

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Eleventh Legislature
6th Day

Thursday, February 17, 1949

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

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY
(Adjourned Debate)

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

Mr. Egnatoff: — Mr. Speaker, when the debate on this amendment was adjourned yesterday I had just made a brief reference to the constituency which I represent in this Legislature. I pointed out that Melfort constituency is in the heart of the Carrot River Valley, one of the finest agricultural communities in the Dominion of Canada, and in that valley live some of the finest people who will be found anywhere in the Dominion of Canada. I likewise made reference and paid tribute to the people who saw fit to elect me to this Legislature; and in the group of people who elected me here, I included the Progressive-Conservatives in that area, and I have no apology whatever to offer for that fact.

I would like today to point out in that connection the Progressive-Conservatives gave me their support without any pressure being exerted upon them by their central organization, and that support was gladly accepted without any influence or interference.

In yesterday's debate the Premier made reference to the way the Conservatives and Liberals had worked hand-in-glove and at that time I had asked for permission to ask the Premier a question and was not granted that permission. I would like to say at this time, that the question — which was, I believe, related to this amendment — I intended to ask the Premier was: how many constituencies his government would have won had they not received the active support of the Communist party in this province, because in the one constituency in this province where there was a communist candidate, the C.C.F. were defeated. I would rather work with a group of citizens known as the Progressive Conservatives, than have . . .

Mr. Walker: — I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member's remarks are not confined to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — I don't think the hon. member's point of order is very well taken.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

February 17, 1949

In debating the amendment I am quite prepared to give the C.C.F. government credit wherever credit may be due. At the same time, this amendment is offered to the government as an indication that the people of this province and the members of this Legislature have no confidence in the government.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — Do you speak for all the members of the Legislature?

Mr. Egnatoff: — I am speaking for, certainly, the members on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, and before I am finished I dare say I will express a number of opinions which will be endorsed, at least within the minds of a large number of members on the government side as well.

Premier Douglas: — What a man!

Mr. Tucker: — You think you've got them under control, do you?

Mr. Egnatoff: — In reply to the hon. Premier's participation in this debate to date, I would just like to say that we appreciate his sense of humour, we appreciate his resort to ridicule and sarcasm; but it is high time somebody informed him that the people of this province are getting tired of that type of tactic. The socialist bubble in Saskatchewan will soon burst. As a matter of fact, at times I really wonder how soon it would be before the hon. Premier would attempt to cross the floor of the House because at times in his address he spoke almost like a Liberal.

Premier Douglas: — That is the worst insult I've had yet.

Mr. Egnatoff: — I didn't say, Mr. Speaker, that we would for a moment consider accepting him on this side of the House.

It is time that the government answered the question whether or not it is a socialist government, or whether it is going to swing back to the right and follow a middle course. Reference was made by the hon. gentleman to the deplorable state of conditions in this province when they took office.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Egnatoff: — You would almost think we had made no progress at all.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Egnatoff: — You would think that we had no schools, no municipal hospitals, no social services of any kind, no anti-T.B. treatment, no free cancer treatment, no free treatment for venereal diseases; and right here I wish to draw to the attention of this House that there were venereal disease clinics in this province before the C.C.F. took office, and the government should not take credit for measures which it did not institute.

Among the deplorable conditions to which the Premier referred, he omitted, either deliberately or inadvertently — I don't know which — to state that the former Liberal administration left a surplus of over \$8 million for his government to spend. Now, if a surplus of over \$8 million is a deplorable conditions, Mr. Speaker, then I have no apology whatever to make for it.

Likewise, in this debate the Premier made reference to grants. He objected very strongly to referring to these Dominion-Provincial "grants". Now, I wish to draw to the attention of this Assembly for the years 1944-45, 1945-46 and 1946-47 referred to this very same payment as "grants" under Dominion-Provincial agreement. In this connection I would like to point out that while we are morally entitled to these grants, we are not legally entitled to them. And speaking of these grants, and directly in connection with Section 3 of this amendment, I would like to point out that Premier Garson of Manitoba gave one-half of the increased grants which he received from the federal government to the school districts and municipalities. Now, had that been done in this province, it would have meant that the provincial government could have relieved some of the burden of the increased cost of education by passing on at least \$3.5 million to the school districts and the municipalities.

I think it is unwise in parliamentary debates, or in debate anywhere, to attempt to try to identify Christianity with the principles of any one particular political party. I would like to suggest that no political party has a monopoly on the application of Christian principles. I would also like to suggest that the comparison the Premier drew between Judas Iscariot betraying Christ for 30 pieces of silver and the Conservative support given to the Liberals in the last provincial election was certainly very ill-advised.

I wish to direct the attention of this House for a few moments to Section 5 of this amendment: "We regret that the government has failed to establish an adequate programme of rural electrification". I cannot speak for all the people of this province, but I am here to speak for the large proportion of the people of my constituency, and here is what they want, and I trust

the government will give due consideration to this idea: one of the greatest needs of our area is rural electrification. People want their farms electrified, and they feel that the immediate post-war period was the opportune time to launch a major rural electrification programme. They feel very strongly about having so little progress made during the past four years, because, after all is said and done, if we are going to deal with facts, it must be admitted, the main achievement of the Power Commission since the C.C.F. took office was to take over, one by one, the power companies providing electrical energy in this province. That was their major achievement, and they took over all except one at Moose Jaw, and our people in the north often wondered why. They have instructed me, when coming down to Regina, to speak very strongly urging the government to act in launching an adequate programme of rural electrification. Let me just emphasize the need by referring to a very human story — and it is not a funny story. Within my constituency, and I am sure it would apply to many other constituencies, there are women who pioneered this land, women who enjoy more amenities of life today than they did some forty years ago. I feel the least we can do now, since resources were not available in previous years and they are available today, is to launch that programme in no uncertain terms.

May I urge you again that the post-war period was and is the time to launch this programme. The province, due to federal agricultural policy, is in a financial position comparable to no period before the war. Let us keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that during the period 1944 to 1947, the average cash income in this province was \$457 million; compare that with the average cash income for the years 1934 to 1943 — it was only \$156,710,000. If you want to go back further than that to the years 1931 to 1933, the average cash income was \$72 million to an average of \$457 million. Now, with such an increase, surely to goodness the people of this province can afford to put into effect a real programme of rural electrification. Mr. Speaker, now is the hour to extend electrical power, and I would urge upon the government to establish and provide electrical power to our farmers on the basis similar to that used in the province of Manitoba, where the power lines are built at the expense of the Commission, where the energy is brought right to the centre of the farming community and, from there on, the cost of wiring the buildings and the cost of electrical energy consumed, of course, is borne by the farmers.

Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this government has failed in that respect, although I must admit it is encouraging to see that the speech from the throne does make some provision for it. I do feel there could be no question at all about them having failed to provide a comprehensive and a satisfactory scheme of rural electrification.

Another section of the amendment deals with the government's failure to relieve Saskatchewan, and particularly northern Saskatchewan, of dictatorial policies and regimentation as practised, Mr. Speaker, all in the name of "socialized planning". Now, I am not going to say a great deal about this because I feel it is a story which the representatives of the north should tell us. However, during the deferred by-election in the north I spoke with many people around Lac la Ronge and Montreal Lake in the Cumberland constituency, and I have found, with the way this government has treated the people of the north; and the loss of those constituencies by the government, particularly Cumberland — as that is the one I have more first-hand knowledge of — is simply an indication that the people there are dissatisfied, and they want those dictatorial policies discontinued.

An Hon. Member: — The fish plant is closed.

Mr. Egnatoff: — That's true. Somebody interjected here that the fish plant has been closed. Yes, it has been closed in spite of the fact that during the campaign there a government plane was landing and taking off at a terrific rate at Lac la Ronge.

I would like to say this, further, in connection with dictatorial policies and the operation of the Timber Board — and I hope the hon. Premier will make note of this because I don't think this is so very funny. The C.C.F. were elected to office on the understanding that they would try to remove the tremendous spread which exists between what the producer receives and what the consumer has to pay for the product. In this case, in the operation of the Timber Board, the producers have no choice; they must submit to regimentation if they are going to operate at all. They are receiving a very low price for their labour, and yet when a consumer has to go through a lumber yard and buy that same lumber, he has to pay around \$70 per thousand board feet. Now in that respect, Mr. Speaker, I think that every sane-thinking person must admit that the government has failed. I might say in this connection as well that with regard to the lumber which one frequently buys from the lumber-yards, lumber which is being handled by the Saskatchewan Timber Board, you will sometimes find 200 feet of unusable lumber per thousand feet that you may buy.

Now that is something that certainly should be investigated, and if those conditions exist, then I believe the government certainly has failed.

Again, I would like to suggest that as a result of the policies of the Fur Marketing Board in the north, part of the northern area has been converted into a bootleggers' paradise. That is a serious charge to make, and I wish to substantiate it.

You will find, Mr. Speaker, that the payment for fur in dribbles seems to have this effect on some of the people in the northern area. Under the old set-up, when a man took his furs to one of the fur traders in the north, he paid his grocery bill, his clothing bill, and probably left some of the money there to provide payments for future produce he would take out. Now, what seems to happen. He gets a small cheque and with the cars running from Prince Albert to Montreal Lake, carrying liquor with them, these fur trappers become victims of that very vicious situation.

The Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Sturdy), Mr. Speaker, of all people who should be interested in developing social welfare in this province laughs at that. I don't see anything funny about it at all.

Premier Douglas: — He is just laughing at you.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Oh, if he is just laughing at me, I don't mind that at all, Mr. Speaker, because it would just be a friendly laugh. That would be quite permissible.

In this amendment it is really charged that the government is guilty of extravagant expenditures. Now that, too, is quite a serious charge to make, and one that must be proven. As the Premier suggested yesterday, facts are stubborn creatures you cannot put away. I have here figures which ought to be authentic with regard to employees under the Public Service Commission and other Boards and Commissions, and this information is taken, Mr. Speaker, from monthly statements of the Public Service Commission. The total employed on May 31, 1944 — that was the last year the Liberals were in office — was 4,103; the total employed on December 31, 1947, 6,458; an increase under the C.C.F. government of 2,355.

Premier Douglas: — We are doing things.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Now, the salaries for 2,355 employees, at an average salary of \$2,000, would cost \$4,710,000. So salaries, together with other costs such as increased office space amounts to an extravagant expenditure of \$6 million per year.

Reference has been made to the Bureau of Publications. The Premier dismissed this question very lightly, Mr. Speaker, by pointing his finger at the Dominion Bureau of Publications. I would like to suggest that any time anyone points his finger at anybody else, there are three fingers pointing back at him, and the thumb is beginning to turn up as well.

What are the facts? These figures are taken from the Public Accounts of 1943-44, and the estimates for 1947-48: under the last Liberal year, the general services, not including libraries and tourist bureau, cost \$14,541; the C.C.F. year 1947-48, \$113,300; an increase from \$14,541 to \$113,300. I submit that that increase is too great, and that it is sheer extravagance.

Another case of what appears, to my mind, to be extravagance is in connection with the Public Service Commission. Here are the expenditures in that connection: the last year under the Liberal administration 1943-44, \$8,484; the C.C.F. year . . . Somebody said that was too much. Listen to this then — the C.C.F. year 1947-48, \$47,889; and if you think that is too much, listen to this one — the C.C.F. year 1948-49, \$61,724. I submit that an increase in the cost of the Public Service Commission from \$8,484 to \$61,724 is indeed extravagant.

Let me refer to one or two other instances, and this data I have obtained from a memorandum entitled “Detailed Comparative Statement of Expenditures on Revenue Account on a Functional Basis”. This memorandum, as I understand it, was prepared by the C.C.F. government for the use of C.C.F. members of the Legislature. It is given in the memorandum of 1946-47, and the figures are for an eleven-month period. The figures I will give have been multiplied by twelve-elevenths to give a figure of the cost, on a functional basis, for a year, and I would like to compare with that the cost, on a functional basis, under the last year of Liberal government under the very capable leadership of Mr. Patterson. It used to be said by C.C.F. speakers, and by many of those sitting across the floor of this House, that Liberals were very extravagant in their expenditure, that the Cabinet Ministers were spending too much. Well, let us look at the facts. Here are the facts, and I would like to direct this, in particular, to the Premier: in 1943-44, the Ministers’ salaries were \$59,000; in 1946-47, the Ministers’ salaries jumped to \$76,000. Expenses of Ministers, and in this connection my colleague, Mr. Patterson, was criticized when he suggested it wasn’t becoming for a Cabinet Minister to stay in a Y.M.C.A. overnight, it was necessary for him to stay in hotels; but listen to this, Mr. Speaker — if anybody can tell me that this isn’t extravagance and prove that it isn’t extravagance, I’ll eat my shirt — expenses of Ministers for 1943-44, \$9,000; expenses for Ministers 1946-47, \$28,000 — from \$9,000 to \$28,000, an increase of 300 percent. Surely the cost of living hasn’t jumped that much.

Here is one that I am sure will not please the government: advisers and assistants to Ministers 1943-44, no money was spent; in 1946-47, \$93,000; nearly \$100,000, spent in one year on advisers and assistants to Ministers. Now I charge that that is extravagance.

Health Board and Commissions 1943-44, \$4,000; 1946-47, \$65,000, and so on. I could go through, item by item on this functional basis, and it would appear to me, in all sincerity . . .

Mr. A.C. Murray (Gull Lake): — Go ahead.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Go ahead, somebody said? All right, if the government wants it I will go ahead. The next item, perhaps, is justifiable; I am not sure. Co-operation and Markets jumped from \$23,000 to \$114,000. Forestry office — hold on to your seats, gentlemen in the government, because here is one you won't like — 1943-44, the last year of Liberal administration, \$150,000; 1946-47, \$301,000. And, Mr. Speaker, they seem to applaud that. Parks increased from \$17,000 to \$143,000; Game and Fish, an increase from \$35,000 to \$249,000; Aircraft services, there was no expenditure on this item in 1943-44, but in 1946-47, \$169,000. It seems to be, and if it can be proven otherwise I will certainly accept the answer, that there is considerable evidence here that this government has been extravagant and, therefore, has lost the confidence at least of this side of the House and, judging by the expressions of one or two members on the other side of the House, they are beginning to think as well.

Mr. Tucker: — They never had the confidence of the people on this side, of course.

Mr. Egnatoff: — In this debate on the amendment, considerable has been said with regard to the air ambulance service. I would like to say that in my opinion the air ambulance service is a wonderful thing in a province which is so widely scattered as this province of ours here.

Hon. J.H. Sturdy: — The Liberals never had an ambulance.

Mr. Egnatoff: — If the hon. member for Saskatoon wants to make a speech I am sure he will have that opportunity later on. That is a stock reply, incidentally, isn't it, Mr. Speaker, in this House.

Mr. Tucker made the statement that the cost was about \$300 per patient to bring in patients in the air ambulance. Mr. Douglas criticized this figure, saying that that cost included capital expenditure, and, according to figures which he presented, the cost is \$47.57 per flying hour. Somehow, to me it appears there is too great a difference between these figures, and the total cost of the air ambulance service in 1946-47, according to the Public Accounts, was \$136,627. In the itemized statement of supplies and incidentals there is an item, Fairchild Aircraft Limited, \$41,393. Now this is probably an item for the purchase

of planes and equipment, but that still leaves \$95,234. The number of patients brought in during the year was 409 — now \$95,234 divided by 409 is \$233. The number of patients was given in answer to a question on March 22, 1948 as 409.

