

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Eleventh Legislature**  
**4th Day**

**Tuesday, February 15, 1949**

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

**ADDRESS-IN-REPLY (Adjourned Debate)**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Kuziak for an Address-in-Reply.

**Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, I would first of all wish to concur, on behalf of the opposition, in the sentiments expressed in the third last paragraph of the speech from the throne wherein it says that the birth of a son to Their Royal Highnesses, Princess Elizabeth and the Duke of Edinburgh was an occasion of general rejoicing in all parts of the Commonwealth, including Saskatchewan, and, further, where it says the indisposition of His Majesty the King has been cause for regret and concern, and the people of this province hope and pray for the rapid and complete recovery of the King's health.

I think I can say that in Canada and Saskatchewan there is general realization of the great contribution the British Commonwealth of Nations makes to the welfare of mankind, the force it is in favour of stability and the preservation of human liberties and world peace, and that the position which His Majesty occupies as the link, almost the only link, joining the various self-government members of the Commonwealth is a most important one. I think all the people of Canada rejoice that that should be so and that His Majesty has so conducted himself as to earn and merit the loyal devotion of the people of Canada. We certainly do hope and pray for his early recovery, and rejoice in the birth of a son, Prince Charles, to the Heiress Presumptive to the Throne.

I would like also to convey congratulations to the mover (Mr. Kuziak) and seconder (Mr. Walker) of the motion for the Address. I don't suppose it would be expected of me that I would congratulate them on the contents of their speeches. I did wish to say that I thought they delivered a story, that has been threshed over and over again, in a most able way. I certainly can see that they are going to be very good debaters and make a great contribution to the debates of this Assembly, for they made such a good job with such a poor case.

Now, I don't wish to take very much time on their speeches but they used the old well-worn tactics of attempting to make out that the Liberal party stands for laissez-faire, unrestricted capitalism, and then, having set up that straw man,

they proceeded to batter it about, quite obviously, to their hearts' content. I thought as I sat listening to them: "Do they live in this day and age when they see all that the Liberal government has done in this province to indicate that it does not believe in laissez-faire capitalism?" They started to talk about the condition in the United States, the terrible conditions down there, and the terrible problems, and all the ways and means in which the people are being abused down there. I couldn't help but think that all the prominent labour unions in the United States supported Mr. Truman, who certainly is not a socialist. The man who was running, more or less, on the programme of the C.C.F. down there got so badly beaten that he was hardly in the race at all; but he certainly did not get any support from organized labour. Now, if conditions are as bad as the mover and seconder said, is it likely that President Truman would have been re-elected, and that one of the most decisive features in the support he received should have been at the hands of organized labour in the United States? It proves that, whatever organized labour may be doing in Canada, organized labour in the United States does not believe that our system is a system as outlined by the hon. members, and that profits are not such a bad thing when they contribute so heavily towards the exchequer of the country and towards the payment of the means of providing social security. That programme, which is very much like the Liberal programme in this country, certainly received endorsement at the hands of the people of the United States. I really must say I thought it was very poor taste on the part of two young members of this Assembly to undertake to condemn a country that is doing so much today to uphold human liberty and freedom throughout the world.

The dictator of the Soviet Union himself testified to the effective part the United States played in the winning of the war, and to the preventing of the Soviet Union being overrun and crushed. We know today that all the great leaders of Great Britain testify that, if it were not for the great might and power of the United States coming to the aid of Europe and Great Britain, there would be very little hope of being able to hold out against the spreading power of the Soviet and imperialistic communism. If things are so bad under the system we have, which is not laissez-faire or unrestrained capitalism at all, how is it that Canada and the United States have the highest standard of living of any part of the whole world? How is it that, if it were not for the help coming from these countries, and eagerly sought by countries living under both communism and social democracy so-called, they would find they would have great difficulty in carrying on?

When the hon. members talk along those lines, I ask them to bear in mind what has been done in imposing heavy taxation in order to pay for people that are sick, old — the

weaker members of society. I recall to Your Honour, it was the Liberal party who introduced Old Age Pensions, both in Canada and in this province. The Liberal party introduced Mothers' Allowance in this province; the Liberal party introduced Blind Pensions; the Liberal party introduced Unemployment Insurance; the Liberal party introduced Prairie Farm Assistance, which gives us such a measure of security on the western plains; the Liberal party introduced Family Allowances; and the Liberal party introduced the measure of assistance being given to weaker provinces financially, without which the present government would not be able to carry on, or begin to carry on, the programme of social services which it boasts about, and gives very little credit to the dominion government for giving it the means of carrying on.

We know that that aid will amount to well over \$13 million over and above the statutory grant, and we know that in order to receive that grant we have given up the right to impose income taxes, succession duties and corporation taxes, under which we never received more than \$2.6 million; and with the statutory grants about \$4.6 million. So today we are receiving from the dominion government \$9 million, for which we give up the right to tax our people, and very seldom have I heard the opposition indicate that they today are getting at least \$8 million more from the federal government — which they don't have to give them, but which is done because it is felt it is right it should be done — and that they are getting today more than \$7 million more than any provincial government of Saskatchewan ever got, even during the war.

These are some of the things that indicate we have not got laissez-faire capitalism. One of the hon. members, speaking on the motion, indicated all the things that had been set up under public ownership by a Liberal government — some of them by a Conservative government — indicating that the Liberal government believes in the control of cartels and monopoly, and believes that, where it is impossible to control adequately a national monopoly, it does not hesitate to enter the field itself. The dividing line between the Liberals and the C.C.F. is that the Liberals believe the test to be applied is what is in the best interests of the people. Certain things may be best administered by a government; certain things may be better administered at the hands of co-operatives; and certain things should be left in the hands of private enterprise. The C.C.F., on the other hand, have as their basic policy: they will not rest until they have eradicated capitalism entirely, and established a government having the whole monopoly and control of everything.

That brings me to the question of communism, and the question of the situation in the world today. I would not want to go any further without referring to that situation. We know

today that communist/imperialism, headed by the Soviet Union, is trying to spread its power over the entire world. We know, for example, that even the Labour party of Great Britain indicated that had not support been given by the socialists of Czechoslovakia that country would not today be under the heel of communism. I put it before the members of this House, the people who believe in the complete ownership and control of all the means of wealth production and that the government should have control of all the economic activity of the country and own all the resources, that they are preaching what has been established in the Soviet Union, and that the only thing left is to get a similarly cruel and ruthless dictatorship in charge of the government, and then you've got the ultimate result, whether you call it socialism or communism.

We know that one of the accepted means whereby communism seeks to spread itself — and socialists who follow the Marxist teachings are with them in this — is that if you desire to eliminate and destroy opposition, first of all smear that opposition. Those tactics are not unknown in this country either. We are witnessing an application of that system in Europe today; and I would like a word of protest to go forward from this Assembly against an attempt, today, to do the very things laid down by Marx in his attitude towards religion, the attitude that religion must be destroyed. Today you have that being followed in Hungary where a Cardinal has been smeared and, obviously, found guilty on the most ridiculous allegations. That trial, Mr. Speaker, is a travesty upon justice. It is an unfair thing; but no more unfair than you can expect at the hands of the Soviet Union. That action of smearing that great Church leader in order to try to destroy religion in Hungary meets the reprobation of every good-thinking man, woman and child in Saskatchewan. It is restricted not only to the Catholic religion; all religions must be destroyed. They are working now in Bulgaria where Protestant leaders are also facing the same trumped-up charges with which we have become so familiar. It behooves, I think, the people of the world to realize just where Marxism is going, and how far it has gone since the days of the First World War.

Along that line there are certain things I would like to draw to the attention of this government. One of them is the text-book which is being used in our schools. I am not surprised at the laughter from our hon. friends; naturally the extolling of communism in our schools does not meet any disapprobation from them. It is a matter of approbation, apparently, to be covered by laughter. But, Mr. Speaker, it is not a laughing matter. I well remember various leading C.C.F.ers extolling Czechoslovakia, saying: "Now, if all countries had as fine a democracy as Czechoslovakia — certainly there is no danger of communism there." I well remember nearly every C.C.F. leader I heard talking used the same argument that the way to stop communism was to have a good functioning democracy to serve the people and extend the

social services that were fair to them. Wasn't it ironical that the first government struck down by imperialist communism was that very country held up to be the real bulwark against communism? And why did they go down so easily? Because they taught socialism and a belief in it to their people and their children until the time came when the people who believed in socialism didn't find it worthwhile to fight very hard against complete socialism. And so, as the British Labour party said, if it had not been for the support given by the socialists in Czechoslovakia they would not have been taken over so readily. They said it immediately after the taking over of Czechoslovakia, as my hon. friend knows.

**Premier Douglas:** — Would you mind quoting it?

**Mr. Tucker:** — I will quote it afterwards if you want it quoted but if you are not familiar with that then you are not as well-read as you pretend to be. It was brought up in the House of Commons by myself, and Mr. Coldwell admitted it.

Now I am going to read from one or two books — I would not use the words used by my hon. friend to another member of the Legislature yesterday about going back to kindergarten. I don't think it was fitting, coming from the Premier of the province. If I may read from this book which is being used to teach children in Grade IX;

In Germany, instead of a democracy, there was a dictatorship; there was no parliamentary government, but instead one man (dictator) controlled the government. There was an assembly to which members were elected by the people, but it had only one party (the Nazis), which supported the dictator. No opposition was permitted, and, indeed, opposition was put down by force.

Then it goes on to speak of Russia:

In Russia there is also a dictatorship, but of a different type.

Yes, that's what we are teaching our children: that the dictatorship in Russia is of a different type.

At first there was a federal system of government, with a central government, and also a separate government in each province (doesn't that do them a lot of good) but really the central government was in control. In 1936 a new constitution was adopted. The various councils were to be elected directly by the people concerned.

That is what we are teaching our children in Grade IX about the Soviet Union, making out it is not quite the same as Hitlerite Germany. Is that a true picture to put to our children? I asked that this book be taken out of the schools, and I ask it again.

Now it goes on to say in this book:

Consequently, government control over industry in the Soviet Union is steadily increasing. Governments, indeed, tend more and more to go into business themselves where it is a matter of special concern to the average citizen.

And it goes on:

The alternative to production for profit is production for service. But the latter is possible (not what we are teaching our children) only where the government is in a position to control industry completely, as in present-day Russia.

