

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Eleventh Legislature
5th Day

Wednesday, February 16, 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.

Premier Douglas: — When the debate was adjourned yesterday afternoon, I was drawing the attention of the House to the amendment which is now before it, and to the plea of the Leader of the Opposition that the members who support the government ought now to turn that government out of office. I was in the process of pointing out that that plea came very strangely from a gentleman who spoke as follows, in Hansard — I had not intended to take any time on this, but, since the Leader of the Opposition called in question my reference yesterday, I thought I might as well quote from Hansard itself. This is the revised Hansard of August 20, 1946, issued by the Canadian House of Commons. On page 5,086, we find the present Leader of the Opposition, speaking in a debate as to whether or not the co-operatives should be subjected to a three percent tax, used these words:

There is great anxiety as to how I am going to vote. Well, I feel so strongly against this particular principle I would gladly vote to take out this three percent principle, because I never believed in it, and I do not believe in it now.

Mr. Tucker: — Why don't you go on and read the next . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is not going to make my speech for me. He made his yesterday. I think I could have improved on his, and I would like him to wait and see if he can improve on mine after it is finished.

Mr. Tucker: — He is not going to misrepresent my position, Mr. Speaker.

Premier Douglas: — I'm not misrepresenting anything. I don't propose to read the entire speech, but I do propose to read what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. Speaker: — I think it is the time now to inform the members of the House that they will have to refrain from speaking across the floor one to the other. If any member of the House wishes to ask a member who is speaking a question, he must rise in his seat. If we are to have any decorum in this House at all, there certainly must be a cessation of this talking across one to the other.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am reading this only because the hon. gentleman denied it yesterday. Let me read it; and I will read all of it, since my hon. friend wants me to. He probably likes the sound of his own voice, and the sound of his own words, so I will read all of it:

I want to say that on this particular principle I would gladly vote to take out this 3 percent principle, because I never believed in it, and I do not believe in it now. But there is more than that involved, other useful sections of this Act; and, also, my hon. friends know very well that this is parliamentary government, and I would rather have the Liberal Party, which has not hesitated to lay this programme before the people, and which is ready to stand and fight for it as no other party is doing today; I would rather have that Party in power than any other.

Here is a gentleman who said “I disagree with this; I am opposed to it in principle, but I would rather have the Liberal party than vote for my principles.” And then he appeals to the members on this side of the House to turn the government out.

The hon. gentleman has moved a motion of non-confidence in the government. He has expressed the opinion that, if the people of the province were asked to decide at the polls today, they would be prepared to turn this government out of office. But, Mr. Speaker, it is less than a year ago that the people of this province spoke at the polls; and the same gentleman who is saying what the people should do, and told us at great length what the people would do for the two years prior to the election, sits in opposition and not as head of the government. I am not going to take the trouble to quote all the things he is reported to have said; but there was prediction after prediction made by the Leader of the Opposition that if the government went to the country the people would turn us out of office. Again, I quote — not because it is important in itself, but because my friend denied it yesterday. He said that at no time had he said the present government was afraid to meet the Legislature. Well, I quote from the Moose Jaw Times Herald . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I did not deny that yesterday.

Premier Douglas: — Well, fortunately, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Tucker: — The Premier has a lot of nerve.

Premier Douglas: — Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, there is a record taken of what is said in the House, and I am quite prepared to have the record speak for itself. I quote from the Moose Jaw Times Herald of Saturday, December 29, 1947.

Mr. Tucker accused Premier Douglas of trying to find an issue for an early election so the people will be rushed to the polling booths before the facts of C.C.F. bungling had become better known. The plight of the government may become so serious, Premier Douglas will spring a winter election rather than face the Legislature and the probing of the Opposition for the facts about the government record.

So, all through the campaign, and for some two years prior to the campaign, the Leader of the Opposition was predicting what would happen if the government went to the polls. Well, the government went to the polls, in spite of the fact that Liberal canvassers and Liberal speakers had been telling people for years that once the C.C.F. got in, there would never be another chance to cast a vote. We went to the polls — and we didn't wait six years to go to the polls.

Mr. Tucker: — There wasn't a war on, of course.

Premier Douglas: — We went to the polls at the end of four years as we promised the people. Mr. Speaker, it was not an ordinary election. For the first time in the history of this province an election was fought on straight economic issues, in which all forces of reaction, spearheaded by the Chambers of Commerce throughout this province and Canada, by the insurance companies which came in here, set up most of the employees from one of the biggest public relations firms in Canada in the Saskatchewan Hotel, put out their own ads and their own publicity men. In my own constituency, as far south as the international border, they had canvassers from the insurance companies driving from house to house. That was carried on all over the province, for the forces of reaction were determined, if possible, to crush this government.

The Leader of the Opposition and I entered parliament at the same time, in the election of 1935, when the Liberals were elected by going around the country denouncing R.B. Bennett and the Conservative party as being the “tools” of Bay Street and St. James Street; when they went about this country talking about Mr. Mackenzie King's lovely phrases: “Usury once in control will wreck any nation”, and “credit isn't a matter for bankers only, but accredited currency should be issued in terms of public need”. They were the champions of the common man. They were

February 16, 1949

the Sir Galahads going out to fight against the forces of reaction, and against the terrible Tories, dominated by Bay Street and St. James Street.

And what do we find in 1948? We find, when this provincial election comes around, the Sir Galahads are hand in glove with the Tories whom they have been condemning for years. The Leader of the Opposition goes into the Rosetown constituency, where there is no Liberal candidate, to speak for a Conservative candidate. Then he came into the city of Regina not only to speak for the Liberal candidate but also to speak for the Conservative candidate — the same Conservative candidate who, at a recent meeting of Mr. Drew's in the Armouries, described the Liberal government as "a patronage-ridden bureaucracy". They got along well together, these colleagues.

Mr. Tucker: — You had the Communists speaking for you.

Premier Douglas: — Here were the people who were fighting this election together — the Liberal party . . .

Mr. Egnatoff: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Premier Douglas: — I will be very glad to answer the question of my hon. friend later on. At the present moment, I am making a speech in reply to the Leader of the Opposition.

The gentleman who just sat down, the member for Melfort, who asked me a question, I have just noticed in a newspaper clipping I have just been perusing, was quoted throughout the campaign as the "Liberal-Progressive Conservative candidate for Melfort", although, apparently, in the campaign he wanted the Progressive Conservative support, when he came to put his name down on the nomination papers he just could not stomach the idea of putting "Progressive Conservative" after "Liberal".

Mr. Egnatoff: — On a point of order. By arrangement I had the backing of the Progressive Conservative people of the constituency . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order or a question of privilege; it is a confession!

Mr. Tucker: — More than you made!

Premier Douglas: — Now, Mr. Speaker, what I want to point out is that, after having departed from their principles, after having associated with people whom they had condemned up and down this country for having put up tariffs and being tools of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association; after having lined up with the insurance companies and the Chambers of Commerce, what was the result? The Liberal party polled 15,000 votes more in this election than they polled in 1944 when they hit their all-time low. Now, Mr. Speaker, Judas sold himself for 30 pieces of silver; the Liberal party sold itself for 15,000 votes.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I object to the Premier mentioning us in any way in that connection. If the Premier is going to resort to this sort of abuse I am not going to sit and take it. There was no selling out whatever.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member made a speech and the hon. Premier is replying to it.

Mr. Tucker: — But I didn't resort to personal abuse, Mr. Speaker.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am not resorting to any personal abuse; I am just dealing with the tactics of the Liberal party. Yesterday my hon. friend spoke for over two hours. I at no time interrupted him. I rose once when he asked me a direct question; I answered the question and sat down. My friend surely does not object to my criticizing the Liberal party and to my pointing out that the one-time great Liberal party sold its birthright for a mess of pottage . . .

Mr. Tucker: — I deny it.

Premier Douglas: — And that, as a result, it got 15,000 more votes than it got in 1944. Mr. Speaker, the government, whom the Leader of the Opposition now says would be turned out of office if it went to the polls, got 25,000 votes more in 1948 than it got in 1944.

Of course, the Liberal party is going to find it difficult now, after having cuddled up beside the Conservative party, as it now has, to have a fight with them in the federal election. That is going to mean a very difficult and delicate situation to deal with. And so, the Leader of the Opposition went up to speak in North Battleford, and I have before me the North Battleford Optimist of January 20, 1949, and there is a three-column heading here which says: "Liberals single choice of stable Government".

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — If that means “smelly government”, I suppose I could agree with the Leader of the Opposition. We are not just sure what he means by the term “stable”. But the article goes on, and on the twelfth page, this is what the Leader of the Opposition is quoted as saying — I ask the Leader of the Opposition to pay very close attention:

Our Conservative friends helped materially in making the gains we did in the provincial election. (That is an acknowledgment of assistance.) Our mutual differences were overcome by the common aim of defeating Socialism. The problem is different in the Federal case, Mr. Tucker said. Mr. Drew has stated that every seat in Saskatchewan will be contested. His organizer in this province has made attacks on both Liberals and C.C.F.s. I hope that the provincial relationship between the Liberals and Conservatives will not be destroyed by these attacks.

Why, Mr. Speaker, the man on the flying trapeze was a paralytic compared to the Leader of the Opposition. He wants to be able to cuddle up beside the Conservatives in a provincial election, and then when a federal election comes along, and the Liberal press is getting all ready to describe Mr. Drew as the arch-champion of special privilege, Mr. Tucker says to the Conservatives and to his own people, “You must understand that this is only going to be a sham battle . . .

Mr. Tucker: — There is nothing like that in the speech at all.

Premier Douglas: — . . . we are just going to have padded gloves, and we’ll not hurt each others. You mustn’t take this battle too seriously because when it is all over we hope that we will be able again to cuddle up together”. Mr. Speaker, politicians certainly make strange bed-fellows.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear! You and the Communists!