There are some interesting items in this connection. There will be some items of capital expenditure in addition to the \$41,000 I referred to, but, in any case, some proportion of the original operating capital should be regarded as operating expenses each year. Here are some of the items of expenditure under “Supplies and Incidentals”: Tip Top Tailors, \$189.81. I don’t see the connection between an expenditure involving the Tip Top Tailors and the Air Ambulance — there must be some connection there; William’s Men’s Wear, \$162.46; West of England Dress Goods, and so on; Army and Navy, R.H. Williams, Simpsons, Eatons, a total of \$654.28. I don’t know what those expenditures are for, presumably for clothing for the staff. If that is the case, I think there is one way of reducing the cost of the Air Ambulance Service.

I would suggest that here is another instance of extravagance. I do not think it is necessary for a Cabinet Minister, unless he is critically ill, to travel in an air ambulance. In reply to a question asked on March 19, 1948, here is a reply given to Mr. Patterson by the Hon. Mr. Douglas (Weyburn): “What Cabinet Ministers have been carried as passengers in air ambulance planes?” There are one, two, three, four, five, six names here. I see one of them blushing so I won’t read these names at this time. “On how many occasions have they been carried?” Twenty-two. Now, if we are going to have an air ambulance service — and I will grant you it is an excellent idea — then let us not use that air ambulance for transporting Cabinet Ministers, including the Minister of Public Health (Hon. T.C. Douglas).

With regard to Health, this amendment states, under Section 4, “have failed to provide a comprehensive and satisfactory plan of health services”. And, of course, in this connection, it is necessary to keep in mind always what the government members promised when they were seeking election, and what they attempted to provide after they gained power. Here are the things I find: “The C.C.F. stands for free medical services for all.” “Free”. Again: “Because the C.C.F. stands for humanity first, the C.C.F. will provide every resident of Saskatchewan with all necessary medical and hospital care, regardless of his or her ability to pay.” “Regardless of his or her ability to pay.” “Let there be no black-out of health”; that is a slogan familiar to all. And then I quote from a broadcast made by the Premier on February 9, 1943, as reported in the “Saskatchewan Commonwealth” — I am quite sure the “Commonwealth” did not misquote him: “Just as we have made education available to all, the time has come when we must make all the benefits of medical science available to all without

money and without price.” And yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the same gentleman talked about a “prepaid medical scheme”. Now, if his quotations, in the pre-election days, are what he considers was a satisfactory, comprehensive medical scheme, then surely the government has failed to provide it. I am not for a moment being critical of the scheme. It is known through the breadth and depth of this province that the Liberals, and I think the Conservatives, are all in favour of providing medical health services to the people. But we feel that consideration should be given to the ability of the individual to pay, and that that is a prime characteristic of a comprehensive and satisfactory plan.

What is the situation? First it was going to be free; then the next thing we knew, for hospitalization alone, it was going to cost \$5 per person; then, not before the election but very soon after, and after the Alberta election as well, that hospitalization tax was increased to \$10. Now here, Mr. Speaker, is where I take objection to that stand. Whom is this increase in the tax going to hurt the most? Let me cite an instance — the town in which I live will have a number of people who would fall into this category: you may have a man who is taking care of a couple of cottages for which he receives about \$75 a month. He happens to get a pension of \$25 per month. He is living with his wife. Before he had to pay \$10 for the two to receive the benefits under the hospitalization scheme, and now that man, who can ill-afford that extra \$10, has it extracted from him by this government which boasts of “humanity first”. I submit that that is not a satisfactory health scheme — and, of course, under threat of jail.

Mr. Kuziak: — How about \$15 in B.C.?

Mr. Egnatoff: — Well that’s all right. “How about \$15 in B.C.” interjects some member on the government side. Two wrongs, Mr. Speaker, will never make a right. Of course, the government laughs because they just don’t care about these individuals whom it really pinches to pay this additional tax. And then the Premier pointed out that this tax was going to affect people with small families. Generally speaking, people with small families are young people, and it is difficult, under any circumstances, at any time in any country, for young married people to get on their feet, financially speaking. Those are the people, a young married couple with one child, previously had to pay \$15, now they have to pay \$25. Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is not satisfactory enough for this side of the House, because, before the C.C.F. were elected to office, approximately half the municipalities in this province had some medical or hospitalization scheme, and they were providing services at a much lower cost. I would like to refer to the Connaught Rural Municipality. The Connaught Rural Municipality provided complete medical and health services at a per capita cost of approximately \$4. Now, they have to pay on a per capita basis, actually, \$9, and they are not getting the services they were getting before.

As an indication of Liberal ideas in this connection, since so much reference was made by the Premier to Ottawa — I don't know why he kept going to Ottawa all the time when this is a provincial House, but I would like to remind the hon. gentleman that the federal government is providing an annual grant of \$30 for health services throughout this country. Do not mistake me, Mr. Speaker; we are all for the extension of hospitalization and medical services, but we do contend that a satisfactory, comprehensive programme would have left the administration of this in local hands.

I wish now to turn to another section of this amendment. I made a very brief reference to it previously: "Have failed to take effective measures to relieve school districts of the burden of increasing cost of education." All right, 33. I will refer to 33. I am going to give credit — I said I would give credit where credit is due — and I would, at this time, like to give credit to the Hon. Minister of Public Health (Hon. T.C. Douglas) for having launched a personal training programme in his mental institutions. I think that is a step in the right direction, and I am paying this tribute to the government, Mr. Speaker, not because the government offered me a job in that connection as Director of Personnel Training in the Weyburn Mental Hospital — incidentally that was offered after my nomination in the Melfort constituency — but because I think it was a good thing.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, so there will be no misunderstanding. The hon. gentleman was never offered any position with my knowledge. If it was offered, it was offered by some official, and certainly not by any member of the government. I want to make that perfectly clear.

Mr. Egnatoff: — That is fine, Mr. Speaker, If it was offered without the Premier's knowledge, I can quite understand that. Nevertheless I did have a long-distance call from Dr. McCracken. You may verify that if you wish to.

Premier Douglas: — There is no Dr. McCracken. There is a Mr. McCracken in charge of personnel selection in the department.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Well, you can follow that up, Sir, if you doubt my veracity.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I do not doubt the hon. gentleman's veracity. I merely rose for the purpose of pointing out that I, personally, and I am sure no member of the government, extended the hon. gentleman an offer of employment.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Mr. Speaker, in reply to that, I did not state that the Premier had any knowledge. I don't see anything to get so hot and fussed about.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the place to start developing mental health is in the schools. One of the best ways of doing that is by placing in our schools adequately trained personnel; but you cannot get adequately trained personnel unless you place school finance on a sound basis, and this the government has failed to do. I would submit that it is a very deplorable situation. The rural municipalities and other municipalities have to bear too great a proportion of the cost of education. Property tax, I submit, has reached its saturation point, and may I give you this bit of evidence: in the town of Melfort, for instance, where does the tax dollar go? To operate our elementary school and our collegiate it takes 51 1/4 cents out of every tax dollar, and then the Provincial Treasurer takes 3 1/4 cents out of every tax dollar. By the time the municipality attends to the various services which it is called upon to do, it has left approximately ten cents out of the dollar to extend its sewer and water programme, and to build sidewalks. I feel the government has definitely failed because, as far as our town is concerned, the government grants don't amount to more than ten percent of the cost of education in that town. If the C.C.F. members had not promised to do something about this, we would not have included this in the amendment. But let me remind this House of some of the promises that were made, and again I would like to quote from a radio broadcast made by the hon. gentleman who is now Premier in connection with education, and I quote:

The first thing which a C.C.F. government would do would be to recognize education as the responsibility of the provincial government. There has been a tendency on the part of the provincial government to 'pass the buck'; to the municipalities and local school boards for maintaining our educational facilities. The time has come when we must recognize that Canada's constitution places the responsibility for teaching our children squarely upon the provincial government, and it cannot be passed to any other party.

That was said on March 10, 1943. I could quote pages and pages of statements made by the gentlemen who are now in the House, advocating that if the C.C.F. were ever elected to office in this province they would really take hold of this problem of educational finance and do something about it, and today very little has been done. They were going to place education on a sound financial basis and still abolish the educational tax. So, Mr. Speaker, I submit that if the government saw fit to retain the educational tax it should have really substantially increased the school grants.

With regard to that educational tax, I must make this reference because I feel it is pertinent. In seven years the Liberal government, by way of education tax, had collected from the people of this province \$21 million — in round figures. In four years, the C.C.F. government, which pledged to bear the burden of the cost of education, collected from the people of this province, by way of education tax, \$22 million. In four years, Mr. Speaker, this government, in which we say we have no confidence, has collected more from the people of this province by way of education tax than the Liberal administration had collected in the previous seven years.

I said a few moments ago that since the government retained this education tax it should have very substantially increased school grants, and, in this connection, I would like to remind the hon. gentlemen that there was a delegation, a province-wide delegation, came to Regina a little over a year ago. The delegation was comprised of 200 people, trustees from all over the province, and representatives of the school teachers. On that occasion two briefs were submitted to the government, two excellent briefs, urging the government to increase school grants. What was the reception we got? I am sorry that the member for Canora is not here since he was the one who referred to delegations. Well, when we came down, the hon. Premier had a cold and, therefore, he was unable to be present — I feel if he had been present we probably would have received a more cordial and satisfactory reception. However, the Provincial Treasurer took his place. It was felt by school trustees and teachers that, in view of the government change of view in not abolishing the education tax, it must have had a revenue of \$3 million more than previously had been stated — and that is a conservative figure — and yet the government saw fit to give that delegation the coldest “brush-off” that anyone could possibly wish to see anywhere. In effect, the delegation was told by the Provincial Treasurer: “Oh yes, more money should be spent on education. Granted; but you may just as well leave the resolution out there”, referring to the trustees. In other words, instead of the province assuming its rightful share of the cost education, he passed the buck back to the school trustees.

Mr. Tucker: — They weren’t looking for votes then, of course.

Mr. Danielson: — They want you to go out and popularize the education tax.

Mr. Egnatoff: — It was claimed by the C.C.F. sometimes that they have increased school grants. So they have; but they were going to increase school grants very considerably because I think it must be granted that before a provincial government can say it is bearing

its rightful share of the cost of education it must bear approximately 50 percent of the total cost of education. I am sure that the hon. Minister of Education will not deny that.

Again, what are the facts in this connection? Facts, it was pointed out to us, are stubborn creatures and cannot be put away. Not to burden this House with too many of them: the total expenditure on revenue account, between the fiscal years 1939-40 to 1943-44, the total expenditures on revenue account during that period amounted to \$135,291,367. The school grants, during that same period, amounted to \$13,426,518. Now take the school grants as a percentage of the total expenditure — and I think that is only a fair way on which to work — and during those years of Liberal administration, the school grants were 9.92 percent of the total expenditures for that period. Now, Mr. Speaker, a voice says “that’s a good one”. Well, listen to this; a wonderful improvement: during the years 1944-45 to 1948-49, the total expenditure on revenue account was \$207,884,292; the school grants during that same period amounted to \$20,447,107. So it is true that the school grants have actually increased, but, when you take it as a percentage of total expenditure, during the C.C.F. term of office, the grant amounted to 9.83 percent of the total expenditure on revenue account. I submit that is not good enough. The people of this province feel, and I think rightly so, that the cost of education should be borne by the provincial government in much greater proportion than it has been, and if the percentage of grants has not increased, it simply means that the government has failed to relieve school districts of the burden of increasing cost of education.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say: the people of Saskatchewan want rural electrification, and they want it now, and they want the power taken right to the farm at a cost to be borne by the Saskatchewan Power Commission. We urge the government to restore freedom to our northern citizens who are opening up new frontiers so that future generations may benefit thereby. We would urge upon the government to get rid of this compulsion in the sale of fire insurance. There is no reason on earth why school districts, larger units in particular, which can get a rate to insure their schools in block lower than the rate of the Government Insurance Company, should have to insure with the government. And, Mr. Speaker, we would urge upon the government to extend hospitalization services through the decentralization of their administration. We urge upon them to eliminate the imposition of heavy penalties on those who are unable to pay the hospitalization tax, without making it necessary for conducting a half-dozen investigations before deciding whether or not the person is able to pay. And we would urge upon the government to relieve school districts and rural and urban municipalities of the burden of increased costs of education by very substantially increasing school grants. If the government cannot do this then for certain this government has lost the confidence of this Legislature.

Mr. V.P. Deshaye (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, you have in the past few days listened to some very able and capable speakers and among the good there must be a sprinkling of the poor, so today for a change we will have a poor speaker. However, I wish to take this opportunity to thank the people of the Melville constituency for the confidence they have shown in me in electing me to this Legislature. I assure them I will do the best I can in their interests in the meagre way I am able to.

A few days ago the member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) criticized the former Liberal administration for their handling of the hospital scheme, for one thing, and he called his constituents “God-forsaken people”. Now, it is unfortunate . . .

Mr. Kuziak: — If the hon. member wishes to quote me, he should quote the whole sentence. I made the statement “God-forsaken under the Liberal administration”. I was speaking of expansion of highways and electrical power that we have now and didn’t have before.

Some Hon. Members: — Oh! Oh!

Mr. Deshaye: — I think we should ask for the record to be played back, and have this brought into the House tomorrow. However, he did use the term with respect to his people. I can assure the hon. member for Canora that we in Melville are not “God-forsaken people”. And I sincerely regret that the hon. member has no more respect than that for the people who sent him into this Assembly.

He also told this House that there was a depression on the way, and he said that we, on this side, did not even doubt that. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that if the hon. member thinks he knows what we on this side of the House are thinking, he has a lot of surprises coming to him. To my way of thinking, for any member of this House to stand up and make a public statement that there is a depression on the way is in very poor taste. I think that a statement like that only hastens such an unfortunate thing, but I suppose if he believes that, he believes his government is going to do it, and I am almost suspicious that with the legislation they have given the people of Saskatchewan during the past four and one-half years, they are doing a very good job of it. I suppose the hon. member feels that he has a lack of confidence in his own government in that it is bringing a depression to Saskatchewan. I think the matter is borne out by the facts. I think the speakers who have spoken so far do feel — even the hon. Premier himself has revealed — that practically every industry in this province has gone bankrupt since the C.C.F. has come into power.

February 17, 1949

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I at no time made such a statement as the hon. member is attributing to me, and I wish to categorically deny having made such a statement either in the House or outside it.

Mr. Deshaye: — Mr. Speaker, however, the Premier did tell us yesterday . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Withdraw!

Mr. Deshaye: — He did tell us yesterday that a number of his Crown Corporations had gone wrong or “haywire”.

Mr. Danielson: — Just like the government.

Premier Douglas: — That is all that’s holding you together — haywire.

Mr. Deshaye: — Well, at least we’re together. I don’t think even the Premier can deny that he said that yesterday.

I certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Canora is wrong in his prediction that we have a depression coming in this province; and if this government gives “due consideration” as it says in its meagre and impotent speech from the throne, to agriculture, if it gives that basic industry of this province due consideration, I think that, with the assistance the federal government and its policies have given in maintaining agriculture, we will avoid the depression the hon. member for Canora would like to have foisted upon us.

It is statements like the one the hon. gentleman made that drive the young people out of our province, and I don’t think that ever in the history of Saskatchewan has that factor been so serious as it has been since this government has taken office. I know of dozens of young people who have left this province — graduates in medicine, graduates in dentistry — and have gone into other provinces where they can practise and give the people service. We, in this province, need those services so badly, and yet there is no inducement for these young people to stay here and practise.

An Hon. Member: — Even Schumiatcher isn’t standing any more.

Mr. Deshaye: — My friend says that even Dr. Schumiatcher can’t stand it any more.

Premier Douglas: — He couldn't stand all the lawyers that were coming into the Legislature.