In other words, the very things my hon. friends are suggesting. We are teaching our children that that is only possible where the government is in complete control as in the Soviet Union. Do you want that taught to your own children? This is the sort of thing being taught to our children. I want to read some more of this — and my hon. friends are laughing; apparently they are not concerned about this. Well, let the people know that the people of the opposition, the C.C.F. members in this House, are laughing at what I have just read — it is a good thing they know about it.

Then it goes on to say:

The government is in control of industry. There it is impossible for a private individual to become rich. With the central authority in charge of practically all industries and services, planning becomes possible, and Russia has given the world the first large-scale example of planned industry.

Well, apparently it is, and if they want to teach it to our children they must believe in it, they must want it to prevail.

The result has been that Russia, once largely agricultural, is now industrialized. The standard of living is still very low, but there has been no unemployment.

**February 15, 1949**

What a thing to tell our children, with at least 13 million in the slave labour camps of Russia, and we are telling them there is no unemployment in Russia! Thirteen million in the slave labour camps! Of course they are not unemployed; they are quite busily employed.

Then it goes on to say:

A planned programme of social legislation (isn't that wonderful?) has relieved the workers of anxiety regarding old age, health and extreme poverty.

There is your ideal country, held up to our children, and it is high time this book which misrepresents the Soviet Union — the greatest menace to world peace today — and extols it should be taken out of the schools.

Further, it is high time that, in our social studies, books be introduced which tell the truth about the Soviet Union. My hon. friend the Premier talks about the economic security in the Soviet Union. Yes. What economic security have you got when you can't strike, and you can't change your job? What kind of security is there of any sort whatever, economic or political? Instead of teaching our children that they have any kind of security there at all, it is high time we taught them the truth about the Soviet Union, the truth about the cruel imperialism of the Soviet, which has trampled down so many people, far more than Hitler did at the height of his power. It is time the free people of the world realize the menace that confronts them. There is nothing in this book about the way they established their collective farm system in the Ukraine. Those Ukrainian farmers were promised their land and told they would get title to their land, and then when the time came they wanted to go further with the collective farm system, they resisted. At least six million men, women and children starved to death to force them out of those farms. And now the pattern is repeating itself in the satellite states. Some people may say to themselves that it can't happen here. As a matter of fact that was the attitude of the Czechoslovakians: it could not happen to them!

We spend money on adult education. The government is not satisfied to teach these ideas to children; it must spend our money to try and teach the adults of the country what they can think about the Soviet Union. I have here "Atomic Future", printed by the King's Printer in 1946 for use in this province, and I would ask every member of this House to get this pamphlet, if they haven't read it before. This pamphlet was written by an avowed communist, a man who said, writing to Tim Buck, the Communist leader: "As for me, Tim, the highest of honours is membership in the Party". And the government office paid this man \$300 of Saskatchewan money to write this book. \$300!

Now then, what is in the book? As I say, I just wish that every member would read it — what the people of this province should know — what this government is spending our money on trying to teach the adults of this province. I would like to read just one or two sentences from this book:

Blind to the real interests of the people, refusing to heed the warning of the scientists, American imperialists, their associates in Britain and Canada, are using the secret atom bomb as a mighty propaganda weapon.

It goes on to say:

Their first aim is to confuse the people, to make us think that if war comes a few super-warriors will be able to wipe out any and all other nations while we suffer nothing. Their second aim is to use this confusion to further their imperialistic policies which are directed not only against the U.S.S.R. (wouldn't that be terrible?) but against European countries, against the British Empire, and the people of the Far East. Their third aim is to keep our atomic knowledge on the secret list so that we shall be denied the unlimited benefits of atomic power used for peaceful, social and industrial purposes.

“But, say some pessimists, “how could we possibly stop the race for even more terrible atomic weapons?”

And here is what this man wrote, and this C.C.F. government sent out to the people:

That would be quite possible if all threatening talk of ‘secrecy’ were abandoned. The Security Council of the United Nations could outlaw atomic weapons.

Does anybody in this Assembly really believe that the Security Council, under the power of the veto — which has been exercised 27 times by the Soviet Union — can possibly outlaw anything or prevent anything? I would ask that this book be withdrawn from circulation, for the most I have ever got has been defence of it from the Premier and the Minister of Education.

Just let me read some more from it, and, incidentally, this is the sort of talk I heard in 1947 from Andrei Vishinsky at the United Nations: the reason why we would not give up the secrets was because we did not want these secrets made known to the people to be used for civilian purposes to improve our standard of living, and all that sort of thing. Here is the identical stuff, paid for by our money, used to teach our people. He goes on to say:



Can you see your responsibility? Canada is a member of the United Nations. Canada contributed scientific manpower and metal uranium that made the atom bomb possible. Canada, says President Truman, can have the bomb 'secret' when our nation asks for it. There is only one course open to us. We must immediately put an end to all bluffing and demand the bomb 'secret' be handed over to the Canadian government, then handed over to the Security Council of the United Nations. If we give the atomic bomb 'secret' and every atomic discovery to all nations, then the world can outlaw war.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, supposing this counsel had been adopted, supposing the opposition had been successful in teaching this idea to our people, supposing they had demanded the atomic "secret" and handed it over to the Security Council, and the Soviet Union happens to be on the Security Council, does anybody think that with our present force we could do anything, as this author says, if we handed over to the Soviet Union all the secrets we have? Yet, there is one of their policies. Is it any wonder that the Communists in the last election supported them in all except one seat? Why, when I listened yesterday to the story that people who were against socialism and communism had joined together in all but six constituencies to try to defeat the use of our money for such purposes as this, the teaching of this sort of thing to our children, in which they made out that there, therefore, was no difference between the Liberal and Conservative parties, I could not help but think, isn't it a good deal more so to think we have done things that are so pleasing to the Soviet Union. It is a most amazing thing: they ran one candidate against your candidate.

**Mr. Kuziak:** — They elected a Liberal.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Yes, they elected a Liberal, and if they had run in more seats they would have probably elected more Liberals, and you are probably in office today because you got the support of the Communists, as my friend there points out.

In regard to the speech from the throne, I looked it over, and one of the things that stuck me about the speech was the extent to which it was a tacit admission of the complete failure of the government, after four and one-half years in office, to accomplish all the high-sounding promises they made the people, promises on which they were elected in 1944. You just need to run through the speech and see how true that is: efforts are going to be made to stimulate mineral production; development of the petroleum industry is to be encouraged; potash has been discovered. I can remember the then Minister of Natural Resources two years ago saying that the potash discovery was going to rank in importance with the discovery of uranium. And what has been done?

Nothing! This government cannot make up its mind on this particular thing, whether it is socialist or free enterprise; and they are so hesitating between the two positions that nothing has been done. Well, on this thing I wish they would make up their minds one way or the other. But anyway, in the speech from the throne, they tell the people of Saskatchewan, who were amazed to hear it, that potash had been discovered. "The government is moving towards its objective of a greater development of natural products." It is moving in that direction.

Then, "Machinery is going to be set up for a long-term electrification programme." They have got around, after four and one-half years, to setting up some machinery about this thing. I will refer later to the great programme being put on in a sister province: 900 farmers connected to hydroelectric in Saskatchewan, 5,000 in Manitoba; more farmers connected in Manitoba with hydroelectric in the month of December than in all the province of Saskatchewan in the whole year of 1948; and now they have got around to working out a programme. After four and one-half years! I wonder when they will really begin to accomplish something. Well, I got an answer to that, too, in the speech by the Hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Darling) who said that we could not expect much in the way of accomplishment for five years, and we could expect some real accomplishment in 16 years. Well, that is pretty fast for the C.C.F. all right, judging from what they have done in the last four and one-half years.

It goes on to say that the government is going to initiate a programme of irrigation and water conservation. They are going to initiate it!

**Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — Do you disapprove?

**Mr. Tucker:** — No, I say it should have been done long ago — if they are going to initiate a programme. My friend says, do I disapprove. I say they should have done it four years ago.

**Premier Douglas:** — Thirty-five years ago.

**Mr. Tucker:** — It is pretty near time with the money appropriated by the federal government something was being done by the government here to make use of that water. It is high time they not only initiated a programme but got it going.

Then, another branch is going to be set up to carry out new policies to achieve greater agricultural stability and security. They don't take the people into their confidence as to

what these new policies are. I thought they would figure out everything possible that could be thought of, but they are going to set up another branch to carry out new policies, which they don't specify.

Then it goes on that something is going to be done to meet the grasshopper menace. That is a good thing. After what happened last year, it is a good thing they are going to do something about conditions. The Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) was so concerned about the two or three American soldiers in Canada, he didn't worry about the grasshoppers, which did millions of dollars worth of damage. Well, I will have something more to say about that, but I will say, at this point, that that damage will probably be found to have amounted to perhaps eight or nine million dollars. This government has doubled its expenditures since it has been in office, brought them up to almost \$60 million; in this thing that menaced the livelihood of thousands of our farmers, that did damage to the extent of nearly \$9 million, all they could do was to find \$300,000 to spend on this programme last year. Actually, when the bait was needed, it couldn't be obtained because, we were told by the Minister of Agriculture, he had warned the municipalities, they hadn't asked for this stuff, and so he didn't have enough on hand. Yet, wherever you went last year you saw the warnings there was going to be a grasshopper menace. It reminded me of a general who was getting ready for a battle. He knew shells were going to be needed; he knew ammunition was going to be needed; but because the officers under him hadn't asked for them, he didn't bother to provide them. So when the time came they were needed, they couldn't be obtained.

But the minister certainly saw to it that the presence of two or three American soldiers at North Battleford was brought to world-wide attention. Doubtless he got a great deal of credit for that some place — I don't know where. Certainly he didn't get credit from the farmers in the part of the province in which I live who saw their crops eaten up by grasshoppers, and couldn't get the bait because the Minister of Agriculture had laid in insufficient supplies. I want to say that this year I certainly hope that, when he doesn't have to worry about American soldiers, he will have plenty of grasshopper bait and other supplies on hand so that we will be able to fight the grasshoppers.

I understand, further, that it is only proposed to spend about \$500,000, part of which amount will be supplied by the municipalities, on something that again may destroy \$10 million worth of crops. I suggest that in other states they have adopted the policy of using chemicals for spraying and destroying insects, and that it has worked. I was at 50 percent of the farms sprayed. And I can say this: agriculture is the basic industry of the province, and we surely can do more than provide that

chemical at cost to the farmers. We should do more in the way of helping them out. The federal government paid this past year about \$11 million to Saskatchewan alone. Surely this government, which is getting a large grant from the federal government, and is always having its followers raise resolution after resolution asking more from the federal government, could deal with this problem in an adequate way and show that at least they can do something besides asking more help from somebody else.