Premier Douglas: — The Leader of the Opposition yesterday said that the speech from the throne indicated the government had done nothing for four years, and this amendment proceeds to elaborate on that thesis. I, therefore, want to deal with what the government has done, as criticized in the various items in this omnibus motion of non-confidence. I want to deal with it, Mr. Speaker, not by just making wide and sweeping statements, but by placing before the

House the facts. There is an old Scottish saying which says: “Facts are dour chiels that winna ding”, which, translated into English, simply means that facts are stubborn creatures you can’t laugh away. I propose to put on record the facts of what the government has done with regard to these various things mentioned in the amendment, with regard to these respective fields during the past four years.

First of all, I would like the House to remember that the government took over in 1944 while this country was still at war. We took over following ten years of Liberal administration, and our first task was not to begin to deal with the social and economic problems we knew must be dealt with in the long run; our first problem was to meet the deplorable conditions that had been left behind by ten years of maladministration. We took over in a province that, in the four years prior to our coming into office, had lost 50,000 of its people, not counting the men who had gone overseas, for these were counted as still living here. There was a 50,000 decline in our population, which is only beginning to come back now. We took over with a provincial debt of \$214 million which has since been reduced by some \$70 million. We took over with \$18 million of seed grain debts lying at the doors of the farmers, the municipalities and the provincial government. These were not debts incurred just the day before; they were debts incurred ‘way back in 1938, and for six years the administration had sat there and had done little or nothing about them. Already the creditors were at our door demanding payment. In addition, there was \$83 million of relief debt; a municipal debt of \$27 million; \$160 million of farm debt over this province, and no adequate measures had been provided to deal with that situation.

It was into this deplorable set of conditions that the C.C.F. government was precipitated in 1944, and the first part of our term of office was spent in dealing with this emergency situation. As I said, since then the provincial debt has been reduced by some 32 percent; seed grain and relief debts are being met, and I am sure it is seldom recognized that every year this government has to spend over \$3 million solely in retiring the old seed grain and relief debts that were incurred by the previous administration, and about which they had done practically nothing. The municipal debt was reduced by some 35 percent and the farm debt in the past four years has been cut in half.

The next thing we had to do was to provide, immediately, some measure of protection for the farming and working population of this province. In spite of the attempts by the federal government to have declared *ultra vires* the crop failure part of The Farm Security Act, and the important part of The Trade Union Act, we have been able to provide protection both to the farmer and to the worker. The result to day is that our farm income has

steadily increased; agricultural production has gone up steadily: to \$337 million in 1945; \$383 million in 1946; \$441 million in 1947. The net farm income has continued to rise. It was \$183 million in 1945; \$228 million in 1946 and \$273 million in 1947.

The workers, under The Trade Union Act, have been able to increase their trade union organizations; better labour laws have established and improved minimum standards for the workers. The average wage in Saskatchewan, in non-agricultural industries, has risen from \$30.75 per person to \$40.86 per person. That is still slightly below the Canadian average. I am far from satisfied with it, but is 33 1/3 percent higher than it was when we took office. In a good bit of the first two years, the C.C.F. government's efforts were devoted to providing protection, and adequate protection, for the workers and the farmers.

Our next task was to begin to do something about these unfortunate people in our community who had been so long neglected: the sick, the aged, the blind, the infirm, the mentally ill, the fatherless and the widows. We took office, Mr. Speaker, at a time when Saskatchewan had probably the lowest average of social services of any province in Western Canada. Today, after only four years, we have one of the highest averages anywhere in Canada.

The Leader of the Opposition, yesterday, tried to justify the administration of the Liberal governments in the past by saying times were bad, that we were down to an agricultural income of, I think he said, \$73 million. That was in 1937, Mr. Speaker; but what about before that? What about after that? The Liberal party was in office uninterruptedly until 1929, and what were the social services in those years? Then the Anderson government came in, and for the five years the Conservatives were in office there was a depression on. The Liberal speakers went up and down this province condemning the Conservative government because of the fact they were not providing better social services.

The Liberals came back into office in 1934. It is true we had a crop failure in 1937, but we did not have a crop failure in 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943 or 1944. Yet what do we find? Let me outline some of the conditions we found. We found that the average Old Age Pension — and these figures are from the Labour Gazette, printed by the Department of Labour at Ottawa — in 1943, in the province of Saskatchewan, was \$17.53; the amount of money spent, \$2,987,000. In 1943 the cost-of-living bonus had been given by the federal government of which the provincial government paid \$1.25, so the average went up to \$23.00 and the total was \$3,644,000. In 1948, Mr. Speaker, after four years

of C.C.F. administration, the average has gone up to \$33.60, and the total in 1948, for only nine months, was \$5,317,000, and for the 12-month period it will be over \$6 million — more than twice what the Liberals were spending on Old Age Pensions. That is only for Old Age Pensions. It does not include the \$1 million a year we are also paying in providing hospital care, medical care, dental care, and glasses and drugs for Old Age Pensioners, and for related groups.

Our friend yesterday quoted Manitoba considerably — I will deal with that later; but he did not tell us that Liberal-Conservative Coalition in Manitoba is paying a much lower Old Age Pension than is paid in Saskatchewan. He did not tell us that they had been charging part of that Old Age Pension back to the municipalities, which we do not do, and he did not tell us that the Manitoba Government has consistently refused to pay its Old Age Pensioners the supplementary bonus of \$5.00 a month paid in the Province of Saskatchewan. Or, if we take Mother' Allowances, we find that in 1943 the average Mothers' Allowance was \$16.40, and the amount spent \$514,000. In 1944, it was \$18.63, but today the average Mothers' Allowance has gone up from \$18.63 to \$34.85; the total amount of money spent being over \$1 million for nine months, and will probably be over \$1,250,000 when the fiscal year is completed. In other words, we are spending about two and one-half times as much in caring for the widows and orphans of this province as was spent by the Liberal government. That again, Mr. Speaker, does not include the health services we are providing for them.

In his amendment, my hon. friend deplores the lack of care for education. Yesterday I was deeply touched by the crocodile tears shed for the poor school teachers. Why, for years, long after the depression was over, the Liberal administration continued to pay minimum salaries of \$700 a year in this province. It was not until this government came in that the minimum was raised to \$1,200 a year. I am not suggesting that it is yet high enough; I think we must do more for teachers, and I think we must have a greater appreciating of the service they render to the community and to society; but the last group of teachers are the people who paid them \$700 a year — and in many cases they did not get even that.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, and I again deal with figures — figures are difficult things for my friend to get around. In 1944, the amount spent in grants to schools, leaving out administration costs, was \$3,154,000. In the past year, these grants will total \$5 million — 56 percent more than was paid by the previous administration. In capital grants — the previous administration paid nothing for capital grants for the construction of school buildings and, as intimated in the speech from the

throne, we will be asking the Legislature for power to spend larger sums of money for the building of schools and for assistance to students who are unable to get an education without some form of assistance.

Then, I noted the other day when someone mentioned highways, my friends across the way all laughed. Well, Mr. Speaker, again I say that facts are stubborn things you cannot laugh away. No one is going to pretend that the highway system in this province is satisfactory. It will take a good many years to rebuild and replace the results of the negligence of years of maladministration. Here are the facts. If we take the four-year period prior to this government coming into office and compare it with the last four years, what do we find? On highways constructed and reconstructed, the Liberals built 1,074 miles and we built 1,856; an increase of 682 miles, or 58 percent; on highways gravelled and regravelled, they built in the four-year period, 1,490 miles; we built 2,540; and increase of 1,050, or 70.5 percent. If we take gravelled and regravelled highways under the maintenance grant, the Liberals completed 483 miles; we did 2,348 miles; an increase of 1,964 miles, or 406 percent. If we take bituminous surfacing or resurfacing, they built 23 miles; we built 416 miles; a difference of 393 miles or an increase of 1,708 percent. Those are the facts, Mr. Speaker, of what this government has done as compared with the federal Liberal administration.

Mr. Tucker: — That was all during the war, of course. The four years to 1944 were war years.

Premier Douglas: — I will deal with my friend's question of what they did before the war. If he will just wait and content his soul in patience, I will give him a "full meal" and not even the "dessert" will be left out.

Mr. Tucker: — You're very good, but you haven't kept your promise.

Premier Douglas: — The most interesting part of this whole amendment is the statement that the government has failed to provide a comprehensive and satisfactory plan of health services.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — Even my hon. friend's supporters couldn't get up enough strength to clap with him on that occasion. His is a solitary voice crying in the wilderness.

Mr. Tucker: — The last voice is pretty powerful sometimes.

Premier Douglas: — It is pretty powerful, but it does not make much sense.

Mr. Tucker: — It did in this case.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, a political party who, when they were in office, had 20 public health nurses for the whole province of Saskatchewan where today . . .

Mr. G.M. Danielson: — You said it was down to nine.

Premier Douglas: — There was a time when it was down to nine. I am giving you the highest figures. Today there are in the neighbourhood of 80, and we need many more. A government that did not have a single health region established in Saskatchewan; 35 years of administration, and they did not have one health region to care for our sick. Today there are six operating in the province.

Here are people who did absolutely nothing towards health services now coming along and saying that the government failed to implement a health programme. When the present government took office in 1944, we found that no survey had ever been made of health facilities. We found, for instance, that the bed capacity in the province was about 3.9 beds per thousand of population; the bed complement, if you use everything, bassinets and nursing homes, about 4.6. There was a government which had never spent a five-cent piece in assisting communities to build hospitals, but had left the entire responsibility to the local community. By contrast, the C.C.F. government has spent in the neighbourhood of \$1 million in giving hospital construction grants. Hospitals have been built, particularly in isolated communities which could not afford to build hospitals for themselves, with the result that today we have a bed complement of 6.7 beds per thousand of the population. There are under construction at the present time some 850-bed accommodation which will be completed this year, which will bring the total up to 7.7 beds per thousand, or just about double the number of hospital beds there were in the province when these gentlemen left office.

This government set up free care for those who are mentally ill instead of charging the cost back to their relatives. We put into operation the cancer programme my friends had talked about but had in fact done nothing about. We also put into operation free care for poliomyelitis, treatment for venereal disease, the health services for Old Age Pensioners, Blind Pensioners, Mothers' Allowance cases, none of which was provided under the previous administration. Now they say we have set up no comprehensive plan for health services in the province.

February 16, 1949

(Due to an original printing error, there is no page 90, and there is missing text.)

Mr. Tucker: — Who provides that?

