit which coincided with yours." Signed Oscar J. LeFrancois.

There is another very good one here. This is also from LeFrancois to Matte, 1942: "I spent three days in and around Meadow Lake this week, and owing to the fact that several of our Athabasca constituents were there and I wanted to do a little ground or I should say underground work, which I will report a little later on when I have obtained more information from another source."

My hon. friend over here, from the Mediterranean Area, is worrying about dictatorships . . .

A Voice: — Fifth Columnists.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . The people that he supports politically, the people that he will probably be a candidate for in the coming election, are the people

who had the gestapo all over the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Embury: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows very well, I have said, I do not know how many times in the House, I do not support anybody politically.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member thinks it is dishonourable for him to support the Liberal Party or the Conservative Party, I will withdraw the remark.

Mr. Embury: — On a point of order, I think, this time, of calling me dishonourable. He misquotes the facts, deliberately too, and I do not think he should be allowed to do it, on a point of privilege. He knows that. He does not have to take my word for it; they are always trying to break through.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member does not support anybody.

Mr. Embury: — That is better.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Except himself.

Mr. Patterson: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question? Is this correspondence that the hon. gentleman is quoting, correspondence that he obtained from the files of the former Commissioner of Northern Areas, that he obtained by going through his records one night prior to the dismissal of the former Commissioner?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — No, that is not correct; but my hon. friend knows too much about this. There are not many people who know about this. I got them the evening following the day he was dismissed, and after Mr. Matte had gone through his office and had picked up all his personal stuff; not the night before. Mr. Matte sent some people back to the office, that evening, to get some more things that he did not pick up, that he missed; but he was too late.

Mr. Patterson: — When there was a call on the telephone to that office, the night before he was dismissed, the hon. gentleman answered it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I did not hear the question.

Mr. Speaker: — Would the hon. member repeat his statement.

Mr. Patterson: — There was a telephone call to the Commissioner's office the night before he was dismissed, and the Minister answered it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — How in the world does my hon. friend know that? I do not know that there was, I was not there the night before, and it is entirely incorrect. I will tell you how it is, Mr. Speaker. I was out

March 11, 1948

in the country I picked up these two letters. I did not have a key to the Northern Area Office, not until I dispensed with Mr. Matte and took his keys. I got in here that morning; at eleven o'clock I had Mr. Matte in my office and dismissed him – at eleven o'clock in the morning. I had been out of the city for a week, and if somebody has been telling the Leader of the Opposition, or if he has been making it up, it is all wrong.

Premier: — Has the Minister not the right to know what is going on?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Anyway, if I want to be in the office of any of the staff of my Department, at any time, I will be there; but I was not there at that time.

Premier: — Probably if the Leader of the Opposition had not taken his files, he would probably have had a lot more.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, this is another letter written by the famous Mr. LeFrancois, addressed again to Mr. Matte, There is a very interesting paragraph here, he says: “You are no doubt aware of the fact, as well as Mr. Staines, that the political situation in this constituency is apt to change owing to the recent removal by the Canadian Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company, of their employees from Gold Fields, Kimberley. At Gold Fields, the government had a large number of supporters on which to depend, and now there only remains the half-breeds to the south, in which group we have plenty of work to do. Marcien Marion was quick to grasp the situation, mentioning that the half-breeds have now controls, and in view of the potential wealth in the north it would be well to have the constituency represented by one capable of development.”

Earlier in this letter, Mr. LeFrancois says: “On my return I stopped at Ile a la Crosse, where I had a personal chat with Marcien Marion and Father Rossignol in the present of one another.” Then later in this letter this is what he has to say: “They were not even square with each other.” Mr. Speaker, I shall support the motion.

Mr. D. S. Valteau (A.S.V.R.): — Mr. Speaker, we have heard some very interesting things in the course of which I have managed to pile up numbers of notes, numbers of books and numbers of newspaper clippings, until I have begun almost to feel like the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), and suddenly realizing the awful predicament I was in, I began to feel a little guilty. However, I can assure the House that I do not intend to read every word here, and I will try to make my remarks as brief as possible.