The speech goes on to say that it is proposed to stimulate interest in secondary industries. How they are going to do any more in that line than in the past, they don't know. Just what form of stimulation they are going to use, I don't know.

**Mr. Danielson:** — They are going to open the boot factory.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, that sort of thing isn't very effective stimulation — to take people on when they can get jobs elsewhere, get them on a job like they did in the boot factory, and then just before Christmas turn them loose — of course, with all kinds of honeyed regrets. That was most helpful to those people; but, of course, nobody can say they did not get sympathized with!

What do these things mean, Mr. Speaker? They mean this: that the government, in writing the speech to be read by His Honour, practically admitted that they had accomplished nothing in four and one-half years in office. I have run over all these things: they are going to initiate things, start plans, stimulate. All it is is a confession of failure. There is a reason for that, of course; but before I deal with that I think I have given you reason enough why I am satisfied the people of this province, having in mind the record of the government, having in mind the speech from the throne with its wordy camouflage covering up no real proposed programme. Why? That government which if, in five seats of this province, an average of slightly over 70 people in each of these seats had voted to us instead of them, they would have been defeated. In other words, they came so close to defeat that 350 people turning over in five seats would have defeated them. Certainly then I say, Mr. Speaker, that this speech from the throne has certainly turned over more than 350 people in five seats. I have no doubt, if this government had to go to the people tomorrow, they wouldn't be returned to office even by a slim margin.

So, Mr. Speaker, I propose to move, seconded by Mr. Patterson, that the following be added to the address:

We respectfully submit to Your Honour that this Legislature regrets that Your Honour's advisers:

**February 15, 1949**

- (1) have failed to provide an adequate policy for promoting the well-being and development of agriculture;
- (2) have adopted policies which greatly retard the development of mining, gas, oil and other industries in the province;
- (3) have failed to take effective measures to relieve school districts of the burden of increasing costs of education;
- (4) have failed to provide a comprehensive and satisfactory plan of health services;
- (5) have failed to establish an adequate programme of rural electrification;

The members opposite laugh, and it is certainly a very hollow laugh — like the laugh of a person passing a graveyard.

- (6) have followed a programme which has developed a pronounced trend towards undue concentration of power in the hands of the government and its boards;
- (7) have exercised political patronage in the appointment of employees of the government, and have sought to involve the civil service in partisan political activities;
- (8) have failed to relieve Saskatchewan, and particularly northern Saskatchewan, of dictatorial policies and regimentation as practised in the name of ‘socialist planning’;
- (9) have spent large amounts of the public money through government agencies to publish and distribute partisan propaganda literature in Saskatchewan and throughout Canada;
- (10) have, despite the growing national and international menace of communism, continued to use a textbook in our schools “The World of Today” which extols communism;
- (11) have, by continued extravagance in the expenditure of public monies, made necessary increased taxation;
- (12) have failed to either fairly distribute expenditures on the highways of the province or obtain value for money expended in highway construction.

I presume, Mr. Speaker, you will put that motion at the conclusion of my address.

The first item on that amendment deals with agriculture. One of the things not adequately recognized, I think, by some people is the effect which agriculture, due to higher prices in the province, has benefited by those higher prices, and it is found in the cash income of our farmers. I won't go into many figures on the point, but the four-year average cash income of our farmers, 1944 to 1947, was \$457 million a year, while the previous ten-year average was only something over \$156 million a year. In 1931 to 1933, due to difficulties in the world at large as well as in Canada, the farm income was only \$72 million.

Along that line something was said to indicate that that was due to our capitalist system. I want to say that during those days of the early '30s, the socialist and communist countries and governments of this world suffered infinitely worse. I have already referred to the starvation in the rich farming part of the Soviet Union; they were under complete socialism. Now, all over the world you have those difficulties. In Germany one of the causes of the rise of Hitler to power was the socialism there, the unemployment affecting millions, with hardship far beyond anything in this country.

I have already mentioned another policy regarding agriculture — a Liberal policy — the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. Under that Act \$68 million has been paid out to our farmers up to the beginning of this year, of which amount \$18 million was contributed by our farmers. This year it is expected that another \$11 million will be paid out. Then, to take care of the ever-possible slump in prices, in 1944 I believe it was, the Agricultural Prices Support Act was passed to endeavour to put a "floor" under farm prices. Family Allowances were passed, which was an endeavour to take the profit of large corporations, to take from people with large incomes, and distribute the money to the parents of the children of the country. Under that programme somewhere around \$90 million is distributed every year in Saskatchewan. And then, of course, the P.R.F.A. programme which we intend to press for in this province with all our strength, particularly the South Saskatchewan River development. I think all the people in the province are behind it, and will press for it with all our strength. Under that scheme it will be possible to irrigate about 750,000 acres, and to generate, after all the energy needed for pumping is used, about 210 million kilowatt hours of electricity for distribution. On the basis of that cheap power it should be possible to really start some secondary industries. That programme is being put into force as fast as it is physically possible to do so at the present time. As far as this opposition is concerned, we will press for it being pressed ahead with all possible speed.

I have already dealt with the question of grasshopper control, but I do say to the Minister of Agriculture that I don't want to see the same thing happen again this year that happened last year, when my neighbours came to Rosthern, seeking to get

the necessary means to combat the grasshoppers, and were told it wasn't available. They were fetching the poison from some place in the States, and trying to get the sawdust from some place, and all that sort of thing. Meanwhile, the farmers watched their crops being eaten up. I suggest if the Minister of Agriculture had been a little more busy about his job, and a little bit less busy about running around the province tearing apart General McArthur and Hirohito, and things like that, he would have done a better job for the farmers of the province.

I say, if he has not done so, some consideration should be given to paying part of the cost of providing chemical sprays. Many farmers are using that with great effect. They say that they kill all the grasshoppers on their land, then find the grasshoppers come in from road allowances, vacant lands and from other lands that have them. They say they fly in, and that they are as badly off, practically, as ever. Now that is something that can only be handled really on a provincial scale; and I submit that that programme should be financed, in part, by this government. It has the right to take from our people and spend \$60 million, and it surely has a right to spend more than between three and five hundred thousand on something that may save crops worth \$10 million. What is proposed, Mr. Speaker, is not good enough for our farmers. They want some fair treatment from this government, and some attention.

Now, on the question of freight rates. I don't intend to deal with that for more than a moment, but I do say this: in the attitude of the government in opposing an increase in freight rates, they have the support, as they know, of the Liberal party of this province.

**Premier Douglas:** — But not of Canada.

**Mr. Tucker:** — They certainly have the support of the Liberal party of Canada to the extent they have set up a Royal Commission . . . Don't laugh about Royal Commissions! You set one up in regard to the coal industry! I suggest the Premier explain what part he had in getting the price of coal raised 20 cents per ton, when one of the main producers . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — If the hon. gentleman is asking a question, I want to say that the Premier had absolutely no part whatsoever in anything to do with the price of coal or anything else.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, I am glad to hear that, Mr. Speaker, but I will continue what I was going to say, if the Premier will permit me.

**Premier Douglas:** — You asked a question and I answered it.

**Mr. Tucker:** — There was one of the main producers in that field who didn't have any people on strike. So far as I know their cost had not gone up, and those people were being consulted by the Premier. We know that and we know . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — That is not true, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I don't accept that from the Premier. I say that those people connected with another mine were being consulted by the Premier.

**Premier Douglas:** — But that is not true.

**Mr. Tucker:** — You can say it is not true, but I say it is.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! When a member asks a question of another hon. member, he must accept his statement. It is against the rules of the House to accuse a man of not telling the truth.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Premier will say that he didn't consult with any of these mining companies in regard to settling the coal strike, and including the company whose employees were not on strike, if he will say that, I must accept his word.

**Premier Douglas:** — That is exactly what I said, Mr. Speaker. The only consultation with the coal companies was with the ones who were on strike.

**Mr. Speaker:** — One member will sit down when the other member is on his feet. It is the rules of this House that only one . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — The hon. Premier stood up when I was on my feet, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Tucker:** — And if the hon. Premier can stand up when I am on my feet, I can stand when he's on his feet, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! If I am going to occupy this Chair, I am going to have the rules of this Legislature obeyed. When one hon. member asks the other hon. member a question and the hon. member rises to reply to the question, it is the rule of the Legislature that the person who is asking the question resumes his seat. It is also the rule, for your information, of this Chamber that no two members are allowed to be on their feet at the same time.



**February 15, 1949**

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I had not finished my question when the Premier rose, and according to your rule he shouldn't have risen when I was on my feet. So I suggest you apply that rule to the Premier.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I will apply it to everyone.

**An Hon. Member:** — May I ask a question here? Does that rule apply to every member of this House?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Tucker:** — I was speaking, Mr. Speaker, about freight rates, and apparently it is all right for this government to set up a Royal Commission on the question of coal, but on this much greater question of freight rates, of far greater importance to the farmers of this country, then my hon. friend thinks that is funny. Well, that is their attitude towards agriculture, and that is why they almost got beaten in the last election.

Now then, they talk about 21 percent. I wonder about the increased costs in regard to hospitalization, for example. That is 100 percent. Yes, we had a \$5.00 hospitalization fee. The Premier went around the province talking about that, but nothing was done until the Saskatchewan and Alberta elections were over, and then it was raised 100 percent. Why? Because of increased cost of operation.

**Premier Douglas:** — You are still getting it for \$30.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, I would say this to the hon. member: in the past two years I have paid more for hospitalization than I paid in the previous ten; so that is how it is affecting me.

Now, if I may go on in regard to this question. The policy of the Liberal party in this regard, as laid down at the convention in a motion moved by myself, is: first of all we want to see to it that all discrimination is removed in regard to ourselves, in regard to the prairie west, regarding the payment of freight. But then we realize that when you have removed all discrimination you still have to pay for the cost of the operation of our railroads. There is no part of this country depends on railroads more than the prairie west does — to ship out grain and so on. You can in the one breath encourage the raising of wheat, the raising of all branches of industry which leads to cost, expect that you are going to have some results in regard to these increased costs. So we say there are only two ways to deal with that. Once you have all discrimination eliminated, then there are only two things left to do. In regard to grain shipped out,

that is fixed by the Crow's Nest Agreement and cannot be raised except by Act of Parliament. In regard to other things, rates either have to go up or you have to pay subsidies. One of the difficulties if subsidies are resorted to is that the farmer, who buys more goods than the average person, is liable to find that he is paying a greater share of those subsidies than if he were to pay the increased rates in the first place. But there is a feature in this question of subsidies that you can do something about, and this is our programme, and so far as I know it has not been endorsed by the opposition. I hope it will receive their support.