Premier Douglas: — I'll come to who provides that. In this year, 1949, we estimate that the hospitalization plan will cost in the neighbourhood of \$9 million, of which the people who pay the per capita tax will pay somewhat less than \$6 million, and over \$3 million will have to be contributed from the consolidated revenue fund. In other words, when you pay your \$10 you are paying for about two-thirds of the cost of hospitalization, and the remainder is being gathered out of the consolidated revenue funds, which come from corporation tax and income tax, royalties, and other general payments. And I am in favour of that. I hope that as time goes by we will be able to have a smaller part of the cost collected on a per capita basis and more collected from those who are taxed on the basis of their ability to pay.

Before I leave this question of hospitalization, I should like to deal with a question my hon. friend asked me. He asked me to say something about the prosecution of people who do not pay the tax. I want to say that there has never been a prosecution in this province without at least three investigations of every case. We send out special staff to investigate the whole case, and to deal with the municipal council. We usually visit the person and visit his neighbours, and the instructions are specific: no person is ever at any time to be prosecuted because he cannot pay; prosecutions are to be instituted only against those people who can pay but who will not pay. The federal government will not let you or me, Mr. Speaker, refuse to pay our income tax, and there is no reason why we should. We are citizens of the country, and we must accept the obligation of the country. If any member of this House, or any member of the public, comes across any case of a person being prosecuted when he cannot pay, I shall be delighted to have that case brought to my attention. The instructions are specific, and all the people we are dealing with, including municipal secretaries and municipal councils, know the circumstances of these people, and if they can pay and refuse to pay, then we must deal with them. You cannot have an insurance plan unless every person is going to co-operate. But if a person cannot pay, the responsibility lies where it has always lain in this province, and that is with the municipality which is always responsible for hospital accounts of people who are indigent. Many of the municipalities send in the hospital tax of such people, and, in many cases, the municipalities save money by doing so. They send us \$5, or \$10 this year, for a person who is bedridden or crippled. Such a case costs the hospital plan thousands of dollars, but the municipality dispenses with its obligation simply by paying the tax.

Mr. Tucker: — May I ask the hon. Premier a question? What happens to the man who has no claim on any particular municipality?

Premier Douglas: — If a man has no particular claim on a municipality, he is a transient, and we have a medical relief account which will take care of the medical and hospital bills of any person who is a transient and not the responsibility of a municipality. There is hardly a week or a month goes by without such accounts sent in to us by hospitals and doctors being approved by me.

Mr. Tucker: — Are the municipalities all aware of that fact?

Premier Douglas: — They are. The practice has been in operation now for several years. So when my friend comes here and talks about “no comprehensive health plan”, I want to say that, while I will never be satisfied until this province is completely covered with health regions, and until we have complete health service for every person on a prepaid basis, we have made more progress towards establishing adequate health services in the past four years than was done in the previous 34 years.

Some reference was made by the Leader of the Opposition to the air ambulance, and knowing my hon. friend’s propensity for being “misquoted”, I took the precaution of having this taken down from the recording machine. He said: “Take this question of 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. In 1947 the costs of these trips amounted to \$330 each.” I mentioned that the sum included capital cost. Mr. Tucker then said: “Well, capital cost is part of the cost. It may be like the man who figures he is making a lot of money when he bought a threshing machine outfit and at the end of the day he had more than he had to pay out, he thought he was making money, without paying for the machine. Maybe that is the way you are running this government, I don’t know. Sometimes I think so. The cost averaged out — I submit it has to be looked into — at \$330. Is it necessary to spend that much money on each trip? When I say that, I am not finding fault with the service, because we had the system — not as well organized as it is today because there was no service over the province as there is today; but there was provision for bringing people in by air ambulance before this government was elected.”

Well, there was some provision for bringing people in. One undertaking firm, I believe, had a small plane that used to go out to the people, but there were no nurses in it, no oxygen tanks or other essential facilities. Except for the odd pilot

who went out on chartered trips, there was no ambulance service. My friend said: "I submit that when you have people ready to do this work all over the province, some consideration should be given as to whether we are spending too much money." What does he mean by "these people are ready all over the province"? Does my friend mean that we should turn the responsibility of flying sick people over to anyone who wants to go out with a plane, say a little Gypsy Moth?

Mr. Tucker: — People who would supply the proper facilities, of course.

Premier Douglas: — Without a nurse or any equipment? Now, my friend says you have to take in the capital cost. As I was pointing out to him, of the \$136,000 which he quoted a very large part was for providing planes. Those planes are not all used up the first year. You have to allow depreciation each year, and these planes should last for a number of years.

Mr. Tucker: — Don't you take proper depreciation?

Premier Douglas: — Yes, we do take proper depreciation, but we do not take it all out in one year like my hon. friend was trying to do when he calculated the amount at \$330 per trip. As a matter of fact, the air ambulance today is flying for about \$47.57 per flying hour. If my friend will try to charter a plane similar to the air ambulance planes, either a Husky or a Norseman, he will find he will pay probably \$74 per flying hour, and that plane will have only a pilot. We send with the air ambulance not only a pilot, but also a nurse and an engineer, so that if anything goes wrong with the plane there is someone there to fix it.

Mr. Tucker: — May I ask the hon. member a question? To what extent are these air ambulance planes used to carry the Cabinet Ministers around the province?

Premier Douglas: — The ambulance planes have never been used to carry Cabinet Ministers around, if they are necessary for any other purpose. I shall deal with that question any time my hon. friend wants.

My hon. friends cannot laugh this off, much as they would like to: 2,000 people who were seriously ill, who, on the statement of a doctor, municipal secretary or clergyman, were certified to be liable to die if they were not hurried to hospital, have been brought to hospital by our planes and the mortality rate has been extremely low. My hon. friend comes here and talks about dollars. It is all right for him, and it is all right for me,

living here in the city, or living in a town where one can step into a taxi and go to the hospital, to be without this service. This government is concerned about the thousands of people who live in isolated communities, for whom the air ambulance makes all the difference between life and death — and yet my hon. friend comes in here and complains about the cost.

Mr. Marion: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Does that apply in this Athabaska seat?

Premier Douglas: — It applies all over the province, Mr. Speaker. If my hon. friends think that by asking a lot of questions they are going to keep me from saying the things I have to say, they are mistaken. I will be very glad to answer questions at the close of my speech.

Mr. Tucker: — The hon. Premier has no right to make that imputation against the hon. member.

Premier Douglas: — There is no imputation at all, I am simply pointing out . . .

Mr. Tucker: — There is — that there is an ulterior motive.

Premier Douglas: — I am simply pointing out, Mr. Speaker, that in two and one-half hours yesterday my hon. friend was not asked any questions. I have been asked a half-dozen questions, and I am very glad to answer them; but may I tell my hon. friends that it is not going to prevent my saying what I have to say.

The Air Ambulance Service is available to every citizen of the province, and there has never been a single citizen of the province who has been asked to pay the nominal fee of \$25 before he stepped in the plane. The orders are — and those orders have been carried out — that a patient is taken wherever he has to go, whether to a hospital inside Saskatchewan or outside Saskatchewan. We have flown patients to Rochester, Winnipeg and Calgary, and they are billed for the amount afterwards. If they cannot pay the \$25, or whatever the amount may be, no person is ever pressed for payment. When the Leader of the Opposition comes here and complains about the amount of money being spent, I say two things: first, we are giving that service for the cheapest possible amount it can be given, \$47.57 per flying hour. It cannot be reduced, in my opinion, and it cannot be compared unfavourably with any rate being charged by any company giving a similar service. Secondly, I believe the people of the province of Saskatchewan are prepared to support a government which is willing to spend money where the welfare and the lives of human beings in isolated communities are at stake.

Having said something, Mr. Speaker, about what we did with respect to social services, may I turn now to the fourth thing we have endeavoured to do in the past four years. I know there has been some criticism, even by our own supporters, that the first talk of the government should have been to begin immediately to increase the economic production of the community, and to think of social services after. I say, very frankly, and I make no apologies for the fact, that we laid our first emphasis on social welfare. We recognized that the first talk of the community is to do something for the unfortunate. In the past four years we have given some thought to the aged, sick, infirm, the mentally ill, people in isolated communities and people who needed hospitals, and we put that need first. It is not something for which we have to apologize, but something of which we are proud. But, we recognize at the same time that it was most important that we should begin to lay the basis for democratic economic activity with a view to developing the wealth of our province in the interest of all our citizens.

The Leader of the Opposition said yesterday that the government, the C.C.F., were primarily interested in controlling the entire economy. My friend can hardly be considered an exponent of C.C.F. philosophy. If he would take the trouble to read the various pieces of literature, and the resolutions that have been passed by the C.C.F. conventions, he will find that this is not correct. We believe that where the principal means of production, distribution and exchange have fallen into the hands of monopolies so that they have a stranglehold on the social and economic life of the community, those things should be owned and controlled by the community. But we recognize that the function of government, whether federal or provincial, cannot be to control the entire economy. Rather we believe that the functions of the government is to integrate the activities of various democratic groups that they may help themselves in establishing a co-operative commonwealth.

I cannot think of any better way to put it than President Truman did the other day speaking in Washington, as reported in the New York Times of February 2nd:

Mr. Truman said that nearly everything was planned in this country, and the idea of it was acceptable until one talked of planning economically, and when one talked about that he was usually charged with being a Communist or a 'fellow-traveller'. Persons who make such charges were thinking of a controlled economy rather than a planned economy. In making this distinction he implied that he considered a controlled economy totalitarian and a planned economy democratic.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that that is an excellent distinction.

To us, particularly in a province but even on a dominion scale, the function of government is to bring various groups of people and popular movements together so that they may plan their economic life for the advantage of the community as a whole. That is why we have been delighted to see the progress of the co-operative movement in this province — why we congratulate them on opening a flour mill, on their success in establishing a seed crushing mill, on their success in establishing a horse-processing plant at Swift Current, and in setting up the co-operative implement business which has been doing so well this last year. That is why we have thought it important that the government assist the co-operatives — and we have — by setting up the necessary facilities and machinery to spread the idea of co-operative organizations. It is rather interesting that whereas the previous administration spent \$23,000 on co-operatives, this government is spending ten times that amount, because we think that co-operatives have an important part to play in a democratic society.