Mr. Deshaye: — Well, I'm glad something drove him away. I think that with a few more lawyers we might get some better legislation at that.

Premier Douglas: — I hope we might get better speeches.

Mr. Deshaye: — The hon. Premier speaks of better speeches. I must admit that everyone isn't as glib with the tongue as he is, but I don't think that that is always a very good advantage. At least if you tell the people what you mean, it means a lot more than to hoodwink them with stories.

I wonder how the government ever expects that prosperity will be forthcoming in this province. What inducement is there for a man to start any business or an enterprise of any kind in Saskatchewan, when the government says: "As soon as you have made a success of it, we will take it over"? And, to fortify that statement, I think we can quote from the C.C.F. Manifesto which says: "No C.C.F. government will rest content until it has eradicated capitalism." I can assure the hon. Premier that as soon as they look at his programme and the statements he has made, there will not be any Swedish capital coming in to this province. He also flies to New York, which I think was a more logical place to look for capital than Sweden, and, apparently, he has also failed there because he comes back and says that the conversations were merely of an exploratory nature and no definite conclusions were obtained. Therefore, even the Americans, who are our neighbours, are refusing to invest any money in our province, whereas in Alberta they are investing millions of dollars, providing employment for the people of Alberta and for the people of Saskatchewan who are migrating to Alberta because of the type of government we have in this province.

I listened to the Premier with great interest because I really wanted to know if he had a solution for the influx of people into other provinces from Saskatchewan. I am gravely concerned about us losing our younger people from this province because I think those are the citizens we should retain here at all costs for the future development of his province. Our own people leave the province and the government brings in all of these imported advisers from every other province and country, and from all over the world practically; brings them in here and pays them tremendous salaries while our own young people have to leave the province for employment. I think that something is radically wrong with any government that does that.

Why is Alberta developing so fast while we have no development, practically, whatever? Surely the imaginary line which divides the two provinces does not divide the products of those provinces. Surely, by drawing a line with one side Saskatchewan and the other side Alberta, there shouldn't be oil on one side and not on the other. Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that we haven't the resources, income and capital coming into the province to develop it and, for that reason, Alberta enjoys great prosperity while we in Saskatchewan are suffering a practical depression. As I said before, the only thing that is keeping this province on its feet is agriculture, and without agriculture you have nothing, and I think even the Premier, with his glib tongue, will not deny that.

Last week, when I was coming into this city on the train, I was speaking to a fisherman. I believe he said he was from Sturgeon Landing up north, and he was telling me that he and his fisherman friends fish on a lake that covers territory both in Saskatchewan and Manitoba; but he says they do all their fishing on the Manitoba side because of the restrictions the Saskatchewan government has imposed, and what is left to him and them after the government has taken off all their royalties and cuts here and there is not enough for him and the fishermen to make it pay. So the fishermen in the province of Manitoba get their share of those catches, and they reap the benefit while we here lose everything. The C.C.F., with all their dictatorial powers, apparently can't stop the fish from swimming across into the Manitoba side to be caught there.

On the same subject, I received not long ago a letter dated January 8, 1949, from a man in my constituency, and for the information of the Minister of Natural Resources, as he may want to do something in this respect, I will read this letter. He writes:

I have a thing on my mind about muskrat furs. I got a permit last fall to destroy the muskrats in my dugout, and I killed the muskrats and stretched the furs properly. To my surprise, when I received my returns one was shown as worthless, two were shown as so badly damaged they were almost worthless, and I have been doing a lot of trapping in my day and should know a little about furs. I never experienced anything like that so far. I am enclosing the invoice for the sale of my furs so that you can see for yourself. I didn't know before why everybody who sent furs to the C.C.F. fur sale were grouching and kicking about it. I haven't sent to them so far except for these muskrats. They wouldn't have gotten them but they have it fixed so a person cannot sell them anywhere else. We are compelled to sell to them so that we can do as they like. I have

some good sloughs loaded with 'rats which I intended to trap in the spring, but if that is the way they intend to do, I don't think it would pay to trap and skin them for what we get for them."

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — Would the hon. member permit me to ask a question? I just want to ask him if he really wants the report on that case. If he will give the name of the person I will get the story, or he might table the letter to bring it to may attention.

Mr. Deshaye: — I will reply to the hon. Minister that I will take this up with the party and see if he has any objections.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — You should take it up with me if you want to know.

Mr. Deshaye: — I will take it up with him and see if he has any objections.

Premier Douglas: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't matter whether a person wants to or not. If an hon. member quotes from a document or letter, he must table it in the House or accept full responsibility for it.

Some Hon. Members: — Oh, no!

Premier Douglas: — The rules aren't being made by the opposition; they are made by you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member must accept the responsibility.

Premier Douglas: — He must do either one.

Mr. Deshaye: — I wonder why the hon. Premier and the hon. Minister are so anxious to have this letter. Is it some more of those tactics they are going to use on this man?

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. There is no need for the hon. gentleman to be insulting and impute motives. I am merely pointing out that the hon. gentleman must either table the letter or accept responsibility. If he is prepared to do that, it is really a point of order; if he agrees to do that there is really nothing more about it.

February 17, 1949

Mr. Deshaye: — I will definitely accept responsibility for this letter that it is written. I have it here, and an additional copy, and I have the invoice from the Saskatchewan Fur Marketing Service.

An Hon. Member: — You won't accept the responsibility for that.

Mr. Deshaye: — I should hope not.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, he either must table it or accept responsibility for that.

Mr. Deshaye: — I accept responsibility for the letter.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — Any document.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member must accept the responsibility otherwise he will table it.

Mr. Deshaye: — Oh, yes, I accept responsibility. I also have the invoice here from the Saskatchewan Fur Marketing Service, where in this age of prosperity when muskrat furs are valuable — I have seen invoices from Winnipeg of muskrats sold there — and here is a man that sells 14 muskrats and gets \$10.04 for them, and then the government takes off 25 cents lotting fee, 50 cents sales commission, and \$1 for the Department of Natural Resources, leaving \$8.29 for 14 muskrats.

Some Hon. Members: — Shame!

Mr. Deshaye: — I don't know how the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Marion) and the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Blanchard) are going to survive if the government keeps paying those rates for the furs.

Mr. Tucker: — That is why they show a profit.

Mr. Deshaye: — At the expense of the trapper.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — We don't take 15 percent.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — You took interest at one time.

Mr. Deshaye: — The hon. member says they don't take 15 percent. From my calculations this is more than 15 percent. They have taken \$1.75 on \$10.04. I think that comes to more than 15 percent.

I was speaking of the inducements there are left in Saskatchewan for young people to stay here and get into business. I want to make one more quotation from a statement that the hon. Premier made in January, 1948, speaking at the Regina People's Forum; he said:

Our capitalistic system is through. The time has come to move out into new waters, to build ourselves a new form of society.

I am not very familiar with the different forms of society in the world, but I know of two main forms and they are the capitalistic system — as they call our present system — and the national socialist system or, as we call it, communism. The Premier says “to build ourselves a new form of society”. In my own mind I was wondering if he meant to go into communism. When a person makes those statements he must want to leave some inference, and, to my mind, that was the only inference that could be left.

As I was saying, agriculture is the basic industry of this province. My friend from Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) spoke quite thoroughly on rural electrification. Four and one-half years ago, we heard the C.C.F. promising the farmers they would have rural electrification. We heard it again last year. I think that the hon. Premier and all his assistants know as well as I do that they cannot go out and give rural electrification to every farm home, as he claims they can, through the Power Commission.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I at no time claimed we could give power to every farmer in the province. If my hon. friend is going to quote me, I ask that he quote from something and not draw on his imagination.

Mr. Deshaye: — That was the inference I took from a meeting I attended when the hon. Premier was speaking. Of course, I may have taken the wrong inference.

Premier Douglas: — I am not responsible for my hon. friend's inferences.

Mr. Deshaye: — I explained myself. That is the inference I took, and if the hon. Premier thinks I went too far, that is my error; but I know that that cannot be done — that is, that you can have power lines to take in every farm home. I suggest that a commission be set up to give every farm home some form of electrical power. I firmly believe that that can be done, through Delco or Wincharger systems. I would like to advocate that the government purchase

a standard type of Delco or Wincharger system, after it has been thoroughly investigate, and resell those, either on a rental or time payment or cash basis, to the farmers who know, probably, that in this day and age they will not have a power line passing their place. I think that we have to do something to deep the farmer on the land. The farmer is entitled to those conveniences the city people have. He is just as human as any person living in a town or city, and he is entitled to those benefits. I think it is the responsibility of the government to see that these people in the outlying districts and not along highways have some form of electrical power to ease their burden and encourage them to stay on the land and to increase production. It seems to me that the government could well set up a department or commission of some kind to look into this question, with the view to supplying, on a basis of time payments or on a rental basis, Delco or Wincharger units to these people so that they can have the equipment they need on the farm for power milking, for separators, for light and all the other things that electricity assists with. I would certainly like to recommend to this government that something along this line be taken because, naturally, it would be much nicer to be on the power line, but, nevertheless, everybody can't be on the power line, and something should be done for the other people in the rural areas that are not on the power line. I suggest that system, operated similarly to the telephone system, where the government will have experts and repairmen available to travel from home to home, and if every home has one of these things we will encourage the people to stay on the land, and will encourage greater production and greater prosperity for Saskatchewan by doing that.

Another thing I think the government should do for agriculture is to immediately take off the two percent education tax on farm fuels. The government has, in its speech from the throne, said it is going to assist agriculture, but in that speech it has not said specifically what it is going to do. There is one specific thing I think the government should do immediately and I press the responsibility upon the members of the government in power and have the ability to propose that legislation, to immediately take off the two percent education tax on farm fuels.

Then, what is the position of labour in Saskatchewan? The government has claimed it has done so much for labour. I think there are many ways the government can be criticized for what little it has done for labour. It claims it has boosted the Minimum Wage Act to \$18.50 in the town where I live. I believe, at one time, the minimum wage was \$12.50 there under the Liberal government. They say they boosted it \$6 per week; but you forget that the cost of living has gone up that much. The price and the returns for wheat and the price of products have gone up more than that percentage, so to my way of thinking the government has not done so much for the labourer.

The subject of the hospital tax has been fairly well discussed, so I do not intend to take any more time of the members of this Assembly discussing that, except I do wish to say . . .

Hon. C.M. Fines: — Before the hon. gentleman sits down, will he permit a question? Would be he in agreement with the government in raising the minimum wage above the \$18.50?

Mr. Deshaye: — I have no objection to increasing the minimum wage, to be guided by the cost of living index. I think a minimum wage of \$20 a week would not be out of line today, instead of \$18.50. I was asked to express my opinion and there is my opinion. I know the Provincial Treasurer is probably trying to put me on the spot, but that is quite all right.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — No, Mr. Speaker. It isn't that at all. I just want to get the hon. gentleman's view. I had no intention of doing such a thing.

Mr. Deshaye: — In reply to that, I don't think there are many people today who are paying the minimum wage. I think most of the people are paying more than the minimum wage, and, therefore that in itself is evidence that the minimum wage is too low. I certainly believe that the labourer, regardless of whether it is a waitress in a café or a man digging ditches, is entitled to a fair living wage, and today, I don't care who uses it, \$18.50 a week is not enough to live on.

Then, of course, labour certainly cannot endorse the government where, as has been mentioned, it has laid off all the help in the different plants it closed on the eve of Christmas, as you might say. Full employment was kept up during the election. In fact, in my own town, I know — and I have no complaint against it — that wages were raised on June 1 in a plant employing some hundred people. On June 1. Shortly after the election there was agitation to have those wages reduced again. I am very glad to report that the wages were not reduced, but I think, from what I understand of the situation, that it was close to that. It seems to me strange that these things should happen on the eve of an election: full employment during the election, wages raised just before the election, and after the election no employment, and all these other things along with the hospital tax going up double for adults.

Hon. C.C. Williams: — Does he suggest that the government had anything to do with any agitating to lower wages after the election, or had they anything to do with raising wages before the election in this particular industry in his town?

Mr. Deshaye: — I do not suggest that the government had anything to do with agitation to have the wages lowered. I do believe that they entertained those who were agitating to lower the wages, and I do not know what prompted them to raise the wages, I believe it was on June 1 the Order in Council went through. I do know, and I will say, all this happened at an opportune time for the government; it all happened on June 1 — 24 days before the election.

Mr. H. Gibbs (Swift Current): — What industry are you talking about?

Mr. Deshaye: — Well, I can certainly give you the industry if you wish, and I think the hon. Minister of Labour knows what I am talking about, and will agree that I am not fabricating the story. All I want to point out, Sir, is that it is strange the situation should come just before an election, and I wish to tell the government that it worked. They did get a 95 percent vote out of the place where they raised the wages on June 1. Some of those tactics do work. I see the Provincial Treasurer gleams at that.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — I always like to see us get a good vote.

Mr. Deshaye: — If he enjoys those tactics, he is surely welcome to them.

The same thing applies with the increase of 100 percent as far as the hospitalization is concerned. I think myself that it is an unusual thing. They surely knew on June 24 that they had to raise the fee to \$10 under that system. I am not criticizing so much the fact that the fee was raised to \$10 because, under that system, apparently they had to have some extra money; but what I am criticizing is the time at which it was done. I venture to say that every Cabinet Minister knew on June 1 that the hospitalization fee had to be raised if they were going to operate efficiently; but they went through the election and never said a word about it, and once the election was over, then they slapped this \$10 onto the people. It is the principle of the thing that I oppose, particularly this. If people have short memories it is very well; but if they have memories at all it will certainly mean the defeat of the government when they go to the polls again. Those are tactics I do not approve of.

Speaking of the government and its hospitalization policy, I think there is a better way than the per capita tax of collecting the revenue for this. I want to make it clear that I am in favour of hospital insurance. I, like my hon. friend for Canora, have had municipal experience. When I was the secretary of the municipality, we had, in that municipality, one

of the finest hospital, medical and surgical schemes that was ever operated, and the people of that municipality will say that the scheme they enjoyed previously was much better than the scheme they enjoy today. That was the scheme under the Liberal administration where they enjoyed complete hospitalization with no exemptions whatever. They enjoyed all medical services, and they enjoyed surgical services. They went into the hospital if they were ill, without payment of a fee. They just had to show they were ill and they were admitted; and when they were released there was no bill. Today you go into the hospital and you are not so certain whether the government will pay your bill or not. I know a lot of people have gone into the hospital and when they were discharged they were surprised to find they had to pay. When I asked why it was, they said they were not covered; their treatment was diagnostic or something else, and they had to pay their own bill.

I certainly am in agreement, and I know from the discussions we have had that all the members on this side of the House are in agreement with the hospital scheme; but there was also an excellent hospital scheme put into effect while the Liberal administration was in power, and the only thing that seems to have held it back was that it was optional. A municipality could take it if it wished, and the Liberals, not believing in compulsion, didn't force it upon the people; but those who accepted it, I think without exception, thought it was very, very good. I am glad to see that a prominent farmers' organization today has submitted to the government that they return to that system of collecting hospitalization tax; that is, increasing the public revenue tax to cover it. I believe it is a good idea for this reason: the very poor man who has nothing obtains his treatment for nothing, and I think that is the principle the members of the government want the people to believe, that they are giving something to the very poor at the cost of those who have. If that is what they believe, why do they not put that policy into force? In the other scheme, the man who has a lot of land pays for the man who has nothing, and hospital and medical services are denied to no one. Now, that is the scheme that existed under the past administration, and it operated very well, and I suggest to this government that they consider the matter of taking off the head tax for several reasons — some of which have been explained already — which I will deal with very briefly.