**Premier Douglas:** — What opposition?

**Mr. Tucker:** — I mean the government.

What has been suggested is this: we have four economic areas in Canada, the prairies, British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec, and the Maritimes. We have set up of those four entities a political entity, the Dominion of Canada, and we have tried to cause trade to flow between those entities. We have caused trade to flow between the prairies and Ontario and Quebec, some of which, if it were not for national policy would flow north and south. The cost of hauling goods back and forth between the settled areas of the prairies and Ontario and Quebec should be borne, in part, by the nation as a whole because it is part of the cost of establishing this country and uniting it together. So one of the things we have put forward is the extent to which the connecting up of those economic entities should be paid by the nation as a whole. This should be gone into very carefully. That is one of the places where, I think, we may hope to get some real relief in regard to freight rates. That is the question of agriculture.

The question of rural electrification is also very important, as every member here knows, to the preservation of our present agricultural industry. One of the things causing the people to leave the farms today is the lack of the amenities of life which we find in towns and cities. I have gone about Manitoba where they have electricity on the farms, and in Ontario in a large measure, and have seen the way they can have all the modern conveniences in a house; have the milking machines, milk coolers and all the rest of it. I have seen that you can take a great deal of the drudgery of farming away, if you have rural electrification. That is why, several years ago, the Manitoba government embarked on a policy of rural electrification, a policy under which, as soon as the war was over, they planned on electrifying all but 8,000 of their farms inside of ten years. Last year they electrified 5,000.

Now, what does the Manitoba government do? Last year it spent about \$6.5 million on farm electrification. It connected

up, as I say, 5,000 farmers. This government only connected up 900 in the whole year. That is the story of what has happened there.

What is the difference in the attitude? We make our farmers pay about 40 percent of the cost, amounting in some cases to well over \$400. In Manitoba, the government pays the entire cost of electricity taken right to the farm. I want to say to the government: they are spending in Manitoba \$6.5 million again this year, and this programme of the government, this plan we are told about in the speech from the throne, means they are going to try and recede even from paying the 40 percent they have paid in the past, instead of the 100 percent they are paying in Manitoba. I can tell the Premier and his followers that any plan that tries to unload more of that burden on our farmers, whether individually or co-operatively or any other way, is going to have the uncompromising opposition of this opposition. We are going to ask that we proceed in the other direction; not pay less. I don't care how cleverly this plan is worked out by the economic advisers of the government; but they are already charging the farmers 40 percent, and we are going to scrutinize this plan very carefully to see if this is an attempt to put more of a burden upon them. We will look at this legislation, when it comes, very carefully, with that in mind.

There is another thing, Mr. Speaker. This commission has been getting along very well as a commission — a good deal better than some of the Crown Corporations, such as the boot factory, tanning factory and others. Why then are they turning it into a Crown Corporation? It is one of the things the people of this province are entitled to know. Is it that they want to bring it under the Economic Advisory and Planning Board so that the profits, instead of being available for extending rural electrification, may go into their Government Finance Office to cover up deficits in some of their losing Crown Corporations? If that is the reason, we intend to oppose that. It is done now, by this government, under the powers it gave to itself under The Crown Corporation Act. It is done already; but why has it been done? It will be interesting if the Premier when he speaks will tell us why they have done this.

**Premier Douglas:** — Delighted.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Is it to have that profit available to juggle around amongst other Crown Corporations? If it is, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a wrong principle. When, for example, the telephone system was set up in this province, rates were charged to provide those services at cost, providing enough to provide extension of the service. There should be no intermingling of those monies, and the same should be followed regarding the Power Commission, except

that money should be provided by the government for assistance, in effect, for agriculture. Manitoba can spend \$6.5 million on this programme — this government is so ready to throw stones at another free enterprise government; we, with a population bigger than Manitoba, should be ready to spend a good deal more than \$6.5 million. If we can't do it, there must be something wrong with the government. It must be wasting its money in other directions.

I now come to the question of education. I wish to deal with that for a minute or so. One of the things in regard to education which I would first of all draw to Your Honour's attention — I have already dealt with the use of "The World Today" in the schools — is the question of the attitude of the C.C.F. towards education when they were seeking the votes of the people in the first place, when it was said that education was a provincial responsibility, and should be recognized as such. A great deal was made of the number of unqualified teachers in the schools, the low salaries of the teachers, and the idea was held out it was going to be much better for them if a C.C.F. government was elected.

Now I wish to deal with that question. Are the schools better off in this province since the C.C.F. was elected?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Yes!

**Mr. Tucker:** — I am glad to get that answer. It shows the people answering "yes" don't know the facts, and it is a good thing they are here to learn.

First of all, I would like to say that one of the reasons the federal government paid these largely increased grants was to enable the province to discharge the province's obligations, and one of the main ones was the obligation of education. This money was not given to them to squander on socialist experiments. It was given to use to discharge their constitutional obligations such as education. Now, with that grant, \$7 million more than any previous government ever got, what do we find? We find this: the expenditures on education for the period 1938 to 1944 were approximately \$57 million. The net grants during that time were \$15,289,000 or 26.7 percent — well over a quarter. The C.C.F. government came into office — this government that was going to recognize education as a provincial responsibility, do away with all this nonsense of school districts having to rely so much on local taxation, and so on; but what did they do? Well, from 1945 to 1946, the only period for which I have figures, in these two years of C.C.F. administration, they spend altogether \$26,571,000. They got in grants of \$5,780,000, or less than 22 percent — 21.75 percent. In other words, the share the

province is paying towards the cost of education went down from an average, during the period 1938-1944, of well over 26 percent to under 22 percent. Was that carrying out their promise? Other provinces have found ways and means of increasing their contributions to the cost of education to almost 50 percent. I understand both Ontario and British Columbia have done this. Now, that is reflected in what is happening to the schools and the teachers.

I wish to say, before I go any further with the question of teachers, and I think most of the members of this House will agree with me that the teachers today, under our system, have a very great deal to do with the moulding of the character and ability of our future citizens. Children get a great deal of training in the home, but some of them spend five days a week in school. A good deal of the rest of the time they spend in recreational ways. They spend a good deal of the Sundays in church and Sunday school; but the teachers have a very great deal to do with the character of our future citizens.

**Hon. J.H. Brockelbank:** — That's why the Liberals paid them \$450 a year.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I suggest, after the promises you have made, and you can't do any better than you are doing today, I would keep quiet if I were you. I am speaking, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture, because when he hears this story, in the light of what they promised, I don't think he will begin to talk about what happened when the total revenue of the government wasn't any more than they are getting from the dominion government. The Minister of Agriculture, I suppose, is such a clever man that if he didn't have the money he would be able to do all he is doing today anyway.

**Hon. J.H. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege; may I point out to the hon. member that the hon. Minister of Agriculture is out at the moment.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, I am referring to you. I forgot you are not the Minister of Agriculture. Let there be no mistake about it; I am referring to the Minister of Natural Resources. I am glad the Minister drew my attention to that for I would not want to blame the Minister of Agriculture when he is not to blame.

I was going to say that I think we owe it to the teachers of this province to see they are well treated, and that we don't treat them so poorly that they feel they should go to some other occupation. We are speaking on the basis of what the people decided when they accepted your promises in the election. You said you were going to do a lot better, but you haven't done so. We say at the present time that we agree the teachers should

be treated a good deal better than they are being treated today. They have a right to expect that in the light of the promises you made. I am dealing with that today. Mr. Speaker, this government is not going to get away with the shameful treatment it has dealt out to the teachers of the province, by going back to the days when our province had very little income, due to the crop failures and the difficult conditions of the thirties. That is a favourite trick. We today are dealing with a situation where the income of the farmers is over \$500 million, whereas in the thirties it was only \$70 million. And then the Minister suggests he wants to compare the treatment on that basis. Why the income of our farmers is seven times what it was in the days of the thirties — in 1931, 1932 and 1933 — and then he brings that up. Well, I suppose something has to be thrown out as an excuse.

What is the situation in regard to the teachers? We find this: the medium salary for our teachers in Saskatchewan, the salary at which level there are just as many teachers drawing more as drawing less, is \$1,265 a year. What has that resulted in? It has resulted in us having 1,340 teachers with temporary certificates. That means, in Saskatchewan, we have 18.9 percent of our teachers who are teaching with temporary certificates; almost one out of five. Take British Columbia where the provincial government is paying half the cost of education; there the medium salary is not \$1,265, it is \$2,042, and the number of their temporary teachers is slightly over eight percent as compared with nearly 20 percent with us.

Mr. Eamer, in speaking about this situation last fall, said that about one-third of the teachers were going to go into the fall term not fully qualified. When I think of the stir raised by the Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) when they were seeking election back in 1944, when there wasn't nearly the money to deal with there is today, and then see the situation today, I wonder he hasn't done something about it.

At the start of last fall, 750 schools were without teachers, and over 1,300 out of the 7,000 teachers were without training — temporary certificates. Well, that may satisfy the members of the government, but I ask the private members of this House: are they satisfied with that sort of carrying out of promises; with that treatment of their children and of the teachers who are doing the splendid work they are in the province? They, after all, have something to say in this, at least they should have, and I hope they have. What is the way they are treated in comparison with people in other occupations? Well, the medium salary with us, as I said is about \$1,200. The average pay received by the grain elevator operator in Saskatchewan is \$2,340, by railway conductors \$3,225.

**Hon. J.H. Brockelbank:** — What about lawyers?

**Mr. Tucker:** — It doesn't record the lawyers because they are not paid by anybody; they only get what they earn and work for.

Surely the teacher is entitled to the same consideration, at least, with all the time and money he has to spend on his training, as some of the occupations I just mentioned.

**Hon. N.L. Buchanan (Notukeu-Willowbunch):** — How about the thirties?

**Mr. Tucker:** — As I said, in the thirties our total farm income was \$73 million, and today it is over \$500 million. You don't think that makes any difference, apparently. Go out and study your figures a bit! Look at the government when the income was only \$13 million; today it is over \$60 million. I suppose that can't penetrate, so there is no use in my spending time on that. If that isn't clear yet, there certainly isn't any use spending time on it.