Mr. Tucker: — You haven't established nearly as much.

Premier Douglas: — Well, the co-operatives are the best judge of that, and the people who are members are the best judges as to how much we have accomplished. That is why we are interested in seeing trade unions expand, because, again, it is a case of workers banding themselves together to co-operatively dispose of their labour. We think that one of the functions of government is not to control those aspects of our economy so much as to stimulate and help those who can best achieve those objects themselves.

We also think that private individuals have an important part to play in setting up a co-operative commonwealth. I want to say, contrary to what my hon. friends have been saying, that private enterprise has not left this province except where they have demanded special privileges. Mr. Speaker, I serve notice now that special privileges are not going to be granted any person, or any corporation whether it be large or small. We think that private capital can play an important part in our industrial development. We think that business can play an important part, provided always we recognize that the government has the responsibility of seeing to it that no group of individuals, because of its economic power, can exploit the community as a whole. We do not believe, as the laissez-faire Liberals have always believed, that if you just leave everybody alone and each one goes out to make the profits he can, somehow or other general good will result for all concerned. We think that, in an economy like that, you simply have a jungle in which the battle is to the strong and the race to the swift, and the rest of the people are trampled underneath in a chaos of economic bloodshed.

Yesterday my hon. friend told this House that private business was leaving the province or was refusing to come into it. Well, I would again like to place a few facts before the House, because, after all, facts are the only important weapon with which to carry on an argument. You will find if you go over the records that the number of companies incorporated in this province, whether Saskatchewan companies or extra-provincial companies, within the last four years exceeds 800. If you would like the figures for the previous years they were: 78 in 1944; 29 in 1943; 29 in 1942; and 800 in the last four years with, in addition, 2,300 partnerships.

Mr. Loptson: — I wonder if you could give me the average capitalization of those companies.

Premier Douglas: — As a matter of fact, I will do better than that. I will send the whole capitalization over to my hon. friend, and he can figure it out while I go on with my speech; and if I send him over some of my notes he might finish the speech for me if I run out of words.

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, I take exception to that remark. I want to say that I have as much right as the hon. member in this House.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am certainly sorry. I assumed that the hon. member had a sense of humour, and I apologize.

Mr. Loptson: — I just asked a civil question.

Premier Douglas: — Certainly, and you received a civil answer. I assumed the hon. gentleman had a sense of humour. I withdraw that. My hon. friends have become so touchy now that it is impossible to even jest with them without having them becoming affronted.

All right then, let us come back to the facts. The Leader of the Opposition said yesterday that prior to this government coming into office, oil companies had done a lot of drilling in this province. They had found oil, but when the present government was elected they immediately left the province. He also repeated that at North Battleford, as shown by the paper I have here in my hand. Let us see whether these companies came in, found oil, and then went away as soon as this government took office. Let us, first of all, look at the number of wells that were drilled in this province before we took office. What drilling did these companies do that were looking for oil, for, after all, the only way you can find oil is to drill for it?

In 1938-39, 8 wells were drilled; in 1939-40, 11 wells; in 1940-41, 19 wells; in 1941-42, 12 wells; in 1942-43, 7 wells; in 1943-44, 25 wells. In the four years before we took office 63 wells were drilled in the entire province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Tucker: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Is he trying to tell this Assembly that the only way you can hunt for oil is to drill wells, and there can't be a whole lot of preliminary and expensive work done?

Premier Douglas: — My friend need not confuse the issues. I will tell him something about geophysical and geological examinations in a moment. I am saying that the only way you can be sure there is oil is to drill. Any engineer will tell my hon. friend that. In the four years prior to our taking office, the total drilling in this province was 63 wells, and I am saying that in the last four years there have been 223 wells dug.

Mr. Tucker: — There should have been a thousand.

Premier Douglas: — 223 wells dug by private companies in this province.

Mr. Tucker: — There should have been a thousand. Look at Alberta.

Premier Douglas: — My friend says something about Alberta. I will be very glad to look at Alberta for my friend and to give him the facts about petroleum production. These are the claims staked for finding minerals in Saskatchewan over the various years, compared with other provinces. In 1944, the total number of claims staked in this province was 151; the total number of claims staked this last year in Saskatchewan was 1,046; and those, Mr. Speaker, may I point out, are much larger claims than are granted in the other provinces — four times as large. If we were to compare them with Alberta and Manitoba they would actually be, for the same number of claims, 4,604. The increase in claims staked in Saskatchewan over the last four years is an increase of 593 percent, as compared with an increase of 101 percent in Manitoba, and an increase of 42 percent in British Columbia.

In the twenties the first geophysical and geological work was done in the province of Alberta. Turner Valley was discovered which gave tremendous impetus to the search for oil in the province of Alberta. The Imperial Oil Company was fortunate enough to strike the Leduc field which also gave a tremendous impetus, and now the Redwater field has been discovered north of Edmonton, and indications are that the Redwater field is probably

the best field on the North American continent, better even than anything in Texas or Oklahoma. I am sure that none of us are going to begrudge Alberta what has been discovered, and it is only natural that, in the last few years, there has been a concentration of people looking for oil in areas that have been proved. But the fact remains that today the eyes of the oil industry are on Saskatchewan. The head of almost every large oil company has been in my office sometime in the last six months, and one of them said to me the other day: "With the area in Alberta now having been pretty well gone over, Saskatchewan today is the hottest spot on the North American continent."

Now, nobody can say yet, with certainty, that we will find high-grade oil. We have found a good bit of oil in the Lloydminster field. It is a low grade of oil but the fact remains that whereas when my hon. friends left office we were producing 331 barrels, this year we will get over a million barrels. There has been a tremendous increase but it is a low-grade oil and there is no use getting too excited about it. We do hope high-grade oil will be found at lower depths. Before that can be ascertained there must be geophysical and geological examinations, and then there must be drilling. A good bit of that has gone on already, and a good more of it will continue. The interesting thing is that 3,381,000 acres have been disposed of under permits, as of September 3, 1948. Leasing permits have been approved, to begin April 1, covering 3,463,000 acres, bringing total area involved to almost 7 million acres. We have today on application requests for permission to begin work on another 10 million acres.

It is nonsense to say that private capital is not interested in coming in here, or that it has been frightened away. I do want to say to this Assembly what I have said to the oil people when we met. We are anxious to have private industry come in and develop our oil and mineral resources, but they must recognize one or two things. First, these oil and mineral resources belong to the people of Saskatchewan, and part of these areas must be retained by and for the people of Saskatchewan — you can't just give away the province wholesale. The people who work and help to produce this new wealth when it is found have to be paid a decent wage. The people who put their capital in, we recognize, have to have security, and a reasonable return on their investment, for it is a very risky venture. Finally, the people of the province themselves have a right through royalties and land that is withheld to a return which will go into the provincial treasury to help pay for social services, and for roads and schools. This wealth taken out of the ground, in the final analysis, belongs to all the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Tucker: — May I ask the hon. Premier a question? Does that represent official C.C.F. policy in this country of ours, in Canada, and does it square with what they announced when they got elected to office?

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, that not only is C.C.F. policy now, but it has been C.C.F. policy throughout the years.

Mr. Tucker: — What about “Make This Your Canada” then?

Premier Douglas: — My hon. friend seems to be insistent on doing everything except listening to these facts I was very anxious to give him, and which I thought he would be very glad to receive. Yesterday he was telling us that all these companies had gone away, and we were not getting any production. I thought, for instance, he would be very glad to know that our natural gas production has gone up from 119 million cubic feet in 1944 to 387 million cubic feet last year, which is an increase of 224 percent. It had nothing at all to do with the fact he came into this Legislature that gas went up.

I thought he would be very glad to know mineral production went up from \$22 million in 1944 to \$34 million in 1948, so that today — and he talks about Manitoba — our mineral production and petroleum and gas production are higher than the province of Manitoba's. Naturally, of course, we lag behind the province of Alberta which is now becoming one of the greatest oil centres on the North American continent. My friend always wants to compare Saskatchewan with Alberta when he is talking about oil, but I would suggest that he compare it with Manitoba, and we have far outstripped Manitoba in the production of both oils and minerals.

I thought my hon. friend would be glad to know, for instance, that value of clay products has gone up from \$331,000 to \$522,000 in the last four years. I thought he would like to know that sodium sulphate production went up in value from \$102,000 four years ago to over \$150,000 today, an increase of some 50 percent.

I thought he would be glad to know that construction in this province had gone up from \$5.5 million four years ago, to \$23.5 million today — four times as much.

No, private business has not run away from the province. There have been those who thought we should give them special privileges, that we should turn the whole province over to them, and that we have refused to do. We have said, very frankly, to these people that we will be glad to have them come in and invest their money, and we are prepared to see that their money is secured, but also have insisted that we shall protect the interests of the people of this province. That is the policy the government has followed and that is the policy we propose to continue to follow.

So, I say, the policy in the past four years has been to stimulate and integrate the work of the co-operative on the one hand, private business that is willing to invest its money on the other, always safeguarding the public interest, and that there are places and there are things which are legitimately the fields of public enterprise.

The government has, in the past four years, laid the foundations for beginning certain fields of public development. I want to take a little time, if the House will bear with me, to discuss the whole field of public development as it has been carried on by the government. I am not going to discuss here the financial reports because the auditors' reports are not yet available, and when they are they will be tabled. The Provincial Treasurer will deal with them when he makes his budget speech, and the Crown Corporations Committee will, of course, go over the financial report of each Crown Corporation in detail, and the members will have an opportunity to get all the particulars.

I want to deal with the whole picture and try to give the hon. members and the people of the province something of a bird's-eye view of what we are doing, and what we are trying to do.

I would divide the government's business enterprises, roughly, into three categories. First of all there are those enterprises that are frankly experimental, and are "problem children"; and there are problems. We did not go into ventures thinking there would be no problems. There are problems, although I would point out that these "problem" industries constitute, on the basis of the amount of money invested, only 4.9 percent of the capital invested. Secondly, I would group those industries which are having a reasonable measure of success but which we feel have not proved themselves conclusively. They cover, in terms of capital invested, 6.7 percent. And, finally, there are those which we think have now proved themselves as public utilities, and which will continue to prove themselves sound; and they constitute some 88.4 percent of the capital invested.