The hon. Premier mentioned yesterday that nobody was prosecuted unless there were three investigations. I must tell the hon. Premier that either his investigators are not making proper reports or are not as efficient as his other departments, because I know of two cases that recently came up in Melville which were absolutely deplorable. A man, with absolutely nothing, was brought up and charged. I am sorry I haven't his name for you, but I propose to get it for you.

Premier Douglas: — Will the hon. member at some time or another send me the names of these people?

Mr. Deshaye: — I will. They were told to me before I left, but not knowing the subject was coming up I have forgotten them. This man had absolutely nothing, and he came into court and said he had nothing, and he was prosecuted.

That was one case. Another case: a man was brought up from Dubuc to Melville, summoned to answer a charge that he hadn't paid his hospital bill, and this man was 86 years of age. Now, I don't know the facts of why he didn't have a hospital card, but apparently he wasn't getting the old age pension. Nevertheless, a man of 86 years of age was brought up in the dead of winter, over 30 miles, to answer a charge of not paying his hospital fee. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that a government permitting and encouraging that, and which passes laws to enforce such action, is a government that doesn't follow its slogan of "humanity first" very well. As I mentioned to the hon. Premier, I have no doubt he does not know these things took place, and I will be very glad to supply him with the names, because I think things like that should be righted, and I am sure he will do something to see that it is righted.

There is one other way — I don't know how sound it is — that this hospital cost might be taken care of. The Premier, when speaking yesterday, said the total hospitalization cost was in the vicinity of \$8 million, possibly \$9 million this year. I believe, from sources I have read, the liquor profits are about \$8 million. These liquor profits, from my understanding, go into the consolidated fund and are spent in operating the province — for social services I imagine, and all that. It seems to me that liquor profits are "found money" — shall we say — and I think for a government today to earmark those liquor profits for special services such as hospital services would be considered as ideal. I don't deny for one moment that there are a lot of places where the money is required, but it seems to me that liquor profits are profits from a monopoly the government has, and it would be very nice for the government to earmark liquor profits for medical services. The idea came to me when the two amounts seemed to be the same. Apparently the \$8 million from liquor would just about pay all our hospitalization and we wouldn't have the cost of collecting the \$5 and \$10, and the government wouldn't be criticized for doubling the amount after the election. That way I think we would be doing a service, at least to the poor people who cannot pay the \$10 that they have to pay.

May I tell of a couple of other examples. The hon. Premier yesterday mentioned that the government had the machinery whereby anybody who couldn't pay, some other department

of the government would pay the hospital. I know of a case where that isn't working. I don't for one moment doubt the hon. Premier's word that his government has that capacity, but I know of a case where a half-breed woman was brought into the Melville hospital about a year ago to have a Caesarean operation. She was desperately ill for six or seven weeks and required a lot of expensive drugs. She finally recovered and the bill was something over \$300. This woman came in, and she didn't have a hospital card. Her husband had paid only part of the hospital assessment, I think one-half. Our hospital is not like the one in Canora; we are not a "God-forsaken" people. Our hospital lets people in regardless whether they have the means or not. We are quite human in the Melville constituency and are, apparently, not like Canora where a girl in a dying condition goes to a hospital and is rejected. She can come a little further south where people are, apparently, a little more humane, and she may come to Yorkton where she is not known and they will let her into the hospital; but not in Canora where my hon. friend comes from. She can't get into the hospital because everybody is too hard up; but that municipality has enough money to pay \$90 to two councillors to come on a trip to Regina. It just doesn't seem to make sense.

Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. The girl was not from the R.M. of Keyes, so don't mix the two municipalities up.

Mr. Deshaye: — Well, I am glad the secretary explained that. I am sure he operates his municipality a little more efficiently than that. I know that when I was secretary of a municipality, our municipality had an arrangement that any indigent who couldn't pay was admitted to the hospital without question. I believe that was the arrangement supposed to be in force in all the municipalities during the Liberal administration.

The hospital had a bill of something over \$300 for the Caesarean operation, including drugs, etc., for this woman. This half-breed was absolutely penniless. He didn't have the money and he couldn't pay the hospital. He couldn't even pay the \$30 he was supposed to pay the government. He had paid half of it; he was making an effort. The hospital sent the bill to me and asked if I could do anything about it. I wrote the municipality and they said the party was a transient, or only part-time in the municipality, and they were not obligated to pay it. I enquired about this chap and he had nothing. He lived in a sod house and wandered around in a wagon. I sent the bill to the Hospital Services Plan in Regina, and explained the circumstances to them, and told them that the hospital was apparently "stuck" for this money. They wrote back saying they were sorry they couldn't do anything about it.

I am not criticizing that so much, except that I want to point out that the Premier told us yesterday that arrangements had been made for those people. Apparently the arrangement isn't functioning. At least it wasn't functioning then, and it seems to me that it is not fair to ask a hospital to carry that burden because there are too many of those burdens. Either the responsibility must be with the government or someone. The municipality says it is not their burden, and the hospitalization plan says it is not theirs. Whose responsibility is it then? Yesterday, if it hadn't been for this particular case I would have thought the Premier's explanation was very fine and logical, but I know from experience it is not working, and I hope he sees something is done about it.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, may I just say to my hon. friend, the logical thing for him to have done, when it was sent back by the Hospital Services Plan, was to have sent it down to me, or to the Deputy Minister of Public Health. There is a Medical Relief Branch in the Department of Public Health which has nothing to do with the Hospital Services Plan. I blame the Hospital Services for not sending it to the Medical Relief Branch, but if my hon. friend had sent it to them or to me it would have been taken care of, if they were transients.

Mr. Deshaye: — I acknowledge the Premier's explanation, and I am broad-minded enough to accept these explanations, but I think everybody in the backwoods — Melville is not in the backwoods . . .

Premier Douglas: — You're off the air.

Mr. Deshaye: — I must have been thinking about the area a little north of there, Canora, where the "God-forsaken" people are.

They wouldn't know just who to send it to. The Premier has told me if there is any future trouble to send it to him and he will fix it up. I am glad to hear that; but everybody in the province hasn't been advised of that, and I think it would be a lot easier if the Premier would advise his different departments, if something in connection with that work comes up and they can't handle it, what proper channels it should be sent through. At the time I knew how busy the Premier of the province was and it would have seemed ridiculous to me to send it to the Premier. He must have too many things to think about; but there must be a policy of the government that these things are attended to by different departments, and it should be up to those departments to accept the responsibility. I don't think it should have been held up until someone brought it up in the Legislature.

As I said, that was over a year ago, and only today I find out where the bill should have been sent. I might inform the Premier that I propose to ask the hospital if this thing is still open, and I will let him have the information. I hope he will arrange to see that the hospital is paid. If we do not look after our institutions which are performing a public service, eventually they will not be able to operate. I think it is the government's responsibility, that is why I propose to let the Premier have this statement and hope he will do something about it.

I was talking about the fee of \$10. In our town, as in the city of Regina and a lot of other centres, there are people who have, through unions, their own insurance which covers a lot more than the hospital plan we have at present. I recall that not very long ago one of these other prosecutions came up. This man would not pay his \$30. No doubt the investigation took place, and they recommended prosecution. As far as being able to pay, this man was probably justly prosecuted, but, here is the point: this man paid into an insurance fund whereby he received complete hospitalization and complete medical services, and he thought the \$30 he had to pay the government was being thrown away. He was covered already, and why should he have to pay another \$30? That was the attitude he took. He was prosecuted and he paid his fine. He was a good C.C.F. voter in the last election — I don't know how he will vote next time. That is the situation. He was an employee of Swift Canadian Company, and they have a scheme of their own, the same as the C.N.R.

In our town thousands of dollars are taken from these employees who have another scheme. In other words, they are not getting value received for the money they pay into the government. I don't know if it is practical or not, but those people should be considered, and the government should try to work out a scheme whereby anybody who already has insurance, whereby the government would not be obligated to pay their bill, should not be compelled to pay to the government the fee that is set. Yesterday the hon. Premier said that to be successful this scheme had to be compulsory; but it seems too bad that people who feel they have a better scheme, which gives them medical and dental services and complete hospitalization should have to pay twice. That is the situation which exists among a lot of people.

A while ago I was speaking about labour and the disappointment when these people were let go on Christmas Eve. That isn't the only thing. I know of a number who were employed in the boot factory, tannery and the meat canning factory — I note that even it was closed; even the C.C.F. couldn't stomach that — some of whom left good jobs because there was the inducement of higher pay with the government. I know of one particular case which was somewhat tragic. A married man was induced to leave his job to

take a job with the government in one of these plants, and today he finds himself with no job at all. There is not much security given to the people there by the government which claims it promotes and fosters security and humanity first.

There is one other thing I want to mention here, and I think it may interest the Provincial Treasurer because I understand it is under his department: \$8 million of liquor profits in Saskatchewan. That's an awful lot of money, and an awful lot of liquor.

Mr. Danielson: — And an awful lot of water.

Mr. Deshaye: — I am not going to say I haven't contributed to it myself in a small portion, but liquor — I don't think anybody can deny — is being abused terrifically in this province, as well as many other provinces in this Dominion and throughout the United States. At least we are not promoting the consumption of liquor as some of the American magazines are, and, I believe, as they do in eastern Canada. I do think, if the \$8 million was made from liquor, this government would be well advised to spend, say \$1 million in propaganda literature and advertising, promoting moderation of consumption of alcohol.

Premier Douglas: — You've already spent that \$8 million on hospitalization. You can't spend it twice.

Mr. Deshaye: — I am very sorry to see that the Premier and his government make so light of the fact that I am trying to suggest some method of alleviating some of the sufferings going on in the homes, and the ill-health, caused by liquor.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I am not making light of it at all. I think the hon. gentleman's suggestion is an excellent one. I was pointing out to him that he had already spent that \$8 million in hospital services, and you can't spend the liquor money twice.

Mr. Deshaye: — Well, despite the fact the Premier said that, he is doing the spending and I don't mind him pointing it out to me, or being laughed at and ridiculed. I have had so much of it in my day I am getting used to it. He, nevertheless, did laugh at the idea. To me it is no laughing matter. I have seen too many homes broken up through liquor. I think it would be good economy for the government to spend some money in trying to stop the consumption

of liquor in excessive quantities. As I said, I have no objection to a man taking a drink. I do it myself and I think a lot of the members in this House do; but I certainly have objection to a man drinking all of his earnings away, so that he loses his job. I know of two cases in the last two months in our town, where a man loses his job and leaves five or six children to be taken care of by this government and the people of Saskatchewan. I think it would be good economy for this government to promote some campaign to encourage moderate drinking, to show the evils of excess, similar to the campaigns that have been promoted against venereal disease. I think it would be a good policy, and the government would be money ahead. With the money you save elsewhere you could make up the \$8 million and still have our hospitalization. Further than that, I still think you would have enough money because you would save enough money through better health, as a result of this campaign; you would have enough money left if you took out the \$1 million to cover your hospitalization.

I won't burden you very much longer. As I said, it must be somewhat dull after the excellent speeches we have heard in this House. I do want to make one more suggestion, however, and I am speaking mostly from the experiences I gain in my home town. I haven't travelled very far and haven't seen very much; but in our own town we often can't get into the hospital. It is still crowded. Not very long ago I was at a home and a very prominent man in town, an accountant, was stricken with a heart attack. He might have died. We phoned the doctor. He said: "Take him to the hospital." We got him to the hospital but there was no bed for the man. I enquired around and the doctor said: "Well, you know, the hospital should be amply large but we have it nearly half filled with old people." I'm not denying that old people need care, and they need good care; but I am suggesting to this government that that situation of lack of hospital space which has been created, and very rightly so, through the present hospital scheme — people need that and they are more able to go to the hospital. I have no criticism against that but I do feel that the government should set up homes for these people who are old — and medical science says they cannot do anything for them — and put those people in those homes, shall we say, where they are going to die. I am not trying to slur the responsibility of this matter at all but I do think those people who are 80 and 90 years old, who are hospital cases and taking up room there that younger people whom medical science can do something for, accident cases and so on, should have, and there is no place to put them when they are ill. I think, in Regina here, it is common for people to come in from my town and stay two weeks in a boarding house before they can get into the hospital. If the government set up these Old Folks' Homes throughout the district, where medical service would be required maybe only once a day, and put in a trained personnel into these homes, and move the old people into these homes which could be set up a lot cheaper than hospitals, where

expensive equipment is in the building, and still the building is being filled up with the old people, and if they would leave that space for the people who really need hospital care, I think the government would be commended by the people of the province in setting up such a scheme.

There is only one other thing I want to mention, and the Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) may take it into consideration if he wishes. This may not appear very big, but a lot of people have proved to me that muskrats, which are very prevalent in the district I come from, are restricted from being caught, and possibly rightly so. Each year hundreds and even thousands of these muskrats are frozen into the sloughs. The water freezes to the bottom, and the same situation has existed this year. Muskrat sloughs, where there were dozens of muskrats, have been frozen right through. The muskrats have frozen in those sloughs and are lost as value to the country. The pelts have not been put on the market and are lost. I do not pretend to be an expert in that field at all, but I had hoped the Minister would be in the House, and possibly some day I may be able to mention it to him personally. I think that is something for his department to look into, and either there should be some programme arranged whereby these muskrats are moved into deep water, or licences should be issued whereby they can be caught in early winter, and that value obtained for the province.

I wish to thank this House for the very good hearing they have given me. I am very well satisfied, and I hope some of the suggestions I have been able to make here today will be considered by the government. I hope some of the insinuations — shall we call them insinuations? — were not out of order, because my criticisms are genuine as far as I am concerned. I do not believe in socialism. I believe in restricted capitalism. I believe in every man having an opportunity to make a living in this country. I do not believe in the government running the country any more than is absolutely necessary. That way, what inducement is there for any man with a family to grow up in a country where the government says you shall do this, and you can't do this, and you can't do that? If a man can make a living within reason, he will stay here and make his living, and if he is making too much money the government has the recourse of taxation behind it. To my way of thinking, let the government tax those people who are making too much money, like the federal government is doing in income tax. That is the proper idea because in that way you do not destroy initiative. You have a man who can go out and make his living and use his personality and ability, and not be restricted with someone holding his thumb on him all the time, and to my way of thinking that is what happens with socialism. You say you don't believe in people making too much money. No more do I, gentlemen of this Legislature. I do not believe in people making too much money. I believe in everybody

making a fair living, and I believe the members across the House believe in the same thing, because I know from their status in life. If someone is making too much money we have the remedy. We don't need to crush them with all these socialistic doctrines. Let them get out there and earn a living, and when they come to the position they are abusing that right, then there are other methods of looking after them.

I was going to sit down, but I just want to mention one more thing. There is a bus operating from Punnichy to Yorkton. I have nothing to do with this delegation, but there will be a delegation coming in to see the Minister, not only from my town but from three other towns in that district: two towns in the Touchwood constituency and one in the Melville constituency. I want to explain this set-up. the common rumour in that district is that this bus is being operated from Ituna to Yorkton, through approximately 40 miles of bare country adjoining a community pasture and reserves, for political expediency. I hope that isn't true, but that is the rumour prevalent in the country; that a certain member of this Legislature is operating that bus there for political expediency and, Mr. Premier, you have asked me to bring to your attention certain things I have mentioned this afternoon. I am drawing to your attention this matter.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — On a point of privilege. I want to inform the hon. gentleman that no buses are being operated in this province because of political expediency.

Mr. Deshaye: — I cannot take that because here is the situation.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, he will have to take my word.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member must accept the statement.