The weekly wages for Saskatchewan teachers is \$23.23; stenographers, \$24.62; warehousemen, \$29.11; taxi drivers, \$31.68, and, according to the last settlement made with our miners in the Estevan, for a 44-hour week the lowest paid worker gets \$48.48, more than twice as much as the average teacher. Is it suggested that the man working in the mine takes longer to be trained for that position than the teacher? He gets the same holidays-with-pay as well.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the treatment at the hands of this government which made so many promises and pretended to be so interested in the teachers. This is what they have done: left the burden of mounting costs in the hands of the taxpayers and on his land, when other provinces are raising their grants. This government should have done the same when its grant was increased by the federal government. Instead of that, they have taken that grant, paying a smaller share of the cost of education than it was when they came into office, leaving this mounting cost of education to be borne, in increasing measure, by the local taxpayer. To any private member who endorses that sort of thing, in the light of the promises of the government, I suggest that he go and talk to some of the devoted school teachers of this province, consider the work they are doing, and ask himself if he is doing right by those people.

There is another thing, the question of the Larger School Units. In those districts which have not set them up — and that takes up almost a quarter of the province — what is the situation? I got a letter from a friend of mine in the federal constituency of Rosthern about his own school district. They had an assessment in that district of \$85,450. The basic grant was \$300; the equalization grant, \$116, and the total \$416. To bring

his district up to the basic \$1,800 they have to put upon their taxpayers a tax to yield \$1,384. If all taxes are paid it means they have to put on a tax of 16 1/2 mills. In a larger unit, they put on their 10 mill taxation, and the other \$1,800 is made up by the government, or elsewhere, not made up by the local taxpayer. In other words, to get the same amount of money, the basic \$1,800, the taxpayer in this district has to pay 50 percent more taxes than if he were in a larger unit. If those people don't want to go into a larger unit — although the government doesn't see fit to hold elections in some of these districts to let them decide whether they want to go or not — they are penalizing those districts all the time, and I protest against that discrimination against people not in the larger districts. There is no possible ground for that discrimination. It is unfair and unjust, and it has been whispered around that it will help to make those people "line up". Well, if that sort of thing is going to be done, penalizing people who want to decide those things for themselves, then I submit it is not in order.

**Mr. A.A. Loftson (Saltcoats):** — That is the way they do it in Russia.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Yes, my hon. friend says that is the way they do it in Russia; but I hope this government doesn't intend to follow Russia in that regard anyway.

Regarding Crown Corporations, I am very disappointed measures are not suggested at this session of the Legislature to repeal that section of The Crown Corporations Act that enables money taken in by such institutions as the telephone system and the Power Commission to be used to finance other Crown Corporations, or assist other Crown Corporations, without being voted by this Assembly. Surely, one of the basic foundations of responsible government is that a government cannot spend the money of the people without it being voted by the Legislature. By that system of the Provincial Finance Office, millions of the money of the people of this province can be spent on taking over other people's property — against their consent, and that money can be spent without being voted by this Legislature. All we can do is to look into what they have done — afterwards!

There are some new members here, and some older members — with great experience in this Legislature — and if that is not a basic undermining of democratic responsible government, then I haven't read history right. If the C.C.F. had their way and got control of all economic activities, and has this system, they could set their prices to yield enough money so they would not have to come to parliament for a single cent of it. They could carry on, as King Charles sought to carry on, without the consent of parliament. The fact they have laid the foundation for that is something every freedom-loving person should study. Yes, laugh! That is the only answer they can possibly make.



The control of the government by the elected representatives of the people is something our ancestors fought for, and it is something this opposition is going to fight to have restored to them. In that I hope we will have the support of some of the people who have some knowledge of the significance of our constitutional history, the people who struggled and fought and died to obtain that control over their government, whether they sit on this side of the House or that. That is a step towards dictatorship. A step to place the handling of the affairs of the people of this province beyond the control of the Legislature and in the hands of the Economic Planning and Advisory Board. That is what they have done with the Power Commission. If they ever got control of the affairs of this Dominion — which I hope will never happen — would we have a dictatorship under that system or would we not? Let anybody just ask themselves that question in all honesty and sincerity.

We have a recent example of the dictatorship attitude, not only in regard to insurance but in regard to other matters. I was interested in the deferred elections. If ever there was an attempt made by this government to apply socialism, and try to make the people like it, it was in the north. This government set out to try and make money out of those people who go out and away from the amenities of life which we have in the south — highways, telephones — far away into the pioneer work of the north. They try to make money out of their lumbering. Why, they have taken lumber from the producers in the north at a price, turned around and sold it at a price which should have yielded this government at least twice the profit it did. The only thing I can see is that government operation of a commercial operation like that is so inefficient and wasteful that these monies that have been kept from the producers have gone to pay employees of the government running around in the north, telling the people what they should do, paying the planes to fly them around the north. I saw lots of planes flying Ministers around during the deferred elections, lots of them. The north people said this: “We know the people of Saskatchewan as a whole, the farmer for example, doesn’t want to be dictated to in every move he makes, so why should that be imposed upon us? We intend, in the deferred elections to show the government we want to get back on the same basis as our fellow-citizens in the south. We want to have the right to sell our furs to the Fur Marketing Board or elsewhere if we want. We want to be able to sell our lumber where we can get the best price for it. We want to be able to sell our fish.” In different places in the north, for example, I saw in the summertime some trout fillets, some of the most beautiful fish I have ever seen, brought in at Lac la Ronge. Do you know what they were paying for those fish fillets? Eight cents a pound! I wonder what they, the government, got for them by the time they were finished! The fisherman was barely getting enough to live on from that stuff. Fishermen were going up into

the North-West Territories to fish this winter, so they could sell their fish where they wanted. The people are going into Manitoba to fish, so they can sell their fish where they want: driven out of their own province because of the dictatorship of the government, and getting twice as much elsewhere than the Fish Board gave them. They have no alternative in the matter . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Tucker:** — They didn't laugh when the results came in from the north, that is a certainty. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, what the Premier said then — after the people of the north had said what they thought about socialism? The Premier said — and I am reading from an interview recorded July 24, 1948: "An intensified programme of education and organization of the people of the far north by the C.C.F. is needed", Premier Douglas said Friday, commenting on the deferred election." They need more education, the Premier thinks. Well, he did his best to educate them, but they showed him what they thought of the socialist planning up there. I say that we live in a democracy, and if the farm members of this House are not ready to submit to the same measure of regimentation this government has imposed on the lumbermen and the fishermen and the trappers, then they should vote to take it off their fellow-citizens in the north. They have asked for it in the deferred elections. One of the things we ask our fellow-members of this House is to bow to the will of the people and not say they need more education at the hands of people who think they know so much more than the average citizen.

If that doesn't show a dictatorial frame of mind!

I would like to tell the Assembly a little bit of the situation in the north. Here I was in a little plane — that was all we could afford, such a little one that when it sought to rise from the water the pilot said: "Lean forward, Mr. Tucker." Wherever I went I saw planes flying around with Cabinet Ministers — all over the place. I wonder who paid for those planes. That is one of the things we are going to ask, Mr. Speaker. Who paid for those planes in the campaigning in the north?

**Mr. L.C. Marion (Athabaska):** — Thirteen at one time in Athabaska.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Yes, they were flying around there, all over the place, and they didn't use little ones such as could barely lift me off the water!

With all this education from the Premier and all the others, when they vote against that sort of thing, the Premier says they need more education. Well, I suggest those people of the north know what they want in the way of wanting the same

things as their fellow citizens, and I submit it is up to this Legislative Assembly to see that their democratic will is respected and they do not get that measure of freedom as soon as it possibly can be given to them.

On the question of health, I don't intend to speak at any great length. I have already referred to the doubling of the hospitalization tax to the individual, from \$5 to \$10. Of course, we heard before this government came into office that it would never play politics and things like that, and some people believed it, I guess; but we saw that that announcement was not made until after the election, and not even until after the Alberta election. Then the \$10 announcement was made.

In regard to the hospitalization situation, I see that the cost in 1947 was \$7,560,000 in round numbers. The population of the province is 841,000. That works out at just about \$9 for every man, woman and child in this province for hospitalization. Now, there are some people on both sides of this House who know something about the success of the municipal hospitalization schemes. They can easily see how those schemes could have been expanded until there was a province-wide scheme. Those schemes are costing about \$3 per capita; in 1947 the government scheme was costing \$9 per capita.

Does anybody think, with the centralization that is going on, the spending, for example, of nearly \$600,000 already on administration, that they are not wasting money on this scheme? We are not getting value for the money expended. Some persons may say it is a good thing no matter what we spend on it. Unfortunately, we are not all so wealthy. If the farmers have to pay most of the taxation, and we set up a system that eats up so much money to centralize administration, with inefficiency, it means there is less to spend on other very essential matters. Every member of this Assembly should ask himself why is it that in 1947 the cost of hospitalization had gone up from \$3 to \$9. That is something for everybody to ask themselves.

Perhaps we think everybody can easily pay the hospitalization tax; but I would point out that today there are people who are finding it very difficult to pay the tax. I have in mind a gentleman in my own town who was not able to pay the tax. His little boy was injured, went to the hospital; and that man found he had to pay his entire hospitalization. Now then, I ask this: isn't it the same thing, even though my hon. friend from Canora (Mr. Kuziak) went into transports of joy at the difference?

I might ask the government, when the time comes, to explain how they are picking the people they are prosecuting for not paying this tax. Harsh penalties have been imposed on war veterans and others who are not in good circumstances; fines and jail sentences have been imposed. We didn't, in the days that

are past, say to a man, if he didn't pay his hospitalization on top of going and trying to get in the hospital as best he could, that he would probably be arrested and go to jail if he didn't pay his tax as well.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson:** — Just as bad as the case up at Canora.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Just the same thing. Let the member for Canora weep over that situation. That's "humanity first". And how they are picking these people to prosecute? Are they going to prosecute them all, whether they can afford to pay or not? Who is the one picking out the ones they are going to prosecute. Very heavy fines have been imposed, and I submit that if you reserve the right to collect taxation in that harsh manner, then you should at the same time say that everyone is entitled to hospitalization under this scheme even though he is so poor he cannot afford to pay the tax. That is one of the things this opposition is going to ask for: just who is being prosecuted; and are people being prosecuted who can't really afford to pay, and being forced to pay this money under threat of going to jail. If that is the case, why can't they get hospitalization service whether they have managed to pay it up or not? It is just one of the things, Mr. Speaker, we would like to have some information about; not now, but when the hon. Premier speaks on the matter.

Another thing: the question of the air ambulance. We have heard — why it would almost wring tears from the eyes of a stone image — the story the hon. member for Canora told yesterday about his own constituency.