Let me deal with those three groups. First I will deal with those that are, very frankly, "problem children" and, in some cases, almost social assistance measures. The first of these I would take would be the Fish Board. As the hon. members know, we were faced, in 1944, with a situation in which the whole fishing industry of the province was threatened because of the regulations imposed by the federal government and the United States, resulting from the infestation of fish. We either had to close the lakes under the regulations or provide for the processing of those fish. It was also necessary when some of the lakes were closed to go back into some of the more inaccessible lakes. If we did that we had to provide some means of

transportation so fishermen could get their fish out. Now, we could have closed the lakes, as some other provinces did and accepted no responsibility. We did not choose to do that. We thought it would not cost as much to try to assist the fishing industry as it would to put the people in the north country on relief, especially those people who depended primarily on the fishing industry. And so the Fish Board was organized, and has been operating for the past two years.

I want to say the whole enterprise has bristled with problems, and we are far from satisfied with the results. We say that very frankly. The situation is this: here we are in an industry at a time when the whole fish market on the North American continent is declining. In war-time, fish could not be imported, meat was scarce, and there was a premium on fish, especially in the United States. Now meat is coming back; the Great Lakes are being fished, and fish is coming into the New York market, where we have shipped a great deal of our fish, and fish is coming in there from Greenland and Iceland; the Maritimes are fishing; lakes are being opened in the North-West Territories which are completely free from infestation. In consequence, we face at the present time a general decline in fish prices, and in the demand for fish products.

Frankly, my own opinion is that the only real solution is for the federal government to implement the Prices Support Act, as several provincial governments have asked them to do. As far as this government is concerned, we take the position that we ought to help these fishermen. If there is some better way of helping them, or if we can give them assistance in some other way or divert them into some industry which is more likely to prove profitable and self-sustaining, then we are prepared to assist in a switch to that. The Fish Board is one of the "problem children". I do not think we could have done anything other than we did to help these people when they needed help; but the problem at the present time is whether we can continue indefinitely to do that if prices continue to drop and the demand continues to decline. It may be that some other form of assistance to the people in the fish industry would be more efficacious.

The two other "problem children" are the tannery and shoe factory, and the woollen mill. The tannery and shoe factory is a single operation. We in Western Canada have thought for years that it should be possible here, where we produce large quantities of hides, to manufacture leather and leather products. The government was very hesitant about going into such an undertaking, as it is not the logical place for government enterprise. It is the logical place either for the private entrepreneur or for a co-operative; but neither co-operatives nor any private individual had shown any interest in the field over the last 30 years, and I think there is a place for experimentation to

determine whether it is possible to produce leather products here on the prairies rather than ship the hides all the way to eastern Canada and bring the leather goods all the way back.

Now, the experiment is being carried on, and shoes have been produced under great difficulties. First, the equipment was bought right after the war and most of it was fairly old. The building was quite poor. The shoe machinery industry, as everyone knows, is in the hands of a monopoly which has complete control over the sale of all machinery for making shoes. You cannot buy machinery; you have to rent machinery for making shoes. Naturally, that monopoly has not been too keen about renting machinery to us. We have had to carry on with fairly old machinery, and with completely inexperienced help and management. I want to say that the workers have done an amazingly good job in becoming proficient in the production of shoes. I think they have produced a fairly good commodity; but it must be recognized that in the last year shoe factories have been closing in various parts of eastern Canada and in the United States, and that we have faced a stiff competition from shoes being dumped on the market.

It has not been too easy to get dealers to take only the one line of shoes we produced, when we did not handle other lines. I think the government has to decide whether or not we ought to go into a general line of shoes or whether we should give up altogether the idea of producing shoes and I say that quite frankly.

The production of shoes, we have demonstrated, is possible. Whether we can demonstrate that markets can be procured, and more efficient equipment to carry on the production of shoes, is something we will have to decide in the near future. The situation we faced, this fall, was that we produced more shoes than would meet the immediate demand of the market. We have enough shoes on hand to last several months. The Leader of the Opposition criticized us yesterday for closing the factory temporarily; but he would have been equally critical if we had kept the factory open producing shoes in excess of the market demand. There was only one thing to do and that was to close the factory until such time as the demand had consumed the surplus that had been accumulated.

Mr. Tucker: — Most private companies plan their production so that they will not have to close their factories in the winter.

Premier Douglas: — A similar problem is to be found in the woollen mill. The woollen mill was set up immediately after the war when it was very difficult to get equipment, and some of the equipment was quite

old. Since that time we have been able to replace the equipment with automatic looms, and we are getting more efficient production. We have been able to demonstrate, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that it is possible to produce not only blankets but a whole variety of cloth, and to produce very good cloth, here on the prairies. We have raw materials as good and workmanship as fine here on the prairies as can be found anywhere on the North American continent. But, we face two problems: one is that the price of wool has continued to rise, and the second amazing thing is that the price of the commodity when finished has continued to drop. Last year 30 woollen mills in the province of Ontario closed their doors. In the province of Alberta the woollen mill at Magrath closed its doors, and in spite of all the money pumped into it by the Alberta government, it has not reopened again. The woollen mill at Moose Jaw has done a fairly good job of production but we think it can do a still better job. The problem is whether or not, with the rising price of wool and the falling prices of the finished product, we can continue to get sufficient markets at a price to make it possible economically to continue.

I say very frankly those are the problems we face. We did not go into these things with any concept of infallibility. We have never been afraid to try them, and we will never be afraid to come to this Legislature and say, this thing won't work and we are prepared to discontinue it. I remember when the C.P.R. spent a million dollars in irrigation at Brooks, Alberta to demonstrate the value of irrigation, and then turned the million dollar project over to somebody for a dollar. There was a good bit of criticism, but they had demonstrated something, and that something has redounded to the benefit of the rest of western Canada. As far as this government is concerned, we are not afraid of experiments, and we are not going to be afraid to say what the result of our experiments has been. So I have outlined to the members of this Assembly what the problems are with reference to our three "problem children".

I come next to the industries which, as I said, constitute 6.7 percent of our invested capital, which are doing reasonably well, but have yet to prove themselves. The Transportation System is one of these. I think most people will agree that the people of Saskatchewan today are getting the best bus service they have ever had in this province. I would say, further, that last winter we faced the worst conditions ever faced by any transportation company in the history of Saskatchewan. By May 1, as a result of trying to continue operations during the winter, and as a result of operations that could not be continued, we faced a very large deficit. As a result of the operations of the summer, which were successful, we have been able to bring the bus company up to the place where it will break even or do a little better. The interesting thing is that, though the cost of gasoline, labour, and all other costs for operating a transportation system have gone up, we have been able to continue to operate the bus system without any basic increases in rates.

Also in the class of those which are doing reasonably well, but have not yet proved themselves, is the Airways in northern Saskatchewan, which was set up to provide a transportation service in the north. Again it has just started; the regular schedules are being carried on, charter work is being done, and we think there is a fairly good chance that this undertaking will not only render good service to the people of Saskatchewan but will also be a successful utility.

I want, also, to refer to the sodium sulphate plant at Chaplin, which was opened last summer and which has been operating ever since, with periodic lay-offs, of course, to re-equip the plant, because the plant has to be overhauled regularly since it is handling such highly abrasive material. We have long-term orders for a substantial proportion of the capacity of the plant, the price at the present time is fairly good, and we think this is one of the industries which ought, other things being equal, to be a reasonable good proposition.

Then there is the brick and clay products plant in Estevan. I am very frank to say that last winter we tried an experiment which was far from successful in that we tried to carry on winter operations, thinking we could manufacture bricks in the wintertime, and that it might be possible to give the men employment all the year round. I do not think we will attempt that again. It was much too costly an operation, and we do not regard it as successful. The plant is being overhauled under some new management, and when it opens again in the spring, with the orders we have in sight, it should have a reasonable chance of doing a good job.

Mr. Tucker: — May I ask the hon. Premier a question? Does he suggest that brick-making is a monopoly in this province, and will he tell the House why they took it over in the first place?

Premier Douglas: — I can tell my hon. friend that very quickly. We took it over because there were no other large brick-making facilities in the province, and because at that time housing was badly needed and bricks were almost unprocurable. For that reason the government itself needed bricks in large quantities for its own building programme, and a good many people in the province needed bricks and were not able to get them.

The same is true of the box factory. The box factory last year operated with fairly good success under new management and we think it is one of the undertakings that can continue to give good service.

A trading division has been opened up, which was formerly operated in connection with the Fish Board, to carry on trading in the north and to help the people in the far northern part of the province to get goods at reasonable prices. Again this project has not gone far enough for me to make any predictions about it, but the indications are that a good job can be done.

Mr. Tucker: — May I ask the hon. Premier a question on that? Does he think it is right for the government to put people in to compete with the people who have gone up north and helped to open it up, to put them out of business? That is not a monopoly, is it?

Premier Douglas: — Well, all I . . .

Mr. Speaker: — When anyone is speaking, if he wishes to answer a question he will resume his seat. If he does not resume his seat it is taken for granted he does not wish to answer the question.

Premier Douglas: — All I want to say, Mr. Speaker, is that the hon. gentleman is not asking me questions as to matters of fact; he is simply asking me argumentative questions to carry on the debate. In answer to the Leader of the Opposition, the people who have gone into the north, and been in the north most of the time, represent one large company known as the Hudson's Bay Company, and if they are the people my hon. friend is concerned about, I am sure the people of the north are not concerned about them.

Mr. Tucker: — There are independent traders up there.

Premier Douglas: — Now I come to the third group. That is the group, as I said, representing 88.4 percent of the capital invested. They have demonstrated that the tasks which have been undertaken can be done efficiently and can give good return to the people of the province. When my hon. friends refer, as they do frequently, to the box factory, or some of the "problem children", they are very careful not to refer to the great bulk of the government enterprises that have been carried on efficiently and successfully.

Let me take, for instance, the Power Commission.

Mr. Tucker: — Started by the Liberals, of course.