Mr. Deshaye: — Very good, Mr. Speaker. I will accept the responsibility of the hon. Premier and his Cabinet. I know, I think he is a fair man and I think he will give this delegation the proper hearing. This delegation will be coming in to see him, I have been informed, and I have not been asked to interfere in this. It is a non-political matter. There will be as many C.C.F. on this delegation as Liberal, and possibly more.

There are the towns of Hubbard, Goodeve and Fenwood being deprived of a bus service. A bus is running north of these towns where they cannot obtain this service, for reasons I have been corrected on. I hope when this delegation comes in the

Premier will be fair to them, and I know, in his own mind, he will know when he has heard the delegations, that these villagers have been deprived of the service they are rightly entitled to, and I ask him to give the area concerned that service. I am not asking this as a political matter because two of the delegates are from the constituency of Touchwood, and that constituency has been won by the government.

With that I will say I support the amendment as put before the House.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, in rising for the first time in this Legislative Assembly, may I begin by extending my most sincere congratulations to you on again being selected as Speaker of this House. It has been demonstrated in the last few days that your position is not an easy one and that you have many decisions to make that must take some consideration. From the little time I have been here, I have seen that you have tried to be fair, and there is one thing that I admire in any man and that is fairness and honesty. I should like also to express the hope that I will not be the subject of too many of your decisions. After all, I am young and inexperienced, but I promise you that I will do my best.

I would also like to extend my congratulations to the hon. Premier and the hon. Leader of the Opposition. On the occasions when they spoke to us here, yesterday and the day before, they showed us that they both have considerable knowledge and experience and guidance which they can give to this Assembly and to the province of Saskatchewan. Therefore, I want to extend my congratulations to the two hon. members.

At this time I would like to say a few words about the constituency I happen to represent, and also a few words about my predecessor. The Moosomin seat lies along the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway and along that shambles called No. 1 Highway, from the Manitoba boundary to Grenfell. Incidentally, the only way you can get to Grenfell now is by Air Ambulance Service.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Even the trains don't go.

Mr. McDonald: — I noticed on the wall here in this room at the back, the other day, they have a map of the province that is marked off into constituencies. I happened to look at that and I noticed that all the way up the Manitoba boundary there is only one C.C.F. seat, and that is away up where, on the Manitoba side, there is nothing but pine trees. There is no way for them to be influenced by Saskatchewan people because there are no Manitoba people over there. We hold all the seats along that border . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Who is “we”? Is this Conservative?

Mr. McDonald: — . . . with the exception of one represented by the Hon. Mr. Brockelbank. I’ll get to who “we” are, don’t you worry.

The other day the hon. member for Canora sure made a mistake. He went to great length in telling what a wonderful seat he represented and how it was the birthplace of the C.C.F. I don’t know how he could ever admit that. Now, what I am going to tell you is that the seat I represent has never in its history given a majority to a socialist candidate, and it never will.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — How about Mrs. Strum?

Mr. McDonald: — Mrs. Strum did not get a majority in the Moosomin part of the Qu’Appelle seat. She was beaten by 270 votes . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Pretty backward down there.

Mr. McDonald: — . . . and if you put another “1” in front of that it will be the result in the next election. I know; I have that place well organized.

This Moosomin seat is an agricultural community. Of course we haven’t any timber or lakes — no Timber Board or Fish Board — but we have a good thriving mixed-farming community, and we are very proud of it. The constituency is also very proud of the members who have represented it in this Legislature for a good many years. As you all know, the last member we had in this House, now the Hon. Mr. Justice Procter — his name has gone down in history . . . I am not finished. Your laugh will be on the other side of your face in just about a minute . . . his name has gone down in history as one who has always told the truth.

Before getting into the main body of my address, there have been so many things said by people on that side of the House — there are just a few little things here that I want straightened out before we go any further. One of them is this “marriage” of the Tories and Grits. Apparently, from what has been said over there, the Tories all voted for the Grits. I wonder where I got mine. I got a good lot of Grit votes, and I am proud of them. I am just going to tell you how that came about in the Moosomin seat. I have lots of time. There is one fellow here that wants to go home on the 15th of April, but I don’t care if I’m not home until the first of August.

Now, in the Moosomin seat, which has never been C.C.F., as I said before, a joint convention was called of Liberals and Conservatives. It was long before a nominating convention was called. They were democratic, free-thinking people, and it was decided that, as the major issue of the two parties in the next provincial election would be to oust the socialist government . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Didn't you have a platform?

Mr. McDonald: — If you want to speak, you can speak tomorrow. I am speaking tonight.

There was your major issue. That was the one great thing that the two great old parties were concerned about. So it was decided that they would run one candidate, and a joint convention was called with equal representation of Conservatives and Liberals from every poll in that provincial seat. I happened to win the nomination as a Tory, and a good one.

There was no "marriage" at all. That is just a lot of foolish talk. You think that a big joke over there, and that just shows the mentality of the people sitting on that side of the House. I am trying to tell you that it was the major concern of both those parties that we should defend ourselves against socialism in this province, and that is what we did. We made a good job of it and we are not ashamed of it either. So we have that cleared away.

There is just one other thing here. The other day when the hon. Premier was speaking he made some reference to majorities. I wonder if he has ever taken the time to figure out the percentage of votes — the majority he got and the majority the people on this side of the House got. If he has not, I would suggest that he do it. It is very interesting.

Premier Douglas: — I already have.

Mr. McDonald: — I wouldn't boast too much about your seat then.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, for my hon. friend's information, I was the second highest percentage of majority in the province.

Mr. McDonald: — That is quite all right. Were you putting the country seats and the rural seats in with the city seats? Now, that isn't a fair way, you see. That is the way you do all your figuring. You must, to get a fair picture, take the rural seats on one hand and the city seats on the other, and then you would have a fair picture.

Premier Douglas: — That is exactly what we did.

Mr. McDonald: — I am not going to argue about majorities. I had enough anyway — I'm in here.

Another thing I would like to bring to the attention of the Legislature is farm debt. I wish we were on the air, I would like the farmers to hear this; I hope it gets in the paper. This government has gone to great lengths to take credit for the reduction of certain debts, and the farm debt is one of them. If this government or any other government would kindly consent to lower the farm debt, I would be a very happy man and I would be the first man to congratulate it. The credit for the reduction of farm debt goes to nobody else but the farmer, his family and his wife. They did the hard work, Mr. Speaker, and the good Lord blessed us with the rain. That is all that decreased the farm debt. "Jimmy" (Rt. Hon. J.G. Gardiner) gave us a pretty good price on our wheat — I should have added that.

They also took credit for the increase in farm production. Well, I don't know; if they get a rain-making machine around here we will grow a lot of wheat. I don't know what this provincial government has ever done to increase farm production. I cannot figure that one out at all. I have never had a letter from the provincial Department of Agriculture or anyone else in this province since I started to farm — no information or anything.

Another thing I just wanted to touch on was education tax. They claim that the regressive features have been taken out of the Act. I explained just where my constituency lies: along the Manitoba-Saskatchewan boundary. Consequently, we have a lot of people from Manitoba dealing in the province of Saskatchewan, and if I have ever seen a regressive feature in an Act, it is in that Act today.

I am going to tell a little story of a contractor from a little town in Manitoba who came into the municipality where I farm, and got a \$750 contract for gravelling a bit of municipal road. He was an honest man, the same as the people in the Moosomin constituency, so he bought licences for two trucks at \$104 apiece. He did the gravelling, and I think it was very fair. He held a \$750 contract and he was probably only in there for about ten days and paid \$208 for a Saskatchewan licence. Then they came back on him for the two percent education tax on his trucks — \$33 apiece. There is another \$66. That is about \$280 he had to give the Saskatchewan government for \$750 worth of work. Is that fair? I don't see it.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — What about the federal sales tax.

Mr. McDonald: — I have no interest in the federal government. If I were in the government at Ottawa I would discuss federal policies, but I am in a provincial House and it is up to me to fight for provincial issues here.

This regressive feature is in the Act. Not only that, but right along where we live there is the town of Moosomin which is very close to the Manitoba boundary. It is a much larger town than any of the towns just over into Manitoba, that is, close to the border. Consequently, a tremendous amount of business comes from Manitoba into Saskatchewan, especially with regard to automobiles. In the town of Moosomin there are two very good automobile dealers, and these Manitoba people would bring their trade to Saskatchewan if it were not for this education tax on automobiles. I see no reason why these people in Manitoba should have to pay this tax. I know what hurts and what is driving business out of this province. Apparently you people don't, but I do. I know that we are losing a tremendous amount of business because of this regressive feature in the Act, and I say that these people should be allowed and encouraged to come in here to spend their money, and not be driven away over a measly two percent tax.

These are just little things I have been wanting to straighten out. I only have a couple more. There was some reference made here to the grant given for the construction of hospitals. I wonder why, when the wing was built on the hospital in the town of Moosomin, they didn't get a grant from the provincial government. I don't know about it. I know they sent a delegation up here, but we didn't get a grant. Therefore when one of the hon. members on the other side of the House is speaking, I hope he will answer this question.

Another remark was made describing the bus service as "the best bus service ever". Well, you know, we have a good bus service in the summer time down there; we have Greyhounds — good service. But the unfortunate part is that as soon as it snows or the roads are blocked we have no bus.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to go on with the main body of my address. Despite the fact that the opposition customarily "views with alarm", there are several things in this government's policy which are deserving of commendation. We are all encouraged by the reports that mineral and petroleum production are increasing, although many of us feel that government policy in the past has restricted and retarded this development. We are also glad that the government has at last seen fit to consider rural electrification, because there is an old saying that goes "it is better late than never", or "a balky mule does deserve some credit if he decides to move".

The government is also to be congratulated on its decision to go on with the trans-Canada highway. Those of us who do not happen to be Cabinet Ministers or anything were considering erecting a few signs at the corners of our seats, and these signs would have read as follows: "Abandon hope all ye who drive past this sign"; but probably now that it is decided to go on with this highway with federal aid, these signs won't be necessary.

While I am on the subject of highways, I should like to express my own personal regret that this government has not seen fit to place the construction of highways under an independent highways commission headed by a competent engineer, so that politics would not play the part in the construction of roads that they have in the past.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — We have never had any highways except in the last four years.

Mr. McDonald: — That must have been the hon. Minister of Highways. I am just going to tell the hon. Minister something about highways. This hon. gentleman over here has spent very little money in Moosomin. We all know that, and I am going to tell him that of every dollar he spent there a large percentage of it has been wasted. I can prove it, and that is just what I am going to do.

There has been very little money spent in the Moosomin constituency, as I said before, either before he took office or since, because the member who represented Moosomin prior to this government taking office was the Minister of Highways, and I said he was a very honest man and he did not give Moosomin any more than any other constituency — not like Rosetown and Weyburn. The money that was spent in Moosomin was wasted to a large extent. Gravel was put on roads that were completely worn out and within one year after it was put there, you would never know it had been touched. What the snowplows did not put in the ditch had sunken into this old worn-out grade until there is nothing left.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — There's no snowplows there now.

Mr. McDonald: — There's no snowplows there now. No, not in certain portions of it, and there won't be for the rest of the winter, I guess, by the looks of it. We haven't had one now for three years, so I guess maybe it won't be out this year. Incidentally, that lost you a lot of votes too.

I am just trying to make a few constructive suggestions. I do not want to tear the government apart. That is no laughing matter at all. I told you at the outset that I wanted to be fair,

and I am going to try and be fair; but there are a few things that I cannot agree with and I must express my opinion very strongly. There are a few things that I agree with you on, and I will give credit where credit is due. But in this matter of highway construction, an interesting highway project is currently going on now in the state of New Jersey, whereby University scientists there are investigating reaction of different types of soil, that is, the soil that the road bed itself is built out of, the reaction it has to hard-surfacing. I do not know if this government or the Minister has looked into this investigation in New Jersey, but I am quite satisfied if you have done that I am very pleased to know it, and I want to congratulate you for being that farsighted. Anyway, I suggest that you contact these people again and we might get some valuable information and save money by experimenting ourselves in this province. It might work all the better, but I do not want you to take offence at me for just suggesting it.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Is he asking the department here to get in touch with the state of New Jersey for information regarding soil conditions?

Mr. McDonald: — Why not?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Well, the conditions in the state of New Jersey are entirely different to what we have in this country, and the co-operation that we have is with the states to the south whose soil conditions and climatic conditions are very similar to those here.

Mr. McDonald: — That is quite all right, but this is a big province you know. There are a lot of different soils here.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — We do know that.

Mr. McDonald: — Now, to carry on, Mr. Speaker, after the interruptions from the Minister of Highways.

I had also hoped that there would be some indication in this government's policy as laid down by the hon. Premier that the government was going to do something about permitting any further increase in taxation on the land for educational purposes. To date much of the increased expenditures on education have fallen directly on the land owners. Last year, I understand, the Minister of Education (Hon. W.S. Lloyd) said it would be impossible to increase the government's share of local school costs to an average of 50 percent for the entire province. Then I read in the newspaper that members of the Saskatchewan Cabinet, while they were campaigning in the Alberta provincial election, campaigned for this 50 percent cost of education. Possibly the

results of the election in Alberta have changed their minds since then. I don't know. I would like to assure the Minister of Education that any efforts he makes in trying to wrestle more money from the Provincial Treasurer for education, that is for the provincial government to bear a bigger responsibility of the educational costs in this province, will certainly have my active support.

I also note that legislation will be brought down to enable collective bargaining between the trustees and the teachers. To my way of thinking, Mr. Speaker, a special committee of the Legislative Assembly should be set up to investigate the demands of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation for a wage scale which would cover the province. As the Minister of Education well knows, considerable differences now exist from one Unit to another. This is not a particularly healthy situation, and will not help us to solve our educational problems. I am sure that members of the government will support me in my proposal for a special committee in this regard.

One appointment that I should like to commend the government on is their appointment of a lawyer to head the Labour Relations Board. Generally speaking, the legal profession is trained to look at every question impartially, and to ensure that British standards of fair play are upheld, even in the less formal hearings of administrative boards. While it is true that Mr. Makaroff has been a C.C.F. candidate, I am sure that a barrister of his standing will do much to remove some of the past criticisms made against the Board.

In speaking briefly on the question of labour, I would like to make the point that some criticism still is levelled at the Workmen's Compensation Board for slow payment of claims, for cumbersome procedure and poor relations with the medical profession. Perhaps later on the Minister of Labour will indicate to the House what change, if any, he intends to make. I want to admit that this criticism I have heard levelled has been more or less of a general nature; but there is and has been considerable dissatisfaction.

Labour complaints about The Apprenticeship Act, which have appeared recently in the city of Regina, should also be looked into. Indeed it is a surprise to me that labour has not been more prominently mentioned in this government's pronouncements of policies. The strike of the government employees at the provincial Government Insurance Office and the coal fields strike have indicated that government conciliation machinery leaves much to be desired. Both of these strikes dragged on much too long. With these two examples, which were so close to home, it is a wonder to me that the government has at least not been some concerned over these two strikes. As a farmer, I am no authority on labour, but I do realize that it is a favourite practice

of the C.C.F. speakers to denounce those opposed to them as anti-labour. I saw very little that was pro-labour in the attitude of the government during the strike at the Government Insurance Office.

To move on, however, with some other omissions from this government's policy which are distressing to say the least, I should like to point out that once again the single transferable ballot has been omitted from this government's policy. The Premier of our province, while he was campaigning in the Alberta election, told the people of that province that he was in favour of the single transferable ballot, and I am informed that the C.C.F. party while in convention are in favour of this form of balloting.

Premier Douglas: — It's the other way round.

Mr. McDonald: — It was on August 17, 1948, while the Premier of this province was speaking to a Bow Island audience in Alberta that he said, and I quote:

I believe in the transferable ballot. I think it is the most democratic form of voting there is.