**Premier Douglas:** — It did not have any effect on you.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Then he went on to say they were a "God-forsaken people". I know the people up there, and I know the wonderful district it is. I found it hard to believe, in fact I can't believe, that the people of his district are as hard-hearted as he made them out to be, because, under the old system, nothing like that happened in the Rosthern district, and I doubt very much that the people in his district are so much more hard-hearted than the people in my district.

To return to the question of the air ambulance: there, again, the attitude is, if it is a good thing it doesn't matter what it costs. Apparently that is the idea, and we find that in 1947 the cost of these trips amounted to about \$330 each.

**Premier Douglas:** — No, you are wrong. That included capital cost.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, those are the figures I have, and when you come to speak you can give them. I think that capital cost is part of the cost. You may be like the man who figured he was making a lot of money. He bought a threshing outfit, and at the end of a day when he got more in than he had to pay out, he thought he was making money, without providing for the cost of the machine. Perhaps that is the way you are running the government. I don't know. Sometimes I think so. Capital costs are costs just as much as other costs.

**Premier Douglas:** — If my hon. friend will permit me. He says that \$330 was the cost per trip. I say it is not the cost per trip, as he is including the cost of the plane, which is not part of the cost of the trip.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I said the cost of providing for each person. Surely you have to provide the plane before you can fetch them in. I say the cost, averaged out over all. I submit it has to be looked into. Is it necessary to spend that money on each trip for each patient? When I say that, I am not finding fault with the system, because we had a system, not as well organized as today because there wasn't the flying service all over the province as today, but there was provision for fetching people in by air ambulance before the present government was elected. I submit that when you have people ready to do this work all over the province, some consideration should be given to whether we are spending too much money on it. I think the time must come, if we are going to do some of the things we should do with regard to education, some of the things we should do with regard to agriculture, some of the things we should do in many different ways, when we have to make sure we don't waste money.

That is all I intend to say on the question of health; but I am glad I get such approval of that viewpoint, because I can well understand some of the members don't like to have to listen to some of these truths. They are members of the Legislature, however, and they may as well make up their minds they are going to hear something besides unadulterated socialism such as we had yesterday. They are going to hear some of the facts of the situation.

I wish now to deal with industrial development for a few minutes. I think it may be fairly said that it has been pretty well proven now that, due to the policies of this government, we are actually suffering stagnation in development in Saskatchewan. The reason for it, I think, is because the government avowed its policy to be that they would not rest until they had eradicated capitalism. One of the first statements by the Minister of Natural Resources in the booklet he put out was that

their ultimate aim was the socialization of natural resources, and so forth. Then there was the attitude taken in regard to expropriation of such items as the box factory, and their willingness to enter into competition, tax free, with money provided by the country, with private enterprise. And so the feeling, apparently, came over the people with money to invest, the ordinary people of this Dominion, that if they had a mind to invest they had to take a chance of losing it. They might just as well put it in a place where all they had to worry about was paying taxes and with regulations where they wouldn't be running the risk of having their property taken away from them. So we find that other provinces are experiencing the development we are not experiencing. I wish to give just a few figures to this House on this, to prove that that has happened.

On the gross value of production in the three prairie provinces in 1946 as compared with 1945, the gross value increased in Manitoba by \$12 million; in Saskatchewan by \$669,000; in Alberta by \$8 million. That is the gross value in the three prairie provinces, manufacturing and other production not agricultural. Then, the capital expenditure in manufacturing industry: in Manitoba, the capital expenditure in 1946 was \$5.3 million; in Saskatchewan, \$2.5 million; in Alberta, \$4 million. In 1947, the estimates for investment in manufacturing, mining, woods operation and selected utilities were: in Manitoba, the investment in 1947 was \$34 million, in 1948, \$38 million; in Saskatchewan, \$15 million and \$17 million; in Alberta, \$37 million and \$36 million. In other words, on both sides you have more than twice the investment in each one of those years in manufacturing, woods operations and so on. Manitoba, in 1948, got 64 new industries; in 1947, 53.

Now, let us look at mineral and oil production figures: Manitoba, 1947, \$18 million, 1948, \$26 million, an increase of \$8.5 million; Saskatchewan, 1947, 32 million, 1948, \$34 million, an increase of less than \$2 million, whereas the increase in Manitoba was \$8.5 million; Alberta, \$67 million in 1947, \$92 million in 1948, an increase, not of less than \$2 million as in Saskatchewan, but of \$25 million. We are told by Mr. Bichan, who has charge of mineral development in this province, that we have 80,000 square miles of the pre-Cambrian Shield, rich in minerals. That is something Alberta has not got. In addition to that, we have a large area which geologists are convinced is rich in oil resources. Before this government was elected, companies were prospecting this province and spending large sums of money hunting for oil. When this government was elected these companies went into the province of Alberta, where they have the great development I have just read to this Assembly. Why? Because of the very reason I just mentioned: the fear that this government may carry out its avowed policy.

It wasn't so unreasonable that they should feel that because, as I have already pointed out, there were the speeches made by the Premier, and there was The Crown Corporations Act which gave the government the right to expropriate property against the will of the owner; and we have the statement made by Mr. Phelps, the former Minister of Natural Resources, in the pamphlet issued by the department and therefore by the government, which says they eventually hoped to establish complete social ownership and management of key industries in the development of our resources. The Premier said, speaking in the Legislature in April, 1946: "We will not rest until capitalism is eradicated from Saskatchewan." We are told that this C.C.F. party follow the wishes of their convention, and in 1946, as reported in the "Commonwealth", they passed a resolution, of which this is a part:

Whereas the C.C.F., as a Socialist Party, believes in and advocates the public ownership of the natural resources of this province for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan, and

Whereas a resolution was passed at the 1945 Provincial Convention urging the Provincial Government to undertake the development and distribution of natural gas and oil in this province,

Be it therefore resolved: We urge our Government to take steps towards the implementation of the C.C.F. platform for the development and distribution of natural gas and oil under public ownership for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan.

There was a resolution of the C.C.F. party, reciting a previous resolution. Is it any wonder the oil people prospecting for oil pulled out of the province? Here today we have the great development in Alberta while we languish with practically no development at all. Now the government seeks to avoid this situation by the Premier going to New York and talking to some of the "big capitalists" down there — well, maybe the big capitalists there aren't as bad as our capitalists in Canada; they must be nicer fellows or something. He went down there, I presume at our expense, and talked to these capitalists; and he was going to get Swedish capital and British capital to come over here in the face of what he must have known about the dollar situation. Yet in spite of that we are told we are going to get all these people to come in. Then he gets up here at the Forum and repeats the old story, and here is what he said:

It is likely that British and Swedish representatives will come to Canada in a matter of months to survey the situation, and to have further discussions with the Saskatchewan Government."

We will be looking forward, with great interest, to the amount of British and Swedish capital that is going to come in here when our Canadian capital goes elsewhere.

Then we have him speaking at the Forum in January of this year, and here is one of the things he said. I would like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, just what you think of these words in regard to this whole situation: "Our capitalist system is through." This is after paying our money to put out advertisements trying to lure people into Saskatchewan, and after he has flown down to New York to try to get capital to come in here; then he gets up in the Forum and says our capitalist system is all through. Yes, he is trying to get men that don't know him so well. He thinks they will trust him better, I guess; that is the only thing I can see. Having done this, he gets up and says: "Our capitalist system is through. The time has come to move into new waters, to build ourselves a new form of society. The existing system has produced great wealth for the few: unemployment, poverty, misery and hell for the many."

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is there any country in the world where there is less of misery and hell than in this favoured country of Canada?

Then he goes on to say: "We in the capitalist countries are politically free, but economically enslaved." Now, that was something I was surprised to find, though I know it does not surprise his own followers. Then he goes on to say: "The C.C.F. believes the people, through their government, should own and operate the means of production, distribution and exchange whereby they live. That, I believe, is the middle way."

That they own and control every means by which they live, the middle way! Well, I wonder what the "extreme" way is that they have got in Russia. They do just the same thing. The only thing is that when a government has that power then nobody can prevent it from doing anything it wants to do. They have a beautiful constitution, too, I am told. Then, on top of all this talk by the Premier, we have Mr. Bichan, an employee of ours under the Department of Natural Resources, putting ads in the paper, saying that if these people come in and invest their money they will get exclusive rights in certain areas in regard to oil; saying that if you will just come in and hunt for minerals we will pay your trip around the province in a plane, and so on.

Mr. Bichan is supposed to have said he is very enthusiastic about the possibilities in regard to oil. If the possibilities are so great why have we not got development like they have in Alberta today? Because we have a government talking socialism and telling the people it ultimately intends to bring in socialism, in spite of what it says when it makes trips, through the Premier,



and talks to the capitalists in New York. They still think that some people in the party, anyway, believe in socialism. Speeches, such as those made yesterday, indicate that some still do believe it.

They have to make up their minds, Mr. Speaker, whether they are going to have these “big shots” come in from New York, Sweden and England, or whether they are going to say to them: “We believe in socialism; if you come in we will ultimately take over.” As it is, we are neither having the benefit one way or the other, and we are doomed if this government carries on the way it is today, to have a continuation of this stagnation.

Mr. Bichan said further: “We have in hand one of the biggest land deals in recent history.” Well, I ask the mover and seconder of the Address yesterday if they have ever asked Mr. Bichan what kind of a big deal is on with some of these big people. They should find out what the government is doing; but the trouble is that when people think they are coming under this risk when they come to our province, we have to hold out to them far more inducements in the way of exclusive rights than a province like Manitoba where they know all they need to fear is taxation and ordinary regulations. It is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that we have stagnation. The unfortunate part of it is that unless this government can be turned out of office before the four years are up . . .

Some of the members laugh at that. Apparently they are not ready to use their right as members to vote according to what they think right. They laugh at the idea that this government, no matter what it does, could be thrown out of office. I submit that is not the right way to approach the responsibilities of members of this Legislature. If facts are laid before the members of this Assembly that show them our province is suffering and people are being driven out of it to make a living for themselves elsewhere, that other provinces are going ahead by leaps and bounds while we are suffering stagnation, I submit they should put the best interests of the province above keeping this government in office.