Premier Douglas: — Yes, I will tell my friends how it was started by the Liberals. Yesterday, my hon. friend wept crocodile tears because of the fact that Manitoba farmers were getting electric power, but the poor

farmers of Saskatchewan were not getting any power. Well, the Power Commission was started by the Liberals, and I tell my friends that it was started in 1929, and in 1944, 15 years after, how many farmers do you think were getting power? Well, I will tell you how many were put on power: in 1940 they put four farmers on power; in 1941, they put seven on; in 1942, they put three on; in 1943, they put five on; in 1944 they put eight on — I suppose we should get credit for half of those, but I will give the Liberals the whole lot. In four years they provided power to 23 farmers, and now my hon. friend comes before the House and sheds tears because the farmers of Saskatchewan are not getting electric power — and his party put on 23 farmers in four years.

Mr. Tucker: — I would like to see you do as well.

Premier Douglas: — I will tell my hon. friend what we have done in the four years since. He will be glad to know that, whereas they in four years put on 23 farmers, we in four years put on 1,812.

Mr. Tucker: — What did Manitoba put on?

Premier Douglas: — You see, my friend wants to keep making comparisons with Manitoba. Why? My hon. friends know that in 1944 Manitoba was producing ten times the amount of power Saskatchewan was producing. The reason we could not supply farmers with power in the past four years was because for fifteen years the Liberal and Conservative governments had done absolutely nothing about building basic transmission lines and generating equipment to give farmers power. Manitoba today is gathering in the fruits of years of building generating equipment and putting in transmission lines. In 1944, as I say, they were using ten times as much power as the province of Saskatchewan. May I tell my friends what they did when they were in office.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That won't take long.

Premier Douglas: — No, it certainly won't take long.

Mr. Tucker: — Remember, during five of those years there was a war on.

Premier Douglas: — Ah, yes. My friend says that during those years there was a war on. I will take the other years before the war as well.

Mr. Tucker: — There was no development in Manitoba during those years.

Premier Douglas: — Let me tell my friend that during the last four years they were in office, the total number of transmission lines they built was 99 miles; 99 miles in four years. In the past four years we have built 1,453 miles, which is more miles than they built in the entire 15 years they and the Conservative government were in office. In other words, we have built more miles of transmission lines in four years than were built in all the life of the Power Commission. Not only that. Let me tell my friends how much money they put in. They and the Conservatives together put into the Power Commission, from 1929 to 1944, a total of \$7 million . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Didn't you get elected because you were going to do better?

Premier Douglas: — . . . 7 million altogether and we have put in \$14 million; twice as much money in four years as they put in in 15 years.

May I tell my hon. friend something else? When we took office in 1944, does he know how many customers the Power Commission had? 12,899. Today we have 51,237.

Mr. Tucker: — How many of those were from companies you took over?

Premier Douglas: — A good many of those were acquired by the companies being taken over; but my hon. friends could have taken them over. We have added 32,248 customers to the Power Commission. Yesterday my friend talked a lot about the Manitoba Hydro — and I don't want to belittle the Manitoba Hydro; it is one of the best in Canada; but did he tell this Legislature or the people of Saskatchewan that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation had 10,000 more customers than the Manitoba Hydro Commission has?

Mr. Tucker: — All the more reason why they should go ahead and connect the farmers.

Premier Douglas: — Either my hon. friend did not know we had 10,000 more customers, or he knew and was trying to keep the facts from this House.

Mr. Tucker: — You are connecting up the people in the villages and towns, and I say you should connect the farmers.

Premier Douglas: — Either my hon. friend was ignorant or trying to deceive the public.

Mr. Tucker: — I did not say that at all. I say you are giving an unfair deal to the farmers. You are connecting the towns and villages and leaving the farmers out.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Premier Douglas: — If my friend has a speech let him get on his feet.

Mr. Speaker: — I would ask the members to kindly stop conversation one with the other. If the hon. member wishes to make any remark or take any objection to what the speaker is saying, will he kindly get on his feet.

Premier Douglas: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not want you to be too hard on the Leader of the Opposition. He made a speech yesterday, and it was not a very good one. He is trying to patch it up today. I would appreciate it if he would make his speech some other time and not try to make one at the same time I am making one.

The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that this government, which my hon. friends say has done nothing about power, first of all built more power lines in four years than Liberal and Conservative governments built in 15 years — they acquired only 117 miles of transmission lines in 15 years; we acquired 1,176 miles in four years. In other words, they added to the Power Commission in 15 years 1,450 miles; we have added to the Power Commission in four years, almost a quarter of the time, 2,629 miles. And then my friend comes and talks about building more power lines. He talks about the farmers. May I tell my hon. friends how many rural lines the Liberals put up in this province. They put up, from 1941 to 1944 inclusive, 11 miles of rural lines. We have put up, in four years, 610 miles, and already legislation is before the House this session to do a great deal more than that. So when these gentlemen talk about what the government has done — I am never satisfied with what the government has done, I always want them to do more — they are the last people to talk about a government doing anything, these people who had the worst record for a Power Commission in the Dominion of Canada, over a period of 15 years.

Mr. Tucker: — You were going to do so much better.

Premier Douglas: — We have done much better, and we will continue to do much better.

Mr. Tucker: — You have not done as well as Manitoba anyway.

Premier Douglas: — My hon. friend keeps talking about Manitoba. He knows perfectly well, if we had the same system to start with in 1944, we would be doing as well or better than Manitoba. As a matter of fact, we started four years ago with not one-tenth of what Manitoba had, and today we have 10,000 more customers. My friend can put that in his pipe and smoke it.

I was listing the corporations which we think now we can label as a definite success. I have dispensed with the Power Commission. The Fur Marketing Agency, recognized today as one of the most popular fur auctions in western Canada, is another. The Timber Board, which today is supervising the cutting and purchasing of timber in the north, and has now demonstrated definitely the value it is bringing to the people of Saskatchewan, is yet another. Also the Telephones, which in the past four years, has increased the number of people on the system by 17,409, a greater increase than my friends can boast in any period of their history.

I want to mention also the Reconstruction Corporation, which has been used to dispose of war assets taken over from the dominion government; the Printing Plant, which is doing government printing exclusively; and the Government Insurance Office which has not only provided cheap insurance for the people of Saskatchewan but has provided low rates even for those people who do not buy from the Government Insurance Office. It is rather interesting that in the past few months the insurance companies have raised their prices, for instance, in every province of Canada except Saskatchewan where the competition of a government insurance office has compelled them to keep their rates down to a reasonable figure.

Mr. Tucker: — Why don't you meet competition in Regina City — the school board?

Premier Douglas: — Before I leave the question of Crown Corporations, I want to say just one word about a reference which was made yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition to the Finance Office. He declaimed here yesterday about how undemocratic it was to have a Finance Office, saying that here money earned by Crown Corporations was being spent again without the sanction of the Legislature. Well, my hon. friend has been a member of the federal House for some 13 or so years; he remembers The Government Companies' Operation Act, which was passed in 1946, and The Canadian Commercial Corporation Act of 1946. I have Hansard in front of me and it is rather interesting. When that Bill was before the Canadian parliament, exactly those arguments used by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday were made by Mr. Bracken. Mr. Bracken moved an amendment, and the amendment would have provided that funds for each corporation would have to be obtained by special appropriation voted by parliament. He was critical of the Bill

before the House, he said, because it gave the government a blank cheque in the form of an appropriation measure on which the government could draw for the operation of its companies without going back to the House each time it wanted additional funds for the corporation. The Hon. C.D. Howe, Minister of Reconstruction, and sponsor of the Bill, declared that the government was not seeking a blank cheque. He stressed that the Crown Companies were operating in a commercial field and, therefore, were not able to predict their financial requirements in advance as accurately as a government department. The federal government asked for the same powers, and the kind of powers, we have in the Finance Office, recognizing that if you are going into the industrial field as, for instance, when we decided to buy the Dominion Electric Company — which is a good example — we could not come and ask the Legislature to vote a certain sum of money to buy the Dominion Electric. That is, we could not say in advance what we were prepared to pay; we had to enter into negotiations to reach a satisfactory bargain. I do not need to tell this House we did not pay what they wanted. We bargained back and forth, had estimates made and inventories taken. We negotiated until we got the lowest figure for which we could expect them to sell, and they, naturally, hung on until they got the highest figure we were willing to pay. And it was for that reason Mr. Howe asked for those powers, and they are no different from the powers which we are exercising through the Finance Office.

Mr. Tucker: — May I ask the hon. Premier a question? Is it not true that there are no provisions the same as in the provincial office in the federal field. They can't take the surplus, say from the C.N.R. and use it in the C.B.C., or transfer money taken in by one Crown Corporation to another Crown Corporation? That is what I was finding fault with.

Premier Douglas: — Well, I will put my friend's mind at ease instantly on that point. First of all may I say that the Finance Office is made up, in the main, of Cabinet Ministers who constitute a majority of its membership. Secondly, we formalize any commitment of finances, either out or in, by Order in Council. And, as for using this money — my friend asked me yesterday to give him some assurance we would not be taking money from Telephones for something else, or from Power — I want to point out to him, not only has the money from Power and Telephones gone back into Power and Telephones but a great deal more. Last year, for instance, in addition to the capital the government put into Power, the Power Commission put \$500,000 into the Finance Office and took \$900,000 back.

Mr. Tucker: — Why do you take power to switch money back and forth if you do not intend to do it?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member can take this up when the Bill comes before us in Committee. We must stop this talking back and forth. It does not help the decorum of the Chamber at all.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Premier objects to my asking these questions I will cease to do so, but I take it he wishes me to have him elucidate these questions.

Mr. Speaker: — This cross-fire does not add anything to the dignity of this House.

Premier Douglas: — It does not matter whether I object or not, Mr. Speaker; if you object, I am sure my hon. friend will desist.