There are in this House a number of members who occupy positions similar to mine, and that is that, other things being equal and unforeseen events not happening unexpectedly, we may find that if this often predicted and anticipated election should occur, this summer, if it should we might not be members here next year, and for that reason it is a good idea, I think, for us to try to go down as nobly as possibly; for us to try to make our last speeches in the House something that we can remember, something to be

carved on our epitaph. When people ask me what I intend to do after my term in this Legislature is finished, I would like to be able to reply that I am going to retire and write my memoirs. However, that depends upon fate; but I do hope that such speeches as I make in this House will be in the tenor of the speech made by the hon. member for Canora (Mr. Feeley) when he began the Debate in this House, this Session, a speech which I will be able to read in later years without being ashamed of it.

There has been a number of peculiar things happen during my term in this Legislature, and possibly many things which could not have been anticipated. The hon. member who is my seat-mate, stated that, during the time that the armed forces were overseas, they probably supported the CCF two out of three. Now, unfortunately, I was not stationed with the Canadian Army. I was with the R.C.A.F. and often I was broken up into small units stationed with the R.A.F.

Mr. Patterson: — Ho did you get together again?

Mr. Valleau: — Well, it was quite easy.

It was often my privilege to travel among my English brothers in the R.A.F. and to talk with them on many occasions; and while my hon. seat-mate said that he has heard Socialists speaking in Hyde Park, it has been my privilege to hear Socialists speaking very eloquently in the Halls of Westminster. I have heard Attlee, Bevin and Morrison, and have met these gentlemen personally; I was very much impressed with them. I have also found it my very good fortune to hear a great many Socialists – the people that my hon. friend referred to as ‘the men’ – I heard a great many of them speaking in the barracks on the various stations where I was stationed. I could have told anyone in Canada, and probably I could have told some of the members of the Labour Party in England, as I did, that Labour was bound to win the election in England if the R.A.F. was any cross-section of English public opinion, because it was there that I first noticed the strong tendency toward what has been called in this House Socialism or Social Democracy. It grieves, me, Sir, to find that, on my return, there are still people in Canada who use the term ‘Socialist agitator’ in a derisive sense, harking back to 1933, 1934 and 1935 days, to the days when R. B. Bennet was trying to apply what he called the ‘iron heel of ruthlessness’. Such a term as ‘Socialist agitator’ went out about 12 or 15 years ago, and it certainly was not part of the vocabulary of any of the R.A.F. boys that I worked with, and I do not think it was part of the vocabulary of the Canadian Army which, my hon. friend stated, supported the CCF two out of three.

However, when I was elected I made no pretence of trying to stand as an independent, because everywhere I went, in discussing the election, I found that the first question asked by the various Canadian units, was “What Party do you stand for?” “How do we know whether we should vote for

March 11, 1948

you unless we know the platform you are running on?" To satisfy that question I got out two circulars and I circulated these to all of the Canadian units that I could, with the permission of the Commanding Officers of these units, and I found that the Commanding Officers believed in free speech and were very democratic. When I requested them to, they almost invariably posted my notices up on the notice boards of the various units.

That is just part of the answer to the question of my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, as to how we got together. It was very interesting, very educational, and I enjoyed it tremendously, and I am confident that when the various members of the Canadian Army, Air Force and the Navy, voted for me, that they knew what they were voting for. That is why I have had no compulsion or hesitation whatever in standing up in this House and saying that I will support the platform I was elected on, and I still support the principles which two out of three of the Servicemen believed in at the time. I am not sure – it is always a debatable point, and we will not know for some time yet – whether these Servicemen, on returning home, have changed their minds as quickly as some of the other representatives of the Veterans or the Servicemen or the various groups, have changed their minds. It may be that they have viewed and had had their eyes open and are now horrified; but they have not told me so if they are.