**Hon. J.H. Brockelbank:** — You showed them how, at Ottawa.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I dealt with the question of development, and I could deal with the question of the increase in government expenditure, but I won't take the time to do that. One of the things I will say before I conclude — because it strikes at the very roots of democratic government — is that this government put through this Legislature a bill providing that civil servants could take part in political activity. Thereupon some of their prominent civil servants began to take part in political activity, and some resolutions were passed by C.C.F. convention that people who were

not good C.C.F.ers should be dismissed. Now some people, very prominent people, have been dismissed, and other very prominent C.C.F.ers have been appointed to public office. A recent one, of course, was Mr. McLeod; but one of the most outstanding ones of that nature was the appointment of the Public Service Commission. Oh so solemn promises were made, Mr. Speaker, that there was going to be no more patronage, no more of that in regard to public appointments, and the first man put in charge of appointments was one of the leading C.C.F.ers of the province. Why, even before the Ministry was sworn into office, I understand the Premier appointed the man, who gave way for him, to a prominent position in the public service. In view of the promises made it is rather surprising that that should be done; but I suppose we shouldn't have taken those promises quite so seriously as some people did.

In regard to civil servants, when these civil servants were told they could take part in politics, and resolutions were passed that if they weren't ardent enough C.C.F.ers they should lose their jobs, some of them began to take part in politics. One of the most amazing episodes took place last June, when something was reported on June 9. Civil servants flew in to Saskatoon to defend the work of the government in the north. Here is the story:

Taking advantage of recent legislation, Saskatchewan civil servants Tuesday evening gave a Saskatoon audience of 300 (this was June 9, 1948) the C.C.F. viewpoint of conditions and policies in the north.

That group flew in from Prince Albert to take part in a political meeting held in the Legion Hall under the auspices of the Saskatoon and District Council of the Canadian Congress of Labour. The speakers were Jim Gray, resident director of Lake and Forest Products, including the operation of the Timber and Fish Boards and the box factory; Mrs. J.J. Wheaton, wife of the Northern Saskatchewan administrator; Malcolm F. Norris, a Métis employed by the government to make a social and economic survey of northern Saskatchewan, and Harvey Weir, president of the union of the box factory. They flew in, we are told, in a plane to take part in this political meeting.

What right has any political party to use civil servants in that way, especially when it promised faithfully to do the opposite? That is the sort of thing that has been going on at the hands of this government: the most faithful promises, and then exactly the opposite done.

The last thing I wish to refer to tonight again is the use of public money to further the interests of a public political party. I have here a bunch of stuff printed at the expense of the people of the province: "Sixteen facts about Saskatchewan";

**February 15, 1949**

“Twenty-five facts about Saskatchewan”; “Toronto ‘Daily Star’ reports on the Saskatchewan Government”; all printed, of course, by the Saskatchewan Bureau of Publications; “Plans for Progress”; some more “Plans for Progress” — the speech from the throne should be “Plans for Progress” — plans but not action. Here is a beautiful piece of election literature.

**Premier Douglas:** — Handsome, isn’t he?

**Mr. Tucker:** — I’d find him a good deal more handsome if the C.C.F. had paid for this instead of asking the people of the province to pay for it. This was put out during the election campaign and scattered all over the province. Then here —he wasn’t so handsome in this picture; I think this must have been taken at some other time, maybe 1945 — I don’t know why he wasn’t handsome then. But here is another picture put out by the King’s Printer: “Record of Accomplishment”. And here is the crowning piece of work altogether; election literature put out by the government at the expense of the people of the province, “Progress Report”, just before the election. Here we have “Greetings for 1948”, paid for by the Crown Corporations, and another beautiful picture and the signature of the Premier of this province.

Now I ask you, especially those who have applauded, do you think it right that public money should be used to support the fortunes of one political party?

**Hon. J.H. Brockelbank:** — They do it in Ottawa, too.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson:** — And in Russia.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Yes, they do that in Russia; they did it under dictatorship. This is a democracy and public money should not be used for partisan political purposes. Why, I was most interested that, to help out the C.C.F. in other provinces, they even insert advertisements in C.C.F. papers. I have here the “C.C.F. News” from British Columbia: “Sturdy works Saskatchewan Leather Products”. It must have been that that killed the boot factory, when they advertised in the C.C.F. paper in B.C., because then they had to fold up.

Incidentally, in that connection, a letter was written to the “C.C.F. News” about these boots:

At this time I have no knowledge of Saskatchewan-made boots being sold in stores in this province. We suggest you address the Saskatchewan Leather Products, 7th Avenue and Hamilton Street, Regina.

Here they spend our money advertising in B.C., and the very paper says it has no knowledge of boots being handled in the stores of B.C. That looks pretty close to a gift of our money to that C.C.F. paper. That sort of thing has to come to an end; that abuse of the funds and money of the people of this province to promote and further the fortunes of a political party.

**Hon. J.H. Brockelbank:** — Boy, oh boy!

**Mr. Tucker:** — That amuses the Minister of Natural Resources. If he handles our natural resources the same way as this, then I am more apprehensive about them than I was before. If he thinks this is all right, then I am more apprehensive about the whole situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to conclude.

We have — and I now move this amendment formally — indicated the different points in which we say that this government has lost the confidence of the people of the province. I have outlined definitely, point after point, where they have failed to carry out their promises, where they have failed to accomplish anything. As a result of their policies, we are enduring stagnation in this province whereas other provinces are going ahead by leaps and bounds. The young people are having to go elsewhere to make their living; the province's population is not increasing as it should. The policies in regard to agriculture are such that even the Minister envisages the time when there will be less than half the farmers in the province that there are today. It is a policy, Mr. Speaker, of defeatism.

We of the Liberal party do not share in that pessimism as to the future of the province. We feel that, with the proper policy, the agricultural industry can be made to forge ahead, and that here we can establish happy and contented farmers as in the province of Manitoba. We feel we can have mineral and oil development for bringing large incomes to our people, and income for our government. We feel that, in the realm of education, something must be done to improve the level of education and to improve the position of the teachers of this province. We believe in all the things I have mentioned; but the government has lost the confidence of the people and were they given the opportunity today, this government would be turned out of office, and the policy which I have just enunciated would be returned by a large majority.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:47 o'clock p.m.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, for a few moments before adjourning the debate, I wish to extend to you, Sir, my congratulations on your appointment to the position which you now hold. I think it is a mark of confidence of the members in all parts of the House when they elected you unanimously to the position of Speaker of this Assembly. I am sure that the members in all parts of the House have a very high regard for your integrity and impartiality. I am sure we shall do our best to co-operate with you in conducting the affairs of this Assembly. I know that in the past four years you had a fairly easy task. I think the only time you had any trouble was when one member of the House called another member a “dirty skunk” — “stinking skunk”, I think is more accurate. The gentleman guilty of that misdemeanour, I believe, has since been elevated to the Bench, and I want to sincerely express the hope, Mr. Speaker, that all members of the legal profession in the House will not take upon themselves to call that particular member a “stinking skunk” at this time in the hope of getting judicial preferment. I think it should not be taken that it will necessarily follow they will go to the Appeal Court if they call another member of the House that name.

I should also like to extend my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the speech from the throne, who spoke so ably yesterday. I have heard a good many motions moved and seconded by members who were making their maiden speeches and I do not think I have heard any member make any better speech than the speeches made yesterday by the member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) and the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker). I would like to extend to them my very hearty congratulations. The Leader of the Opposition has told them he thought that, in making good speeches, they had made a good job of a poor case. I can assure you, Sir, that if he had as good a case as they had, he would have made a much better fist of what he was trying to do today.

I would like, also, to welcome the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker), and to congratulate him on the very fine effort he put forth this afternoon. In offering him my congratulations I should like publicly to express my high regard for the former Leader of the Opposition, the member for Cannington (Mr. Patterson), and to say how much of a pleasure it was during the past four years to work with him here in this Assembly, and to say what a great debt the people of Saskatchewan owe to men like him who engage in public affairs and come to a prominent position in the public life. Public affairs is always a strain, and one who engages in them and comes to prominent position has to give up much of the social and family life one would like to have had. I am sure I speak for all the people of the province and all members of the Assembly when I say to the former Leader

of the Opposition how highly we regard him for the work he has done. We are delighted to see him back with us at this session. Rumour has it that he may be elevated to some higher task within the next few months. If he is, it will be a well-deserved reward, and he will take with him the best wishes and the highest regards of all the members of the Assembly.

I should like to say to the present Leader of the Opposition that we welcome him here, and now that he is here, I am sure we will do our best to keep his life from being too dull for him.

He has already shown that it will take time for him to get adjusted to his new position and environment. Throughout his speech, he kept referring to this group as the “opposition”. I suppose he sat so long with the government at Ottawa that it had become a habit; or when he entered the provincial field last June, he probably had, in his imagination, seen himself sitting on the government side of the House instead of in the opposition. He will have to get himself adjusted to the fact.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Coming events cast their shadow before.

**Premier Douglas:** — My friend does cast a very large shadow. I am quite willing to admit that; but it doesn't extend over this way; in fact if you get the shadow and the light falling accurately, the shadow will be backward and not forward.

I am not going to attempt at this late hour to deal with all the arguments of the Leader of the Opposition, but with just one or two things I think my hon. friend got himself a little excited over, quite unnecessarily. The speech which he delivered here today, of course, is not new. He referred to the same old line that the mover and seconder reiterated what had been used by the C.C.F. again and again. The bogeyman story we listened to today has been used to frighten little children all over Saskatchewan. From a score of platforms, my hon. friend has tried to frighten people about the terrible menace of this government, the terrible things they have done, and the terrible things they are going to do. They haven't succeeded in frightening very many people as I shall proceed to show later on; but it is very amusing to see the histrionics repeated here today.

For instance, my friend talked a great deal about the publications put out by the Bureau of Publications. He said that that is what they do in Russia. My friend and I had the privilege of sitting in the same parliament for quite a number of years — we both left it for the same reason — and if he would care to cast his mind's eye back he will find that, in Ottawa, the

Dominion Bureau of Information puts out far more literature about what the government is doing, and what its programme is. If you take the trouble to look at the figures, you will find the dominion government today is spending in the neighbourhood of \$500,000 — not \$30,000 as we spend here, and at the present time they have a staff of some 262 public relations and publicity men. If you take the trouble to read the address in defence of that action by Mr. Claxton, the Minister who is responsible, you will find these words in his speech in the House of Commons. He said descriptive booklets, a regular daily airmail service, a weekly summary of the news, and a monthly publication were issued. These were put out by the dominion government he said “in order that the people of Canada may know how their money is being spent, so that the people of Canada might know what is happening.” The pamphlet that my hon. friend held up a while ago, with my picture on the cover, was a reprint of a speech I made in the budget debate. My hon. friend suggests that the federal government does not send out copies of the budget speeches, either by the Minister of Finance or by the head of the government . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — They pay for them themselves.