Mr. Loftson: — Now he doesn't like it.

Mr. McDonald: — Well now, if that is what the hon. Premier believes, I say why doesn't he bring it into effect in this province that he is the Premier of? This form of voting, undoubtedly, is absolutely the fairest form of voting yet devised, and I call on the Socialist party, which the hon. Premier represents as their leader, to bring in this system of voting. I believe he has said on some occasions that he doesn't think the people of Saskatchewan are smart enough to put down 1, 2, 3, instead of an X. Now if that is the attitude, there will be, undoubtedly, by-elections probably before another provincial election in this province, and I suggest to him that he bring in this type of voting and try it in a by-election, and I am sure that if it were tried there it would be found successful, and at the next provincial election we might have it over the entire province.

However, Mr. Speaker, as a farmer, what interests me most is security for the farm people. I have farmed all my life with the exception of a short period during the war. Today the original homesteaders in the country are just getting a little old. Many of these people — not only homesteaders but original people who came over and bought their land — are wanting to retire. I know that there are a few of those gentlemen right in this Legislative Assembly, on both sides of the House. They would like to retire; they want to retire; but the drawback is

that the young man who should be buying that farm in many cases has not got the cash to put down in cold money to pay for it. Under the existing legislation in this province, if a man sells a farm to a young lad with a down payment — probably all the farmer has to retire on and to live the rest of his life on are his meagre earnings in what he gets from the sale of that farm; under the existing legislation in this province, if the young fellow goes ‘bad’ on him and does not want to pay his debt, how can that farmer collect his money?

Premier Douglas: — Take the land back.

Mr. McDonald: — No, he cannot take the land back, not under the system today.

Premier Douglas: — Explain that, will you?

Mr. McDonald: — I hope you will explain it. You are the man who is running the thing. I am asking questions; I want to know.

Premier Douglas: — If you are asking me a question, I’ll answer it. The explanation is that under an agreement of sale you can take the land back. He doesn’t own the land.

Mr. McDonald: — Many people, hon. Premier, who are confirmed supporters of yours, have come to me and told me that they think the world of you, but they think in this one instance that you are wrong.

Premier Douglas: — What kind of people are they?

Mr. McDonald: — You have some good people in your party; we will give you credit for that. In certain commitments, however, the situation that arises to a young fellow not having all cash to buy the land, I understand, is being taken care of by the Credit Unions which are being backed by this government. I think the Credit Unions need more encouragement. They are a fine organization, and I want to extend my congratulations to the government for helping these sort of things along, giving them a start. It may have been organized by the Liberals, but we must admit that this government has helped them, and I said I want to be fair.

To conclude, I want to say I intend to support the amendment for the following reasons, and I am going to read them, Mr. Speaker: firstly, the government fails to place highway construction under an independent highway commission; secondly, the government fails to lift the crushing burden of education taxation from the land; thirdly, the government has failed to

investigate the possibility of a province-wide wage scale for teachers; fourthly, the government has failed to do anything about the credit needs of young farmers.

These grounds seem more than adequate why I should support this amendment.

Mr. B.L. Korchinski (Redberry): — I was overjoyed to be in this House last Thursday and to be present at the opening of this Legislature. I was pleased to see you, Mr. Speaker, elevated to that high position as His Majesty's representative to preside over this Legislature, and to impartially judge and render decisions, and protect those who have something to say in here. I was very much pleased because I know of your fairness. Perhaps it is not known that I come from the same district Your Honour represents. I was born in that district — quite a while ago — and I know there are many good people there, and I know I will be given a fair hearing.

I have the honour to represent the constituency of Redberry. This district is located, as most of the members know, northwest of Saskatoon. It is on the line between Prince Albert and North Battleford. I have the great honour to represent this district, and let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that that district of Redberry has suffered, in the past four or five years, tremendous misfortunes. It happens that this district has not had a crop for the last four or five years. It has been visited by grasshoppers and by black flies, and it has had the misfortune, during the past four years, to have had a representative from the C.C.F. ranks. I class this as one of the misfortunes because I was told this by the people I went around to visit. They said that since the C.C.F. was elected, there was nothing but grasshoppers, black flies, no rain, heat and drought. I sympathize with those people. I feel sorry for them, for there are many good people in there, cultured people, who try their best and are not looking to the government for any handout. They have tried to do their share. People in high positions, — doctors, professors in the university not only in this province but in other neighbouring provinces and states — have come from that district. The people are very good, and I sympathize with them.

I rise to speak to the amendment to the address-in-reply to the speech from the throne. The motion for the address was moved by the hon. member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak), and I suppose it concerns all the matters before the House. I would like to congratulate the hon. member on his wonderful speech and, as was mentioned before, his very good job of a bad case; but I regret he described his district as a "God-forsaken country".

Mr. Kuziak: — Under Liberalism.

Mr. Korchinski: — I have been privileged to live in that district for six years of my humble life, and I know that district thoroughly. I would say, outside of fringes such as Hazel Dell and a small district around Devil's Lake, that this is one of the best districts in this province. They have good soil, and in the years I was there they had tremendous crops, and I was very sorry to hear my dear friend describe the district of Canora as "God-forsaken". Of course, it may have been a "God-forsaken" land, and the people may have been "God-forsaken" spiritually because he boasted this was the birthplace of the C.C.F. I realize there are many good people there, and if it wasn't for the Social Credit — the people are coming back to their senses — I suppose the result would not have been what it is now.

Mr. Kuziak: — You would have lost your deposit.

Mr. Korchinski: — As I said, Mr. Speaker, I believe that certain sections of that population have been spiritually "God-forsaken". May God look after them and bring them back to their senses.

The hon. member for Canora was boasting that this was the birthplace of the C.C.F. Well, I would not be surprised if someday it were not the burial place. He was saying something about delegations from the municipality coming down to the former Liberal administration, and coming back with \$200. Mr. Speaker, that was pretty good, because I know of delegation after delegation from my own district coming down, much more than they used to under the Liberal administration — four last summer — to this government and coming back with nothing. Now that is true. They came down here, up to the number of 200, and they didn't even get a good hearing. So my hon. friend for Canora should not be overexcited about delegations because they were successful to some extent; they spent \$90 and got \$200. They got \$110 back, which they could do something with.

I also regret to have to criticize the hon. member for Canora for insinuating, and criticizing in an indirect way, our medical profession, the doctors. It has been the practice, as I have noticed, of members in His Majesty's Government to criticize various occupations in this province of ours. They have singled out the medical profession and the law profession and the monopolistic capitalists. They single out these various groups and criticize them. When any party begins doing that, that party ceases to be a provincial or a national party. It is merely a provincial party. It becomes a party of some special interest, of some special group. It becomes the representative of certain groups, groups like the government here which cannot speak for all the people of this province. Among the medical men we have

some of our best citizens of the province. I have in mind the doctor who serves our hospital at Hafford, the sacrifices he has to suffer to serve the district, the lack of roads, the lack of facilities, and yet he goes out, miles and miles, with a team to help the people in need. I take very strong exception to this attitude of the C.C.F. party. Perhaps not all of them are guilty of it, because I see some very sensible men amongst them. Some of them don't know what you are talking about, but some are taking it to heart. I appeal to this party that in their caucuses, they should try to cut out this policy of attacking certain groups, because I know all these groups in the province have a right to live, and they would like to make a living as well as anybody else. They would like to be left alone so that they could develop their own life to the best of their ability.

There was quite a bit mentioned about socialism by all the speakers on the other side, and I am beginning to think that they began to say they are socialists because for a long time it has been difficult to decide if the government of Saskatchewan was a socialist government. The term has been used so loosely and so subtly that it was difficult to know, exactly, the score upon this issue. All the speakers from the government side have criticized capitalism and, in one way or another, mentioned they were socialists, and that they were going to institute in Saskatchewan a Co-operative Commonwealth Federation government. As far as socialism is concerned, I will have something to say later on because I think it also has something to do with the amendment to the motion.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take very strong exception to the way the Premier of His Majesty's Government makes his speeches, and the way he makes remarks about the members on this side, more especially the Leader of the Opposition. It has been the practice, for long, long centuries, that His Majesty's Loyal Opposition has a rightful place in parliamentary government in the British Commonwealth. It is an honoured place, and I believe the Leader of the Opposition also holds an honoured position, and that he should be treated as a respectable citizen by the Premier of this province. Yesterday I was shocked, ashamed and astonished at the insinuations made about the person of the Leader of the Opposition, as to the size of his family, hints thrown here and there as to the size of his shadow. I don't think it was funny at all. Referring to the Leader of the Opposition as the biggest "cry baby" in Ottawa wasn't funny either because by its own actions, since I have been watching this movement — I was interested in it as many gentlemen on the other side when the thing appears; I studied it and read all about it — I have come to the conclusion that the whole party is a "cry baby" party. That is all they have been doing since the day they were organized. You cannot deny the fact because in the speeches that have been presented so far we heard so much complaint against the federal government. We have resolutions against the

federal government; we have the capitalists to blame; we have the United States to blame for keeping a few soldiers in the province; we have all kinds of complaints. I think the hon. Premier must have been thinking of his own party, and had his wires crossed. Instead of calling the Leader of the Opposition such names, he should have remembered the quotation from Shakespeare saying: "The fault is with us, dear Brutus, that we are underlings". That, I believe, applies to that group which enjoys name-calling.

I have been interested in the way the Premier carries on because, I assure you, Mr. Speaker, the people, at least in the district I come from, are beginning to think they should take his speeches, not with a few grains of salt, but with bags of salt. I had the privilege once of listening to his speech over the air, from North Battleford. Perhaps it has nothing to do with the whole thing, but to illustrate the point, in a very short speech there were 35 jokes and insinuations. Now, if we are going to have a Premier who thinks of nothing but jokes, nothing but fun, in this government, then I regret to say our people are rather disappointed at the way the Premier of this province carries on.

Mr. M.J. Willis (Elrose): — They sure like him though.

Mr. Korchinski: — Saying that the Leader of the Opposition has his hospitalization at very cheap cost per person and by his insinuation, according to my humble understanding, discouraging the size of families in Saskatchewan, such a thing as that is either sheer meanness or jealousy. Criticizing the size of a person or his looks is not a dignified thing to do in this House.

Quite a bit was said in criticism of members of this side because they received Conservative support. I was not one of those because in our district we had a Conservative candidate running. I fail to see what is wrong in a Conservative voting for a Liberal. In my constituency, not only Conservatives supported me, but even the C.C.F. I can illustrate this. It is not a joke. In 1944 the C.C.F. were elected by two-to-one in that seat. I got elected in 1948 with a small majority. Some of the C.C.F. must have voted for me because, otherwise, I could not have been elected.

I was interested to watch the members on the other side when my hon. friend for Melville (Mr. Deshaye) was speaking, as he was really getting them convinced. I believe they were getting convinced because he did not get up and say anything trying to provoke them into a fight by trying to convince them, because that is what we are in here for. We are His Majesty's Loyal Opposition, and the government seems to be holding back. They fired their big gun yesterday, and the shot did not go very far. They will have to do much better than that to get elected again.

I would like now to go into the history of the C.C.F. — which might seem strange — because that is connected with the way they brought in the speech from the throne. It is really regrettable that they should put such words into His Majesty's representative's mouth. I think that the whole thing is connected, but I may be wrong because I am new here and I admit I do not know all the regulations; but I trust, Mr. Speaker, you are going to help me out and instruct me, and if I am off the course you will put me right.

I would like to discuss the history of the C.C.F. movement in Canada, and in Saskatchewan in particular. As far as I remember, and I followed it very closely because I was interested in the movement myself, this movement appeared in what was known as the hungry thirties. As far as I have now concluded, originally it consisted of disgruntled Tories, Liberals and what were once called Progressives. This is my own opinion and I may be wrong, but that is who the originators of this movement here. They began, strangely enough, to use the tactics employed by communists in Europe. I know they are denying that they are communists. They claim they have nothing to do with the communists, that they are the strongest bulwark against communists, and that they are the only ones who can defeat the communists. I know they say such things now; but originally, when this movement was started in the hungry thirties, it had a sort of resemblance to the communist movement in Europe.

Mr. Speaker: — I must ask the hon. member to stay a little closer to the amendment.

Mr. Korchinski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought this would have something to do with education. Despite the growing international menace of communism we are continuing to use a text-book in our schools "The World of Today", which extols communism.

To understand why we are against the government, you must understand where it originated. It may be a long and tedious story so I will try to make it as short as possible.

I remember that the gentlemen who originated the C.C.F. used to appeal not to the human mind, but to his stomach. They used to go around the districts — they had a lot of time because they were not doing very much — and they would say: "Look at the wealth in this country, the forests, the lakes and the land. We are in the land of plenty, and we are poor, hungry people.

Mr. J. Wellbelove (Kerrobert-Kindersley): — Would the speaker just mind saying which of these twelve points of the amendment he is dealing with? We have no desire to interrupt him as long as he keeps fairly reasonable, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. G.H. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. Yesterday afternoon the Premier took at least 30 minutes on that particular . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! A point of order has been raised. I do not see how you can rise on a point of privilege when a point of order is under discussion. If you are rising to speak on the point of order it is all right.

Mr. Culliton: — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order: I think what the hon. member for Arm River says is correct. The hon. Premier yesterday, in speaking on the amendment dealt with the question of communism and socialism. The hon. member who is speaking now has already related the matter with which he is dealing to that section of the amendment which deals with the growing fear and danger of communism. I think, Mr. Speaker, you will agree that you have allowed — and I think quite properly — a fair latitude in this debate, and I think that latitude should be continued, particularly in respect to new members. I submit, therefore, that the point of order raised by my hon. friend for Kindersley is not well taken.

Mr. Tucker: — Speaking further, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order: I do suggest that the hon. member for Kerrobert-Kindersley, who is an old member of this House, in getting up and suggesting to a new member that in speaking to this amendment he must relate his remarks to any particular part of the amendment, is hardly fair, because obviously when the hon. Premier yesterday was trying to say that Social Democracy was a great bulwark against communism, it would be a great deal harder to relate that to any specific item of this amendment than what the hon. member was saying just now.

Mr. Speaker: — Ruling on the point of order, I think the member is trying to tie up his speech with the amendment, but I would ask him to not go too far afield.

Mr. Korchinski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I again wish to congratulate you on your fairness, because I notice you have been dealing fairly with the other side, and I want to again repeat that same statement.

I would like to continue — this movement was appealing to hunger and poverty. I remember, for example, the former member for Canora going around a district electioneering, and he had very poor clothes, with holes in his overalls both back and front, although he owned very much land. We later found out he had one of the biggest farms in the district, yet he went around like that. People were crushed by the depression which, of

course, was not a creation of the Liberal government in Saskatchewan, but a result of the socialist movement in Europe choking off the trade of the world.

Mr. Speaker: — I would remind the hon. member that it is approaching six o'clock, and if he will arrive at some suitable point in this speech we can recess.

Mr. Korchinski: — We will call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, and I will continue after recess.

8 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Korchinski: — When the House recessed at 6 o'clock, I was explaining the history of the C.C.F. in this province, and I am going to continue on the same subject. The group was organized in the early thirties and began to appeal through our community for support. They were very shrewd in coining many "catch phrases", words that would appeal to the common man. They called themselves "The People's Party", because they saw this tactic had been very successful in Russia, where the Communists were the "People's Party". They also realized they should attack something, especially something very far away, and it would carry weight. They then began to attack capitalism. In many cases they did not explain to the people what they meant by the term, but just kept on stating that the suffering we were going through was on account of capitalism. Our system was outmoded, and it should be replaced by what they had to propose. The farmers, labourers and a great many of our people suffering from the depression began to adhere to this new propaganda, and many of them began to support this group. There were, of course, promises made, left and right, high-sounding promises, that if they were elected poverty would be abolished from the province. They were the "Common Man's Party", and were going to take away from the rich and give to the poor. They were proposing a planned economy, which was planned on the lines of a factory, run from a central office, for the benefit of all. They made their case very strong, and, as I said, people being oppressed by conditions of drought and depression elected these people to office.