But referring to that statement 'the men' and what they think, and how we are to determine what they think, I find it is a difficult thing for a Veteran returning from overseas, particularly if he has changes in fortune – if he finds that instead of washing dishes in the kitchen and scrubbing the floors of the canteen, that he is sitting as a member of the Legislature – it is difficult for him to maintain the point of view of the Veteran, and of the ordinary Servicemen, of which I was one.

Possibly that has been brought home to me more than anything else, by a book I read the other day. It is entitled "Back Home", by Bill Mauldin, one of the American Servicemen overseas who drew up the cartoons that appeared in the 'Stars and Stripes'. In the previous speech in which I referred to Marion Hargrove and Bill Mauldin, I did not quote from Mauldin; but in this book he tells of the remarkable change in his fortune, which he found on returning home. While overseas, he had been a common G.I. – a private – he had been bossed around and pushed around and he felt that he could draw cartoons that pictured the ordinary feeling of the ordinary Serviceman. When he returned home, he found that he was drawing cartoons for a large syndicate, and he felt he had to be very careful or his point of view would be changed. The point of view of a man with lots of money is not the same as the point of view of a Veteran returning home and struggling to make his living; and this book tells how he had to constantly fight against the tendency, which always exists, for a man to adopt the point of view of the class in which he finds himself. I think that Mauldin has done a very creditable job of trying to keep the point of view of the Veteran. But he does point out the danger of those of us who tell ourselves, he does point out the danger of us becoming what might be called 'professional Veterans'.

Referring to criticism that has been voiced about General Bradley and of his Veteran administration in the United States – General Bradley has been called the “G.I. General” – Mauldin refers to a speech which Bradley made in addressing the convention of the American Legion. He says that Bradley sat quietly at the speaker’s table while the usual convention paunches shook before the ‘mike’ and emitted the usual platitudes; Bradley did not bother wrapping himself in a flag, he was already warm enough. He said: “There are among the ranks of the high-salaried professional Veterans, those who forget that the Veteran has paid and is paying for all that he gets. More dangerous than the German Army is the demagoguery that deceives the Veteran today by promising him something for nothing.” Mauldin points out the danger of Veterans thinking too exclusively as a class of Veterans against the rest of the community, and emphasizes what I have endeavoured, in my very small way, to say on previous occasions, that our job as Veterans should be to get back as quickly as we can into the flow of the civilian community, and that the chief function of Veterans’ organizations – both in Canada and in our neighbour to the south – the chief function of these organizations is to assist us, through group action, to get back into the civilian stream and become citizens again.

Mauldin, I believe, when he came back, probably had something of the same outlook that I had, and that two-thirds of the Veterans had, and in this book he has done quite a bit of studying. I do not believe that he has changed his ideas greatly; I would not go so far as to say that he is a politician – he is not a politician – I believe, he is not even a Socialist; but he does have some hard things to say about the so-called free enterprise system. He says – referring to Hollywood and the west coast, which has been referred to as possibly the hot-bed of Communism or Socialism – that among the movie people there are a number who have not forgotten the days of ten cent lunches, and who still bear the scars inflicted by springs that burst through worn mattresses in 50-cent hotel rooms, and who realize that for every success at the top, there are twenty equally talented and equally hard working people at the bottom, who have not been blessed with the breaks. Some of them sleep better at night because their politics are on the side of the people at the bottom.

Then, in a later paragraph, he says – referring to the typical free enterpriser – he says: “Such characters sometimes remind me of a guy I knew when I grew up in the West. He was a successful farmer and one of the worst “Scrooges” the world ever saw; he was one of the ‘big business’ farmers, rather than the family farm that we hope to see established in Saskatchewan. He was not above tripping his neighbours, and he specialized in dropping around when they were in financial trouble, with the result that he soon owned a lot of farms. By some standards he was a booming success as a 100 per cent American free enterprise, but by my standards he was a horse’s tail.” I guess I should not go on, Mr. Speaker, because in referring to free enterprise, Bill Mauldin says many things that would hardly be parliamentary, and I do not wish to make un-parliamentary statements in this Assembly.