**Premier Douglas:** — No, they do not pay for them themselves. They have been sent to every home in my constituency and to hundreds of homes in Regina; speeches made by Mackenzie King and speeches made by the Minister of National Defence during the war. They were sent into thousands of homes all over this province and all over the Dominion of Canada: “Canada at War”, which was a history of the Liberal party’s alleged efforts and accomplishments during the war . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — The efforts of the Canadian people.

**Premier Douglas:** — Yes, and particularly of the Liberal government. They took most of the credit rather than give it to the Canadian people. I have no doubt that my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, sent out a good many thousands of that pamphlet.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I paid for them myself.

**Premier Douglas:** — You did not pay for the printing of them. They were printed by the Bureau of Information. They were not paid for by any individual members.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, any political speeches I paid for myself.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, these speeches could not be paid for; they were given free to Members of Parliament who wanted to send them out. Any Member of Parliament could get them and they could “frank” them out. So, when my friend comes along and says that literature is being sent out by this government, and that that is what they do in Russia, I would like to tell him that right at Ottawa more literature is being sent out today, in proportion to either its budget or the population for which it is responsible, than has ever been sent out by this government.

I was also rather interested to hear the Leader of the Opposition, before he sat down, predict that this government would be turned out of office, and urging that it should be turned out of office. My friend is very good at predicting. He became the Leader of his party in the summer of 1946, I believe. The following January, in 1947, the announcement was made that there would probably be a provincial election that summer, and that the government would be turned out. When the provincial election did not materialize in the spring of 1947, he immediately announced that it would be held in the fall of 1947, and that the government would be turned out. That did not materialize. He then announced that the government would probably not dare face the Legislature in the spring and winter of 1948, but would probably hold a winter election, and again that they would be turned out. That did not materialize. When an election was called in June, 1948, he announced, of course, the government would most certainly be turned out.

**Mr. Tucker:** — That is a very nice fairy tale but I never, at any time, said you would not dare face the Legislature, and there would be a winter election. If you got a report to that effect then it was mistaken; but I doubt if you have such a report.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of the radio broadcast which my hon. friend gave, and he said there would be an election in the winter of the year 1947-48.

**Mr. Tucker:** — My hon. friend is wrong on that, Mr. Speaker. I ask him to accept my word for it. He can't produce it. I said there would probably be an early spring election, but not a winter election.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I will be very glad to accept the hon. gentleman's word, quite willingly; but, as I say, I will also be very glad to send over to him a copy of the broadcast in question.



**February 15, 1949**

My friend has always been predicting the government is going to be turned out of office. As a matter of fact, he went so far as to predict, during the election campaign, that I would be defeated in my own constituency.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I never did predict that.

**Premier Douglas:** — He said to the people, “Why the Premier is not even safe in his own constituency”. But the fact is, of course, that I was fortunate enough — I think undeservedly — in receiving a much larger majority than my hon. friend was given in his constituency. When my hon. friend makes an appeal to the private members who sit with the government to turn this government out, it is passing strange. To ask men to turn against the government they may support, and to turn out the government which is pledged to the programme of the party of which they are members, comes with ill grace from a man who stood in the House of Commons when the legislation was being brought in to tax co-operatives and who said: “I don’t know what I should do. I am opposed to this legislation. I don’t like it, but I can’t vote against the Liberal party because it would mean putting a Liberal government out of office.

**Mr. Tucker:** — On a point of order. My hon. friend is stating something that I did not say. I said that I did not like the principle of the taxation of co-operatives in any way, shape or form, but this measure took more taxation off them than was put on them. That is what I said.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Is the hon. gentleman’s point of order that he was misquoted?

**Mr. Tucker:** — Absolutely, Mr. Speaker.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I shall produce Hansard and read it to my hon. friend tomorrow.

May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend talked for two and one-half hours and, with the exception of when he asked me a question, I let him talk. I know that my friend does not like this . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — I’m not talking with your permission.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, the Premier said he let me talk. Surely it hasn’t come to that in this Legislature.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The hon. member will allow the member on his feet to make a speech without too much cross-fire. Yesterday there were many interjections, and today it has been quite as bad. I think the hon. members will agree with me that this cannot continue. When a member is on his feet making a speech it is due to that member to have the opportunity of making it without interruption, unless someone rises to a point of order or a point of privilege. This cross-fire across the floor has been altogether too prevalent.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I did not mean that I was giving the hon. member any privileges in his speech, I merely meant that I would like him to extend me the same courtesy and let me speak. This is still a free country and a free Legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one point, I think, which should be corrected in the mind of my hon. friend — I doubt if it exists in the mind of any other member of the Legislature — and that is: at least six or eight times, when he was speaking in his two and one-half hour speech this afternoon, he kept referring to the fact that “grants” were being given by the federal government to the people of Saskatchewan. He kept talking about these “grants”: we were being given seven or eight million dollars, and we were being given this money for this purpose and for that purpose. Mr. Speaker, he may have brought here with him the mentality of the government at Ottawa, but I would suggest that it would be well to disabuse himself of that attitude. The people of Saskatchewan are not mendicants receiving grants, thrown like a bone to a dog, from the government at Ottawa. These are not “grants”, they are subsidies paid to the people of Saskatchewan in lieu of, and in return for, fields of taxation which they have surrendered. They are a part of the revenue to which we are entitled by virtue of the fact that there are corporations in Canada which make their money all over Canada, including Saskatchewan, but which do not pay taxes in Saskatchewan. By virtue of our constitutional set-up, we in Saskatchewan are not able to tax larger firms, like the oil companies, the railroads, where their head office is, for corporation tax or income tax. We are not able to tax the farm implement companies which do a tremendous volume of business in this province. The whole basis of the Dominion-Provincial Conferences, and the whole basis of the Dominion-Provincial Agreement, was that provinces like our own, in which these corporations make money, and make a great deal of money, since such provinces cannot tax those corporations, they should delegate to a central authority the power to tax them, and that provinces such as ours should get back that which is rightfully ours. When the International Harvester or the Massey-Harris Company or the Imperial Oil Company makes money in this province, and pays its taxes in some other part of Canada, it is paying taxes on income which it earned in

Saskatchewan. When the federal government taxes that corporation, sets aside part of the proceeds of that tax and pays it back to the province of Saskatchewan, that is not a gift, Mr. Speaker. It is not largess handed out by some benevolent government at Ottawa . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I never said it was a gift. I said it was taxation . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has made his speech and . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, I object to the hon. member saying or intimating that I suggested the people were mendicants. I never said anything of the sort. Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask that the hon. member submit to this: he puts words in my mouth, indicating that I thought the people of this province were mendicants. I say I never said it, I didn't imply it, and he has no right to say it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. Leader of the Opposition categorically denies that he made any such statement in his speech, but the hon. member did make some statements, and he must expect to be replied to and . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — But fairly so!

**Mr. Speaker:** — If I find any speaker making statements which are obnoxious or not in accordance with the truth, if anyone rises on his feet to a point of order, I will enforce that order.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend is exceedingly touchy. He has always had the reputation of being probably the biggest “cry baby” in the House of Commons, and he is certainly doing his best to live up to it.

**Mr. W.J. Patterson (Cannington):** — On a point of order. I do not think it is proper for the Premier of this province to refer to an hon. member in such terms. I think it very undignified indeed, coming from a man who holds the position he does to make that reference.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I have been on my feet for 20 minutes, and the hon. gentleman has interrupted me at least eight or ten times. He spoke for two and one-half hours this afternoon and I did not interrupt him except when he asked me a direct rhetorical question. It is a fairly good indication, Mr. Speaker, of just what is going on. There is no question of privilege.

**Mr. Patterson:** — On a point of privilege: any member in this House who gets up and makes statements the Premier has made during the last 20 minutes can expect to be interrupted, and will be interrupted.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. What the hon. member said about me being well known as a “cry baby” in the House of Commons is absolutely untrue, and the hon. member knows it, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

**Mr. Speaker:** — On the point of order, I will rule that if the hon. Minister who was speaking used that term to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I think he should withdraw it. It is not very dignified.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I was not using it with reference to the hon. member. I simply said that was the opinion that has been expressed. If it gives offence to my hon. friend I will be very glad to withdraw it.

**Mr. Tucker:** — It wouldn't offend you, oh, no!

**Premier Douglas:** — My hon. friend has demonstrated very well, today, that he can hand it out, but he can't take it.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I can take what's fair, but I won't take the stuff you try to hand out.

**Premier Douglas:** — My hon. friend is trying to wiggle out of something. He said it six or eight times this afternoon — he referred to the payments made by the dominion government as “grants”. He can't deny that! The record is perfectly clear — will my hon. friend just keep quiet. He is not on his feet now — you are not in the House of Commons where you have 180 people to shout everyone else down. Just give me a chance to make my speech.

He referred to these as “grants”. I am saying, clearly and categorically, these are not grants. These are payments made to the people of Saskatchewan to which they are entitled. They are the proceeds of tax revenue which belong to the people of Saskatchewan as a part of the Dominion of Canada. Anyone who comes here and talks about giving them to us for this purpose or that purpose had better get over the idea of some benevolent centralism kindly handing out to the provinces some little tidbit on the understanding that they shall do this or that with it. These

**February 15, 1949**

revenues belong to the people of Saskatchewan to be spent by the people of Saskatchewan through their elected representatives, and they are not something the dominion government, or any other central government, can tell them how they should be spent or for what they should be spent. I think it ought to be made clear to my hon. friend at the very beginning of his regime here as Leader of the Opposition . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I never suggested anything of the sort, that the federal government would dictate how . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! That is not a point of order.

**Mr. Patterson:** — Mr. Speaker, hasn't the hon. member the opportunity of stating his point of order? Should he be cut off before he states his position?

**Mr. Speaker:** — If you want to debate whether this is a point of order, it is all right. The hon. member did state his point of order: that he didn't say it. As a matter of fact, I am sitting here and I listened. The statement ascribed to him he did make, and I rule it no point of order.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier said I had to learn that these were not grants, and I had to learn that the federal government did not have any right to dictate how they should be spent. I do not have to learn that from the hon. member or anyone else. I know that just as well as he does. He has no right to make that implication against me.

**Mr. Speaker:** — That is not a point of order.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend has a perfect right to get up and make a speech on some other motion, but he has no right to get up and argue every point. If I had got up and argued each point on which I disagreed with him today, his speech would have taken much longer than the mere two and one-half hours. However, Mr. Speaker, in the hope that a good night's sleep may make him more amenable to listening to someone else make a speech, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:47 o'clock p.m.