I was pointing out to my hon. friend, in reply to what he said yesterday, that the Power Company and the Telephone Company have not only got back any money they put into the Finance Office, but have got a great deal more. In the last four years, the Power Commission has paid into the Finance Office \$900,000 and has received back from the government, in advances, in the neighbourhood of \$14 million. May I give my friend this assurance, and I want to give this assurance to the people of the province: insofar as the Power Commission is concerned, not only will capital expenditures be supplied by monies appropriated by this Legislature, but all surpluses from the operation of the Power Commission will be devoted exclusively to the expansion of rural electrification in the province. We feel, if the Power Commission is going to make money over the province, that money can be spent in no better way than in making available to the people of the rural areas the services they require.

I have talked much longer, Mr. Speaker, than I had intended, thanks, probably, to some of the interruptions my hon. friends were kind enough to supply. May I sum up what the government programme has been, and what we propose to do? We propose, in the next five years or whatever term we are in office, to continue the protection of the farmer and the worker as we have in the past. Secondly, we propose to continue and, where possible, expand the social services we have begun in Social Welfare, Education, Health, Highways and other services. We recognize that as we move closer to the point where we are giving the maximum amount of social services we can afford to carry, the rate of acceleration will not be as great unless two things can be done: first, that federal aid will be available for some of these services. When we met at the Dominion-Provincial Conference in 1945, the federal government was going to assume responsibility for all old age pensioners over 70, half the cost of those between 65 and 70, and also the responsibility for 60 percent of the health insurance scheme.

If we get federal aid along some of those lines, if some of the recommendations of the Sirois Commission were implemented, we could speed up the implementation of a greater social welfare programme. I am saying what the Provincial Treasurer said two years ago, that as our tax burden moves closer to the maximum we can carry, having regard to our total wealth production, the rate of increased services will have to be reduced unless one of these two things happen: either we get more federal aid, which we are entitled to, not as a gift but as part of a general agreement, or, secondly, we can increase the total wealth production of the province of Saskatchewan. We must face this question realistically. If we are to have more services for our people, if we are to have more wealth distributed to our people in the form of social services, then there must be more wealth produced; and the whole tenor of the speech from the throne is that the government intends to direct its energies increasingly into the field of increasing wealth production.

That is not as my hon. friend has said. According to him, we have done nothing for the past years. We have laid the basis in the past four years. In 1944, for instance, the Minister took over a Natural Resources Department in which there was not even an inventory of available and discovered natural resources in the province. That inventory is only now being completed; but we are now beginning to move to the place where we can stimulate the wealth production of the province in two fields. The hon. members will see, as the session proceeds, and legislation is brought down, and as the budget is presented, that the emphasis will be on two things primarily. We will continue the social services and extend them where possible. But the emphasis will be, first of all, on increasing agricultural production by making possible better land utilization, water conservation, irrigation, drainage and land clearance. To that end, the emphasis will be laid on helping to create a greater amount of wealth, recognizing that only as we have more wealth can we enjoy greater social services.

The second emphasis will be upon a greater development of our natural resources. There may be, in this province as the years go by, some manufacturing; but it seems to me that the main wealth of Saskatchewan for many years to come, probably within the lifetime of us all here, will be mainly in agriculture and in the extracting industries — those that extract wealth from the ground, either in the form of gas, oil, coal, minerals or uranium, and so forth. And so the emphasis will be on the spending of more money in, and the directing of more energy to, development of these resources. The figures I have already read of the large acreages that are to be made available for exploration, the interest of companies which have come in here, the interest in uranium, the interest in potash and other minerals, indicate that we are, we believe, on the verge of a period of expansion in this province.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, there has been nothing in the policy of this government that has either kept business out, or has driven business that was here away from the province. As a matter of fact, I want to say that the kind of speech made by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday will do more to hurt the business life of this province than anything this government has done in four years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — It is speeches made by men like him and others who go up and down the length and breadth of this country, and some newspapers who are careful not to say these things here but whose correspondents write down to the eastern financial papers and completely distort the government's plan, that frighten business interests; but, when business men come in here, as they are coming in here, as they are coming in increasing numbers, they are gaining confidence that while, on the one hand this government is not prepared to sell the people of the province "down the river", on the other hand, when we give our word we will stand by our word; we will treat them properly, and we will treat them honourably.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, in the future of this province. I believe this province has great possibilities. This province has been slower than other provinces in getting started in development, thanks to the fact we kept a Liberal government in this province for about 35 years. We were late in getting started, but we are now beginning to make progress. I believe that the next five or ten years will see a tremendous period of expansion and development in this province, and that Saskatchewan may well become known throughout North America as the centre of a great concentration of wealth in the form of minerals, oil and natural gas.

Before I leave that — it has nothing to do with my speech — I want to refer to something my hon. friend mentioned yesterday, and which was mentioned in the press, since it may be misunderstood if I do not deal with it. My hon. friend suggested, and The Leader-Post has already suggested, that I or the government had something to do with fixing the price of coal. As everyone knows, there was a strike in this province, and after the strike had reached the stage where we felt it was liable to endanger the public welfare, we called the various parties together. The Department of Labour had been trying to bring about conciliation for weeks without any success, but we got these people together around the table, and we had a number of conferences which were frequently adjourned so that the representatives of the companies could go back and confer with their directors. Very naturally, I conferred with these companies, and not only with the companies on strike; I corresponded also with the companies who were not on strike, with

regard to the main problem which was at issue. It was not so much wages or hours as a question of a welfare fund for miners, to ascertain whether or not they would be prepared to drop the question of the welfare fund and pension fund, and have us deal with it by legislation.

Mr. Tucker: — And also whether they would raise the price, too.

Premier Douglas: — Is my hon. friend making that as a statement?

Mr. Tucker: — I am asking you if that is not the case?

Premier Douglas: — Well, if you want to ask me, do it civilly and get up on your feet.

Mr. Tucker: — All right. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Premier again, was not the question taken up with the company that was not on strike as to whether they would not increase their price 20 cents if they could get the strike settled?

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I answered the question yesterday. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is prepared to accept my word or not, but I shall answer him again. I do not intend to repeat it many times: I say the answer is no. We discussed with these firms two things: first, whether or not they were prepared to have the question of the welfare fund dealt with by legislation; secondly, the question of costs. The men representing the companies that were on strike contended that to raise wages would raise their costs. We differed as to the figures. The company that was not on strike was already entering into negotiations and, I understand, is in negotiation regarding wages. The figures we received from the companies varied, and their figures varied from our figures as to what their costs of production were, and as to whether or not they could afford to make these contributions.

For these reasons, the government is proceeding to set up a Royal Commission, and that Royal Commission will be charged, among other things, with the whole question of looking into the cost of production, and as to what the industry can pay. May I say this Royal Commission will be appointed, and it will be appointed expeditiously. It will not be like the Royal Commission referred to in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix of May 22, 1948, where it stated:

On May 21, 1948, Mr. Tucker spoke at Waldheim, just after his resignation from the House of Commons, and said, among other things, a Royal Commission would be set up to enquire into the factors that have led to strikes in the meat-packing industry, for the last few years, just as the farmer was ready to market hogs.

Well, that is one of the Royal Commissions that has never materialized. May I assure my hon. friend this one will materialize, and we will ask them to make a report as expeditiously as possible, in order that we may not have a recurrence of the unfortunate incident of this winter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I must apologize to the Assembly for having talked so long. I want to conclude by saying one or two words with reference to the Leader of the Opposition's talk yesterday about socialism, and the fact that socialism leads the way for communism. In saying this, he was most unfair to the people of the gallant little country of Czechoslovakia, and quoted the British Labour party — although I have never been able to find such a quotation — as having said that socialism had paved the way to communism in Czechoslovakia. Well, as a matter of fact, I do not think anyone doubts that had Czechoslovakia not been intimidated from without by the way of communist imperialism sweeping over eastern Europe, the communists would never have reached first base within Czechoslovakia itself. As long as there was an aggressive socialist movement, as long as it had able and courageous leadership, I doubt if Czechoslovakia would ever have fallen under communist sway.

I had the privilege of talking to Mr. Benes, just before he went back to take over the leadership of his country, and he recognized the terrific problem that was theirs. There they were, close to the Soviet Union, far away from the western democracies, where they could expect no assistance militarily, economically or commercially, and they were in the position that if the Soviet Union were ever disposed to swallow them up, they would fall a very easy prey. That is exactly what has happened, and I am sure all lovers of democracy must regret it. But let no one attribute that to the fact Czechoslovakia had a socialist government.

As a matter of fact, I want to say to the Assembly, and I say it in no partisan sense at all: it was my privilege, as hon. members know, to have been invited by the United Kingdom to represent this Legislature at the British Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference, which was held in London, and I deemed it a great honour, and I hope sometime I may have the opportunity of telling the members something about that conference. It was a historic conference. Prior to the conference members travelled to various parts of Europe and all parts of the United Kingdom

in order to see some of the things we were going to discuss — foreign affairs, defence, treaties, emigration, displaced persons, and so forth. What impressed me, and I think impressed most people, was that in Berlin, Holland, Belgium, France, and particularly in Great Britain, the only bulwark that stood against the relentless onward march of communism was the democratic socialist movements.

I am sure the military governor of Berlin for the United States would not mind my quoting him, since his statement was made before a large group there. He said:

I am here in Berlin representing a free-enterprise country, but only a fool would not know that as far as Germany is concerned it will never go back to the old type of capitalism. The struggle going on today in Germany is a struggle between democratic socialism and imperialist communism: a death struggle.

Who are the people struggling today in Germany? They are men like Kurt Shumacher who, when I was there, was lying in hospital having his leg removed as a result of the torture he had undergone in Dachau concentration camp; men like Reuter, the Social Democratic Mayor of Berlin, who has since been re-elected with an overwhelming majority: men like Dr. Leber, Kreidermann, Dahrendorf, Shoetley.