March 11, 1948

Now, as has been pointed out in this House, many things happened, while we were overseas, that we did not have a chance to know much about, some of them tied up with free enterprise. I found, the other day, an advertisement that appeared in the Saskatoon 'Star-Phoenix' during a by-election in Saskatoon. I guess this was before I went overseas; it is dated December 16, 1939, just at the time when war contracts were beginning to boom. This advertisement reproduces pictures of newspaper headlines: "Australian Defence to Spend \$178,000,000 on an Air-Training Scheme": "Canadian War Orders Climb to \$54,000,000". It is a great big advertisement; covers half of the 'Star-Phoenix' page, and in a little box it says: "To the citizens of Saskatoon":

"Do not give Saskatoon a black eye all over Canada. Do not tell all the rest of Canada and Great Britain that Saskatoon is not prepared to co-operate with the government in its efforts to win the war. Keep Saskatoon on the map; vote for the government and get war industries built in your city."

If I may say so, Mr. Speaker, this is typical of what was called the profitable patriotism of certain classes of Canadian enterprise, and even on occasion, newspapers can adapt their editorials to suit the changing political situation. Saskatoon 'Star-Phoenix' is usually very good in its editorials, very unbiased; but on this particular occasion it quoted, and I am quoting from the editorial of that date:

"On Monday the voters will give their decision. First is the viewpoint of the practical working politician who reduces the by-election to a question of whether or not Saskatoon is going to co-operate with the Federal authority in its vast air effort. It requires mutual co-operation. It is therefore, in view of the challenge to the government, implicit in the contesting of this Seat, it is up to Saskatoon to show that it is going to co-operate to the limit in whatever war activity Ottawa may assign it."

The implication is that, by working for the government, they are liable to get specific war contracts. There has been in this House, and I regret it, Sir, much argument that, through these progressive plans of the Government of Saskatchewan, there runs an undercurrent of conspiracy; some deep and unrevealed plan. Well, behind the administration of capitalistic governments, there is always the unrevealed plan; the plan such as I have outlined in that advertisement, that free enterprise and 'big business' is going to get just about what it likes, and sometimes even the implication that this establishment and consolidation of free enterprise will be linked up with elections and with appeals to people to vote in certain manners.

While I was overseas I was under the impression that it was such things we were struggling against, that they had been carried to their zenith, and they had reached the ultimate perfection in the German Fascist state; that there enterprise went to the community that supported Hitler, and if it did not support him, it lost not only the business and the enterprise, but quite a few other things as well. As a matter of fact, the

A.V.C.A. discussion groups, British and Canadian Armies, often had discussions on what constitutes Fascism. I have before me an appendix "23" to a book entitled "One Thousand Americans", by George Seldes. It is army talk of Orientation Fact Sheet No. 64, from the War Department of Washington, D.C., dated 24th of March, 1945. The title of it is "Fascism" and it gives notes for this week's discussion. I just want to let the House have a few lines from it. The time is getting on, but I shall conclude with this quotation, Sir. I do not want to let the House think that this my particular opinion, because I think, in cases such as this, I can give more weight to my opinion by quoting the source, although I substantially share many of the sentiments expressed in this particular talk. It states:

"Fascism cannot tolerate such religious and ethical concepts as the brotherhood of man. Fascists deny the need for International co-operation. These ideas contradict the Fascist theory of the master race. Right now in our nation, Fascists are spreading anti-British, anti-Soviet, anti-French and anti-United Nations propaganda."

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the Motion.

The debate was adjourned by Mr. D. M. Lazorko (Redberry).

The House then adjourned, without question put, at 11 o'clock p.m.