No sooner had they got into office when they realized they were on the spot because they had made so many promises. They were shrewd enough to see they got in there by propaganda, because no one had had any experience with a C.C.F. government before. They realized this was one of the strongest instruments in their hands — propaganda. They knew they would not be able to

carry out the promise of giving everyone something for nothing, so they began to try to find a type of propaganda to keep themselves in office. Great minds and brains were brought from throughout Canada and abroad to act as advisory boards and to plan new approaches to the public of Saskatchewan. New words and phrases were coined and after they were in power for about 18 months they began to broadcast they had done more in 18 months than Liberals and all the others put together in the previous 34 years. This was heard all over Saskatchewan. It was, of course, copied from men like Goebbels, Hitler and those people in Germany. In the book "Mein Kampf", Hitler said that if you tell people a lie and repeat it often enough, the bigger the lie the sooner someone will accept it. So they kept on repeating that they had done more in 18 months than the others had done in 34 years. As the time went on they just changed it to two years, and so on.

This programme of radio and press propaganda began to use the Government Bureau of Publications as a means of propaganda. There was some reference made to this yesterday and I would like to go into this a little further. Significantly enough, this booklet "Progress Report from your Government" was published before the election, and it claims to be a report of the activities of the government. It says in the introduction that this is something unusual, not done anywhere else, but they believe it should be done, and that the government should give a report on its activities. I quote from the report:

It should, perhaps, be pointed out that the majority of items presented here might very well be expanded considerably to give a true picture of their importance.

That is to say, the report is not exactly true. It is something unusual. When I and other people of the province saw this report, we were stumped. We were always led to believe that the government was the servant of the people, and the people were the ones to render judgment upon its activities. This government is giving a report on its own activities, and, reading the booklet from beginning to end, you will find nothing but praise. There are no facts or figures given. There is nothing in this report that is critical of the government. Not a single thing. I know the school inspectors, for example, render a report on the school teacher. Would it not be wonderful if I could sit down and make a report upon myself to the School Board? I could say something like this: "My name is so and so; I am a good fellow; I teach school; there are so many children in the school and I am a darned good teacher. I think all your children will pass as they are making wonderful progress. We started hot lunches for our school; we purchased a basketball, radio, and hired five new teachers." Do you suppose the ratepayers will accept that as a true report, especially if they were watching me to see if

things were as reported? The people of Saskatchewan have been watching this administration very closely during the past four years, and there are many things should have been in this report that were omitted. I would suggest that, in the future, when public money is used for publishing praises of the government, there should be a little criticism here and there to disguise it a little. It looks too bad.

This is just one of those reports. There were very many other reports and claims published. Peculiarly enough, they were published not only for the people of Saskatchewan but for other parts of Canada. For a while I worked in the Fraser Valley in British Columbia, and I remember seeing pamphlets in the Fraser Valley. I remember our Ministers coming out there and praising the paradise they had organized in Saskatchewan. I remember quite well how the public monies of Saskatchewan were used to further propaganda throughout other parts of Canada. I think if the C.C.F. party wants to spread its ideas throughout Canada it should do it at its own expense, and not at the expense of all the people of Saskatchewan.

“Blame the capitalists for everything.” That is an accepted socialistic slogan. We have many capitalists in Saskatchewan but we have no big ones they talk about. I suppose almost all of us are capitalists. We have, perhaps, saved a little money, and we call it our capital. We invest our money in instruments of production, and call that capital. The farmers in this province are capitalists. Some of the members on the opposite side in the government are capitalists. What advantage is there in attacking themselves? The hon. Premier was saying something about the man on the flying trapeze being a paralytic compared to some people. I think this technique of blaming capitalists when you are one yourself beats everything.

In speaking to the amendment to the address-in-reply to the speech from the throne, I gave very careful attention to the speech. I examined it very carefully because it would be irrational if I got up to criticize the speech and there was nothing wrong with it; if it was all right, we should accept it. So I examined it very closely. It is composed in paragraphs, as every good composition should be. Strangely enough, when I came here I was inexperienced, and was always under the impression that the speech from the throne was supposed to forecast legislation — what is going to be done in the future. I judged this speech by what is going to be done in the future, and I find there are a certain number of paragraphs and each one has a topic.

The first paragraph: “Important steps have been taken” — that is not a forecast of what is going to happen. Second paragraph: “Mineral production in 1948 reached” — that is the past tense. “Exploration is”: that is going on now, so we should not talk about that as it is going on — that is the third paragraph. The fourth: “The Government have announced”. “Forestry

activity has been based.” Sixth paragraph: “You will also be asked.” Now that is the first sensible paragraph: “You will be asked about rural electrification”; that is a point in the speech that I consider forecasts legislation. Seven: “For the purpose of overcoming some of the natural hazards and uncertainties of agriculture, my government proposes irrigation.” That is something forecast. The next paragraph: “A new conservation and development branch will be established.” I notice they like branches and boards and delegated powers and that sort of thing. They are tired of running things themselves so they get someone else to do it. “Engineering assistance will be made available for individual water conservation and drainage work.” I think that should have had a place two paragraphs earlier, where they were talking about irrigation. They have this thing mixed up; it should be reversed.

I counted all the paragraphs beginning “has” and “will” and there are 15 paragraphs dealing with “has”, two with “is”; 17 paragraphs of back-slapping; 11 paragraphs “will”. Now, ten of those are trivial — small potatoes. There is only one I can say is fairly important, and that is about rural electrification; but it is so vague — they are going to “set up machinery”. There is nothing to say they are going to put in electrification; they are just going to “set up machinery”. So I think the speech from the throne is inadequate, poorly worded, and insufficient; and surprisingly short of what we would expect from a government that has promised so much.

I was wondering why we should be presented with a speech like that. I could think of some reasons: I heard that this government was losing power; that it has passed on its power to act to various boards, and so it seems — the speech proves it — the government does not intend to present any legislation. They intend either to rule this province by boards, which pass regulations of their own, or by Orders in Council, or by regulations in the “Saskatchewan Gazette”.

While I am speaking about the “Saskatchewan Gazette”, I may say there are so many regulations appearing every week it is very difficult to keep up with them. You have to devote all your time to nothing but following the regulations, and I don’t know what our poor people can do in this province, faced with so many regulations that change so often. I believe this government is completely out of contact with the common man; they work above the heads of the common people. I think there is ground for criticism; they intend to either rule by Order in Council or by boards, because the speech from the throne is inadequate — or they don’t know any better. It is one of those things; they cannot draw up a better speech.

Now, Mr. Speaker, agriculture is our basic industry. It is the most important industry in this province — I understand that 85 cents out of every dollar of our income comes from the farmers. In the past this government has done very little to help the farmers. In fact, they embarrass the farmers with heavy taxation on gasoline, cars, trucks. They took the money out of the farmer's pocket, and made the carrying on of his work much more difficult. This has placed great hardships, especially on the people of my constituency. There were no crops, and to pay all this burden: the hospitalization tax or the hospital tax, the heavy school tax . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — The income tax.

Mr. Korchinski: — They don't pay income tax there because they have not earned them . . . The gasoline tax, the truck and car tax; all those things made the work of our farmers very difficult, and it is no wonder the farmers were so dissatisfied, and no wonder they voted so strongly against the government. If it were not for the assistance they are getting from the federal government in the way of dried-out bonuses, in the way of family allowances, I do not think they could have paid the hospitalization tax. The hon. gentleman says they have done so much for this province, but the common man sees it in a different light. He sees this government with its hand in the pocket of the common man, pulling out the money that is coming from the federal government, and using it for its own purposes.

Last year there was a shortage of fodder in our district. Stock, cattle and poultry were starving, and we did not get any assistance. In the spring many animals died, our mixed farming was ruined, and all because of this government's policy towards agriculture. Today, what do we see: Grasshoppers are upon us; coyotes are killing off our poultry and sheep; black flies are hatching out in the river . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Not in this weather.

Mr. Korchinski: — My friend does not understand the biology of the whole thing. Any elementary biologist will tell you that the eggs of the black fly must be in the river, because where do they come from?

Another thing I would like to mention is about the bee keepers of my district. As soon as this government got in they, of course, appointed many inspectors. They had condemned the Liberals for having so many inspectors, but they appointed an inspector for everything in your life, and, of course, there was a bee inspector. There was quite a bee industry in some parts of our district, and the inspector came around and examined the bees and said the bees were sick and should be destroyed.

One gentleman there had quite a large apiary, and the inspector said the bees were diseased and should be destroyed. This man said: "I have been in this business for over 20 years, and whenever there was a disease among the bees I always destroyed them myself. I do not think these bees are diseased; there is nothing wrong with them at all." The inspector said: "No, they will have to be destroyed." The man said: "I will not let you destroy them." He said: "You will have to." The gentleman said then: "I want a sample of these bees to make sure there is something wrong with them." So he got the sample and he sent it down to have it tested. He sent it to the Dominion Entomologist at the university. Of course, he got a report that there was nothing wrong with the bees; but they were destroyed by the inspector, and never paid for. This case is still pending; it has not been settled yet, and I would ask whoever is in charge of it to have this case settled, because this man lost, I think it was 16 colonies of bees. There were many others in that district — this is just one case — and many other districts who lost their bees because of inexperienced inspectors throwing their authority around left and right, trying to show their superiors they were really "on the bit" and acting.

On the question of education, Mr. Speaker, many of the teachers of the province today feel they have been betrayed by the Minister of Education. The Minister of Education was a teacher himself once upon a time.

Mr. Willis: — And a good one too.

Mr. Korchinski: — He fought, together with us, for the improvement of the teachers' lot. Once he got into this group he forgot about the teachers — he was drawing a fairly good salary; but the teachers were, in those far-away schools, disorganized; they could not do anything; they had to be good examples to the community and set an example by their good behaviour. They could not go on strike; it is never done by the teachers. So the teachers today feel they have been betrayed by one of their fellow-teachers, and I regret to have to say that. Of course, they will say the salaries were raised, and the teachers' lot has been improved so much; but if you study sincerely the conditions existing in the country today — we were told by many speakers before — the teachers' lot is a very sad one.

Many changes have been made in the curriculum, and some more changes are proposed. I do not know who is in charge of that; but whoever is in charge of it seems to think we must have changes continually, whether they are for better or worse does not matter as long as they change. The parents and the students are wondering why they have to buy so many new books for supplemental and social studies, say in grade IX or X. Yet many have to go and use the old ones if they want to dig up any

facts. They have so many new books, perhaps written by socialists, expenses piled, without any improvement on the texts, or with very little improvement. There was some mention about the lack of proper text-books for presenting communism in its true light in our schools. Instead of “pussy-footing” around it, there should be a text to expose this movement. There should be a text in the social studies to present communism and socialism in its true light — not in flowery phrases, but in the true light as to what it is. From what I have heard up to now, especially from the government side, about socialism, I am convinced today they do not know what socialism is; that they have not given the whole movement study at all. As I have told you, I was interested in the movement myself and I gave it considerable study. This is not a new thing as they pretend to tell everybody. It is a very old movement, and you have to go very far back in history to get the true authority.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — To the beginning of Christianity.

Mr. Korchinski: — That is true — perhaps farther than that; but the true modern socialism originated in France after the French Revolution. What happened was: at the time of the Renaissance, when people began to fight for individual freedom — not collective freedom, but the individual freedom in which we believe — they began to make gains; and in Italy we had the Renaissance. It began to spread westward, and as it went farther west it began to assume a different form, so that when it came to Britain it began to mean the freedom of the individual from oppression of the overlords. In Great Britain, under the British form of government, this individual freedom flourished and developed to the highest degree, and from there it began to spread eastward into Europe, and the farthest it got was Germany. This was known as the western civilization, the spread of progress. In Germany we have the origin of socialism, copied from the French, under Bismarck and the Hohenzollern rulers. The gentlemen across laugh, but they don’t know the facts. I would refer them to their own library, the Legislative Library, to the text-books that deal with this. Well, I suppose they don’t keep books that present falsehoods; they are probably books like “The Road to Serfdom”, “Ordeal by Planning” by Professor Dukes. I believe those books are an authority on the subject, and, not only those, but you have many books in the library with index, quotations, and so on.

In Germany was the beginning of socialism. I heard quite a bit about socialism yesterday, and about Social Democracy, or democratic socialism, used by the hon. Premier. Now, there is no such thing as democratic socialism. It is just a catchword. Democracy and socialism cannot exist together; they are two opposites. They also talk about economic freedom under socialism: there is no such thing possible. Do you call it economic freedom

when you are regulated where you are going to spend your income, how you are going to spend it? I believe economic freedom means that if you have any money you are supposed to be able to spend it according to your own plan. Is it economic freedom that the government makes us pay every year \$30 out of our own pockets for hospitalization?

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — Do you have to pay income tax?

Mr. Korchinski: — I am \$30 shorter economically, I am \$30 out, and more money out on other things: insurance, education tax, and so on.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — You will be right out after a while.

Mr. Korchinski: — Now this is just the beginning. I believe if this theory was carried out any further it would enslave us completely. They say that is not so, that socialism began to develop in Germany. I would like to quote from “The Road to Serfdom”. The title itself tells you where socialism leads you, and it proves it leads you to serfdom. Here is one quotation:

Germany had a large socialist party in her parliament, and that until not very long ago. The doctrine of development of socialism was almost entirely carried on in Germany and Austria, so that even today Russian discussion largely carries on where the Germans left off. (This is something for our friends, the government.) Most English, American and Canadian socialists are still unaware that the majority of the problems they begin to discover were thoroughly discussed by German socialists long, long ago.

They are unaware of that; they are talking about socialism today as if it was something they had discovered. The originators of socialism, the French originator, said this about socialism: “Where freedom is concerned, those who did not obey his proposed planning board would be treated like cattle.” And Tugwell, the authority on socialism, because he was the originator, said: “Democracy expands the sphere of individual freedom; socialism restricts it. Democracy attaches all possible value to each man; socialism makes each man a mere agent or number. Democracy and socialism have nothing in common, but one word: equality; but notice the difference; while democracy seeks the equality of liberty, socialism seeks equality in restraint and servitude.” You don’t have to go any further. I think this man should know what he is talking about. There is your socialism, gentlemen. Further on he says: “There is talk about economic democracy. They say what is political democracy worth if you have economic democracy. There is no such thing. There is the

search for economic power which is mixed up with this idea of economic democracy. What the socialists are concerned with is not economic democracy for the common man, but economic power for themselves, the rulers who would have the power over all the people whom they governed.”

Mr. Speaker, I was very glad to hear that they went on record, speaker after speaker, telling us they were socialists. Now the people of Saskatchewan can see them in the true light. I would refer the people of Saskatchewan to books on both sides; those that praise socialism and those that expose it. Let the people of Saskatchewan get down to the fundamentals of this thing, because it is a serious movement, and we should be aware of what it is like. I know that the majority of the gentlemen of the government are sincere men; they were looking for improvement — I do not doubt that. This book states that such sincere men were found in other places, but they got just the opposite of what they were looking for. There was a socialist in Russia called Kerensky. What did he bring to Russia? Communism. There was a socialist in Hungary, Nagy, the Premier. Did you read what he said about how his government was stolen by the communists? How about Mikahlichuk of Poland? Was he not the socialist leader of the Peasant Party of Poland? How about Czechoslovakia? Wasn't young Masaryk the leader of the socialists? Their intentions were good. What happened? Do you mean to tell me that we are going to carry on until our hon. Premier will have to commit suicide, jump out of a window like Masaryk did?