I sat in the German parliament at Frankfurt which has a preponderant Social Democratic majority and where they are drafting a constitution for Western Germany, and doing it without any interference from either the British or the Americans. The hope of Germany today, and the hope of Western Germany today, lies in people who believe in democratic socialism, who believe not only in political democracy but who believe that the political democracy must be extended and expanded into economic democracy. And any person, be he the Leader of the Opposition or anyone else who comes out and condemns these social democrats as paving the way for communism, is doing them a great disservice. Some of these men are risking their lives for the things they believe in. Ernest Reuter, who said, "I walked the streets of Berlin with a rope around my neck", lived in the Russian Zone, yet he is mayor of Berlin. He has to travel to the British and American sectors to hold city council meetings. Every day he lives in fear of arrest. These men are carrying a banner for freedom and for democracy, and we do them a great ill-service when we say they are paving the way for communism. These men stand as a bulwark against communism, and for freedom, and whether my friends opposite believe in democratic socialism or not, they should at least hold out the hand of fellowship and friendship to, and speak a word of admiration for, these democratic socialists who risk their lives to maintain freedom and democracy in the dark and unhappy part of the world in which they live.

Mr. Tucker: — Without the support from us and the United States, I am afraid they would not get very far.

Premier Douglas: — I will take second place to no person in admitting the great service the United States has rendered; but I want to point out that the United States is 4,000 miles away. If men like Reuter, if Social Democrats in various parts of Europe were to lessen their willingness to fight the encroachment of totalitarianism, all the American dollars in the world would not stop the spread of communism right to the Atlantic Ocean.

My hon. friend ought to know, and I am sure he does know, that you cannot fight with dollars alone; you have to fight with blood and with will, with courage and heart, and these men are supplying all of that.

Mr. Tucker: — The Americans are supplying more than dollars.

Premier Douglas: — My hon. friend just made his own speech. He made a very poor one, and he should not now try to spoil mine. He can just sit on his seat. He is well-padded for sitting, and let him use it.

Mr. Tucker: — Not very funny.

Premier Douglas: — My hon. friend yesterday made reference to the fact that the British Commonwealth of Nations is one of the great powers for preserving the freedom of mankind. I agree. Sitting in Westminster Hall and looking over that Assembly which represented 37 parliaments under the British flag, represented over 25 percent of the earth's population, I was impressed with the fact that the British Commonwealth of Nations is today a great force to be reckoned with. It is, in itself, a League of Nations; a league of peoples of different races and different colours and religions, bound together, not forced together, but held together by common objectives, common loyalties, and by their loyalty to the Crown. Yet, as you look over that Assembly, the interesting thing is that with the exception of Canada, South Africa and Northern Rhodesia, every other part of the British Commonwealth of Nations today is governed by a Democratic Socialist government: the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, India, Pakistan, Ceylon. Here are the people who subscribe to the kind of policies this government advocates. We do not need to come here, Mr. Speaker, to apologize for the programme we are seeking to implement, or for the philosophy by which we stand. This government is in step with the progressive and democratic-minded people the world over; and the fact that the British Commonwealth of Nations is such a power for the preservation of human freedom is because in over 80 percent of its territory it has Social Democratic governments.

Increasingly, people are learning — some day the Leader of the Opposition will learn; certainly progressively-minded people have already learned — that the menace of communism is not going to be stopped by calling it names. It is not going to be stopped by recriminations. Communism is going to be stopped by bringing into effect a society that will give to man the right to work and the right to enjoy the fruits of his labour. I had in my office some time ago, before the Chiang Kai-Shek government fell, a Chinese official. I said: “What is the reason Chiang Kai-Shek seems to be making no progress in China, despite the fact he had so much assistance from the United States?” He looked at me, and he put it in one sentence. He said: “You can’t argue with empty bellies.” — and you can’t argue with empty bellies. All the reasoning in the world will do nothing to stop the onward sweep of totalitarianism if people become hungry, if they become unemployed, if they see their children sick and are not able to take care of them; if they see their families in want, or if they have to produce goods and get less than it costs them to produce the goods. Communism will be stopped not by arguing about it, not by screaming about it, not by calling those you meet and do not agree with, communists; communism will be stopped and will only be stopped, Mr. Speaker, when in this country and in this province we institute completely a system of social justice and economic equity.

Mr. J.G. Egnatoff: — Mr. Speaker, I suppose it requires some considerable courage to stand before this House after having heard the addresses of two very capable leaders in our province. I feel somewhat reluctant in getting up immediately after these two hon. gentlemen. However I feel in duty bound to the people of the Melfort district, who saw fit to elect me, to speak at this time and on this particular occasion.

Now, like the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker), the new member, and as a new member of this Assembly, I feel very happy that a gentleman who has so much respect for the rules of procedure in this House as you have was elected as Speaker. It simply means I have been able to enter this House with a greater feeling of security and confidence in speaking about what is in my mind, and in advocating the principles which are dear not only to myself but to the people who elected me here.

Sir, I wish you every success in your very difficult task, and I believe the past few days have already demonstrated that your task will indeed be difficult. I cannot help but feel you are in a position perhaps somewhat analogous to a referee at a baseball game or a hockey game being played by two very enthusiastic rival teams, except in this one difference, Mr. Speaker; we have not come here to play. We have come here, I believe, to discuss the affairs of this province, and it is my sincere hope that you will be successful in seeing that the rules of procedure are maintained in this House by every single member.

I would like to offer my condolences to the hon. Premier of this province for having lost two Cabinet Ministers during the past provincial election. I do not wish to make any comment regarding the former Minister of Natural Resources for I did not know him. However, I do wish to say a word of tribute to the former Minister of Social Welfare for this province, the Hon. O.W. Valleau who represented the Melfort constituency for some considerable number of years. The people of the Melfort constituency did not defeat Mr. Valleau personally, for in that area that gentleman is held in very high repute. The result of the vote in that constituency was merely the expression of a growing resentment in this province against the socialistic regime of the C.C.F. government. But, Mr. Speaker, it was not merely a protest vote; it was likewise a vote for the principles of liberalism which form part of my philosophy of life.

I will refer, because the question has been raised, to the people who elected me to represent them in this Legislature. Unlike the member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) who comes from what he terms a "God-forsaken country", I come from a part of the province which may be likened unto a paradise. I come from a part of the Carrot River Valley, one of the most prosperous, thriving and enterprising agricultural communities in the whole Dominion of Canada.

Hon. I.C. Nollett: — Did you create it all yourself?

Mr. Egnatoff: — If the hon. gentleman has a question and wishes to ask it at any time, Mr. Speaker, if he does so through the proper channels, I shall be delighted to answer his question.

I would like to say that the people in my area of the province love freedom dearly. They love freedom more than they love affiliation to any particular political party. And Sir, the result of my nomination was not quite in the terms used to describe it by the hon. Premier. I was nominated as a Liberal candidate in that part of the province, with Conservative support — and I am not ashamed of it. I am proud of the Tories of the Melfort constituency who helped to elect me here. There was a definite understanding at the nominating convention that was held that whatever candidate received the joint nomination was going to run under his own party label, with the active support of the Tories. And if it is necessary to make any public acknowledgment, I at this time, Mr. Speaker, acknowledge my gratefulness to the Liberals and Conservatives of my constituency for having done me the honour of electing me to this Assembly. Those people have not lost the real pioneer spirit, the real pioneer spirit which was responsible for the development of this country, the real pioneer spirit which made it possible even for a socialistic government to carry on from where others left off.

I would also like at this time to pay a word of tribute to the young people in my constituency who rallied to my support, and I think it is necessary to deal with this because of some of the allegations made by the hon. member for Canora, and also by the hon. member for Hanley. It is all progressive-minded people of the Melfort constituency whom I represent in this House, Mr. Speaker. With regard to financing the campaign, with regard to those interests I intend to fight for in this Legislature, I just wish to say it was the common people of the Melfort constituency who financed my election campaign — small businessmen. You may laugh, but it is a fact the hon. member for Saskatoon (Hon. J.H. Sturdy) must recognize. Finances were supplied by small businessmen, for we have no “big” business there in that part of the country. Likewise, nurses, teachers, doctors, restaurant workers, labourers helped to contribute to that fund. I am saying this in order that it may be placed on record.

Mr. J. Benson (Last Mountain): — Are there no farmers up there?

Mr. Egnatoff: — There is also, within our area, as I pointed out a few moments ago — and it wasn’t necessary for the hon. member for Last Mountain to mention it — Melfort is in the heart of the Carrot River Valley, a farming community, and farmers in that community contributed to the campaign funds which were necessary to win that constituency in the cause of democratic freedom.

I quite appreciate that after the address of our very gallant Leader of the Opposition yesterday, a gentleman who unceasingly and consistently extends his energy in the interests of the common people of Saskatchewan and of Canada, and, likewise, after the very platitudinous, flowery address of the hon. Premier we heard today, I wish, with the consent of this House, to move the adjournment of this debate.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be at all discourteous, but the usual thing is to give the Leader of the Opposition or the Leader of the Government the right to adjourn the debate. If we are going to adjourn the debate every afternoon at 5:30 p.m., this debate will go on endlessly. I suggest that we go on and finish the debate on the amendment, and then go on to the motion. We still haven’t touched the motion yet.

Mr. E.M. Culliton (Gravelbourg): — I realize the motion for adjournment is not debatable, but I have been acting as Whip for the members on this side of the House and the hon. member for Kelvington (Mr. Howe) on the other, and we

February 16, 1949

have, to this point, agreed on the list of speakers, and we have had no meeting with respect to radio time. While the hon. Premier was speaking this afternoon the hon. member called me out and suggested the government was anxious to have a vote on the amendment today. I told him we were somewhat caught by surprise in that matter, as we had agreed on the list of speakers, and suggested to him that the hon. member who was following the Premier would speak for a few moments and adjourn the debate, and he and I could discuss the question of speakers and procedure after that time. I think, in view of that arrangement, the House should agree to the motion for adjournment.

Premier Douglas: — If the Whips have some understanding I certainly think we should comply with it. I don't think we should get into the habit of thinking we are going to adjourn every day at 5:30 p.m. This amendment has to be disposed of, and then the motion. I mean if a longwinded fellow like myself makes another two-hour speech on the motion, we will be here for months — which I can assure the House I am not going to do. I think we should agree to adjourn if some understanding has been reached, but I think it should be with the idea we will go on tomorrow and probably on into tomorrow night if we are going to begin to get to grips with this debate and get at the legislation.

Mr. Culliton: — I think that was the understanding between your Whip and myself — that the adjournment would take place and we could discuss the matter of future arrangements.

Premier Douglas: — I would then agree to the adjournment of the debate.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:37 o'clock p.m.