Mr. Loftson: — That is what he will do.

Premier Douglas: — If I listen to this much longer, I will.

Mr. Korchinski: — I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that my humble speech has such an effect on the Premier. There is more than one way to skin the cat.

I would like to turn my attention for awhile to the natural resources of the province, because I believe this particular sphere of the activities of our government has been so mishandled that the people of the province are really fed up. I know the members for the north will have more to say about this because there has been more abuse in the north. I would like to deal with one small phase of it: in our district of Redberry there is a beautiful lake called Redberry Lake, and the constituency I am from is named for the lake. This lake, which covers about 27 square miles, has been barren of fish for many years. Scientists from the Department of Natural Resources under a Liberal government finally found some whitefish that would thrive in this lake. The water in this lake is very salty. There are many creeks running into the lake, but no water going out,

and the water evaporating leaves various minerals in the lake and the water is very salty, and it is very difficult to find fish that will survive in it. They finally found some fish that would survive in it and, of course, the people in the surrounding district became aware of the fact there were fish in the lake, and they were happy that some day they will be able to fish. This happened before the present government got in. When the present government got in, the lake was opened for fishing, and, in spite of the claim they are the "Common Man's Party", that they were for "Humanity First" and did not care for dollars, they began to take fish out of this lake in thousands and to ship them out. The regulations they introduced were so rigged that the common man around the lake was not able to get any fishing. The common people who had lived in the hope that some day they would enjoy the fish in the lake were not able to get any of that fish. If they were able to get the fish, it was very difficult to obtain because there were all kinds of regulations you had to know and you had to go through before you could get the fish. I think it is contrary, not only to sense but to the natural law, that such regulations should have been imposed. For example, last year they had what they called "domestic fishing" and "commercial fishing". If you have a domestic licence you pay \$5 and you can go down to the lake and fish for a day or two — I think it was two days — and whatever you got was yours. I don't think it was to exceed a certain poundage — 100 pounds. Many people bought a domestic licence. I know one man from Speers who was very excited because he was going to go out fishing, got himself a licence. He had to make two trips to Hafford to get the licence because when he went there the inspector was in a bad humour so he was not able to get the licence, and had to come back the next day, and through his friends he was able to influence the inspector to give him a licence. It was quite a distance had to go, 12 miles to go to Hafford twice. He got himself a licence, went down to the lake quite early to be there on time. He made a hole through the ice; he put a net in, and no sooner did he start fishing than he heard a great noise from the shore. There was the inspector with a snowmobile and he said: "Here, here, here, you can't fish here. Go further from the shore." And this man, as he did not know the score, moved further in. After he got settled down, the same thing happened again; it was not far enough yet. After he got through fishing and when he drew his nets out that night, there were two fish in the net. He does not know whether they were the Liberal fish or the C.C.F. fish. This is what it cost him to get those two fish, six pound for three days, the wagons cost \$2, the meals on the way cost him a few dollars, the net cost him \$6. He figured out the whole thing and he figured he paid \$6.75 per pound of fish. Now, this is the Common Man's Party that is supposed to work for the common man. He caught his own fish at \$6.75 a pound.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — He should have bought it from the Fish Board. It is cheaper than that.

Mr. Korchinski: — I am going to get down to the hon. Minister of Natural Resources. I am going to rake him over the coals for a while yet.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — Will that be today or tomorrow.

Mr. Korchinski: — This was not an isolated case. The majority of fishermen had the same experience.

This year the socialists had great plans for Redberry Lake. They shipped in two refrigeration cars; they gathered a big pile of ice; shipped in many crates . . .

Mr. Lopton: — Did they ship any sausages?

Mr. Korchinski: — By the way, before they announced they were going to permit fishing they formed a kind of committee which was supposed to supervise the fishing there. There were about five representatives of the government at a meeting up there, and the local people were chairman and secretaries; they were all important officials in this. But we found out they were just kidding the local people, because after the regulations were passed at that meeting there was supposed to be an eight-mile limit around the lake. That was agreed and passed at the meeting at Hafford, but when the regulations came back the limit was changed, and most of the regulations were changed.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question? What was the change in the eight-mile limit? Was it made larger or smaller? Greater limit or less?

Mr. Korchinski: — They tell me, after a very strong protest from some C.C.F. supporters from Oscar Lake, the limit extended to 20 miles to include them.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — May I ask one more question? Does the hon. member object to those people who happen to live over eight miles away from the lake fishing there?

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, I object to nothing. I merely want to state they were kidding the local people that they had some authority over Redberry Lake. I think the people of Hafford are reasonable

beings; they can think, and if they were taken into the confidence of the government and told they were supposed to set up a committee, I do not see why it was necessary to go over their heads. If they were given authority, why go over their heads and make the whole thing a very bitter situation.

By the way, before the fishing opened, there was a very great activity about the lake. The police and the inspectors began to watch, and they found some people taking fish from the lake out of season. They brought them before the court, and they were heavily fined. Do you know who was in this? Surprisingly enough, there were some members of this committee who were supposed to have been the right-hand men of the party; they were violating the regulations they set up themselves.

An article appeared in the Star-Phoenix criticizing the government on account of its high-handed methods of handling this lake. The hon. Minister of Natural Resources made a statement — the gentlemen on the government side are famous for giving statements to the Sifton Press. Strangely enough they criticize the press of our province, and Canada generally, for being unfair — how they are united to the capitalists to destroy the people's movement in this province, but I believe this criticism of the press is absolutely unfounded. I think they would like to have control of the press. I was looking over last night's Leader-Post and I found seven items of news about this government's activities, giving them all the publicity they could wish for. I found items upon items in the various periodicals and daily press of the province, giving the C.C.F. party all the publicity. To hear, on the floor of this Legislative Assembly, criticism directed against the press, I think is wrong.

There was this one small item criticizing the government, and there was a long statement the Minister made in reply to this criticism. He explained the history of the lake, how the fish were placed in there before 1940, and how it was found there was very little natural spawning and that, from the report of the Fish Commission, it was found it would be necessary to conserve the fish in the lake because there was very little natural spawning. He goes on to say:

It should be obvious, from the above fact, that the regulations put into effect by the department are based on scientific investigations by experts, and that they are designed to preserve a valuable natural resource for the people of that district, not to deprive them of any rights or privileges.

I don't think it is true that the regulations were imposed to preserve the fish for the people of that district, because scores upon scores of people tried to get fish just a month ago, and they were not able to get it; they were not able to buy it for money. They were able to pay for it and did

not want it free, but they could not get it. There were some fish shipped out, not for the people of that district; I do not know where they shipped it. I suppose it went to Chicago or New York to make a little profit. The people of the district are bitter about the whole situation because they were looking for fish. They went down to the plant on the highway where they were packing the fish, and wanted to buy some, but there was none to buy.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — They like fish there.

Mr. Tucker: — They are entitled to it.

Hon. L.F. McIntosh: — They found one.

Mr. Korchinski: — “Strict observance of the regulations is important from the standpoint of rural wealth” — and they sell the fish in Chicago. This is what I take objection to: “Unfortunately, until the last couple of years, the Redberry Lake district had quite a bad reputation for illegal fishing.” The gentleman who does not know the district or the people tells us the people had a bad reputation. On account of foolish regulations they have imposed on the people of this province, they are trying to make criminals out of the people of this province by regulations they don’t know — and sometimes don’t remember themselves. The regulations change so rapidly, as I mentioned before, the people of this province cannot follow them up. You would have to have a battery of lawyers to follow up all these regulations. Today they tell us the people of that district have a bad reputation. I take strong exception to that statement.

Mr. Tucker: — Who made it?

Mr. Korchinski: — It was made by the hon. Minister of Natural Resources.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — What is the date of it?

Mr. Korchinski: — This was in the Star-Phoenix. Ask your librarian to look it up for you. She searched the files for me yesterday. They are very efficient there. Ask them.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — The people pay for the search too.

Mr. Korchinski: — Have you forgotten your own statements?

Mr. Speaker, I don’t think the regulations were meant to preserve the natural resources of that lake for the people of that district. This is quite an established fact: one of the reasons the party was turned out in that area was the fishing industry in that particular lake.

People change their minds about various political moves and they are entitled to do so but I was really surprised to find that fish changed their minds about the planning of the Fish Board. You see, they planned to load two cars with fish from the lake, but the fish did not bite. All they got was 7,000 pounds. There were five officials around there; they imported a bulldozer to open up the road; they flew in and out, at our expense; they shipped in two refrigerator cars; they made boxes; they bought ice. For all that expense they could have taken all the fish and given it to the people in the district free of charge, and they would have been money ahead.

Mr. Tucker: — The fish wouldn't bite, eh?

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — You are a great authority on fish.

Mr. Tucker: — Not a sucker, anyway.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Lopton: — He made a sucker out of you that time.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, I really admire your patience, and I am sincere about it, because I see what a difficult position you hold.

I would like to deal for a moment with the Department of Public Health. I do not suppose there was so much bragging about any other department by the Premier as about Public Health, about the wonderful hospitalization plan they have in this province, and how it is copied all over; and the sad, tragic story we heard from the hon. member for Canora about the conditions before the wonderful 'plan' was introduced. In our district very many people cannot pay the hospitalization because for the past four years there was no crop in the district; and so now they say in the district we can go either to the hospital or to jail — two institutions. Because there are, as was mentioned, inspectors — I may say this is characteristic of any social state — police. They may call them inspectors, but they are actually police because they are performing functions of the police. They can go and investigate and arrest, and that is a characteristic of a police state. These inspectors are multiplying very rapidly. We have bee inspectors, dairy inspectors and so on. There are so many of them we can't keep track of them.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Income tax, radio, unemployment insurance.

Mr. Korchinski: — There are, today, Mr. Speaker, people who have been served warrants to appear in court for failure to pay the hospitalization tax. The hon. Premier stated they investigate a person's means, whether or not he can pay. What is the standard of measure of who can pay and who cannot? How can you measure that? I suppose, if it comes to the last ditch, a person could produce something. You could sell your bed; you could sell your last piece of bread; you still can pay.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — You cruel-hearted thing.

Mr. Korchinski: — I would ask, Mr. Speaker, to advise the government to be lenient with the people of my district, because they are up against it; they cannot pay because they have nothing to pay with. They get these little allowances coming in, but they need them.

Mr. Kuziak: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? How many of your people in the Redberry constituency went to jail because they did not pay the hospital tax?

Mr. Korchinski: — I have no record. I think the hon. member for Canora can get that from the Attorney General. I believe that is the proper place to get that information; or I imagine he could place that in a question before the House.

Hon. J.W. Corman: — The answer would be "No".

Mr. Korchinski: — I would like to mention a case in the Whitkow district. They say that they have such a wonderful service of hospitalization. Well, last winter, a year ago now, there was an accident there. People were sawing wood and something happened — one man got cut up with the saw. This place is thirty miles from North Battleford and the roads are very poor. There are not telephones. You cannot get the air ambulance because you cannot call them up. Whenever you want to get to the phone you have to travel a long way. This was an emergency case and the roads were blocked, and so the father of this young fellow had to take a team and rush him to North Battleford. This accident happened about seven o'clock in the evening, and it was twelve o'clock before he got to North Battleford. That young man was suffering as it was a serious accident and, of course, his father, not knowing anything of these regulations, rushed him to the hospital, but he was told at the hospital: "You cannot get in here. You have to have a certificate from the doctor." Before a person can be admitted as an in-patient — they have this "in" and "out" and all kinds of words they use, which is really confusing — you have to have your card and you have to have the doctor's permission. Well, all the

doctors, at that time, were asleep: it was midnight. The man was suffering but they would not let him in. The farmer said: "Just a minute, I am going to leave him right here, and I am going to go and get a doctor." "No," they said, "don't put him in here. Take him out." There was a blizzard outside at that time. They said: "Take him out. We cannot admit anybody without a doctor's permission." "Well," he said, "No, I'll leave him right herein the corridor of this hospital and I will go and get the doctor." So, the hospital being a little way from town, he went out looking for a doctor. He also wanted to find a place to put his team because his team was exhausted travelling all this distance. He could not find a barn — this was in the city. He found a Mountie on the street and he asked him about a place where he could leave his horse. The Mountie said: "I'll show you. It is quite hard to find the place because it is on the outskirts of the city. There is a farmer there and you can leave your horses up there. I'll go with you." So they started for the hospital. On the way to the hospital he met his son coming out of the hospital. He had walked away from the hospital, and had fallen. He was exhausted on account of loss of blood; he had walked away and fallen in the snow. This is what they call the wonderful hospitalization. Wonderful service. Just because of foolish regulations.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, there are no such regulations, and I hope my friend does not expect anyone to believe this. The Sisters who run the North Battleford hospital would not turn away any patient who was ill and needed hospitalization. There are no regulations to keep them out. I think my friend ought to have his story re-checked.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, there is the farmer and the Mountie to prove this statement.

Premier Douglas: — If the hon. member will give me the name of the person, I will be very glad to check with the Sisters. I am quite certain they would not keep any man out who needed to be in the hospital.

Mr. Korchinski: — I don't think that it is a safe thing to give names of the people and have them checked. I can produce the name.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — Look what you have done to the hospital; the people that run the hospital.

Mr. Tucker: — Look what your man did to the Canora hospital.

February 17, 1949

Mr. Korchinski: — It is not the hospital, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — Pretty bad spot you are in.

An Hon. Member: — I'll say you are.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, it is not the hospital.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member understands the statements he makes he accepts the responsibility for?

Mr. Korchinski: — Certainly, Mr. Speaker. The members of the government are trying to say I am doing damage to the hospital. They are trying now to cover themselves up with the good name of the hospital. Everybody knows the good name of that hospital. It is the regulations.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — That applause is too late.

Premier Douglas: — I have already stated there are no such regulations. Any emergency case may be placed in the hospital at the discretion of those who operate the hospital.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, it happened anyway.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, there is a hospital at Hafford, and there is a Health Region around North Battleford. I do not know how many hospitals are included in this region, but I believe there are sub-regions in this Region No. 13. The Hafford hospital has been trying to qualify for this particular sub-regional hospital because there are some things the people could use, certain services that they can look forward to. The Health Region, I believe, offers free inoculation, free pre-natal examination. To get this free service, the people of the Hafford district — and it serves a large district — have to go to North Battleford; they cannot obtain it in their own hospital. Look how free it is. It is 35 miles to North Battleford. It will cost you at least \$3.60 for transportation to go there. Suppose you are taking the children to be inoculated, which takes five different times to be completed. You have to take five trips up there, your meals and your children's meals . . .

Premier Douglas: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Is my hon. friend telling the House that everybody in the entire North Battleford region has to go to North Battleford, and that Public Health nurses do not go out and give the inoculations in the respective communities? The Region, of course, is run by the Regional Board but I would like to have that information since he lives in that region.

Mr. Korchinski: — I do not say everybody in the Region had to go to the North Battleford hospital. The hon. Premier was not listening to what I was saying.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Well, what are you talking about?

Mr. Korchinski: — I said: in the Hafford district the Hospital Board tells me they qualify; they have everything. It is a 30-bed hospital, and they answer the requirements, but they are not included in the Health Centre. Therefore, they have to go to North Battleford to have these services performed. It will cost you \$8.60 per trip — five trips, \$43. That is free inoculation — for \$43. I could give you a free car if you give me \$2,400. They talk about “free”. Free hospitalization for \$10; free inoculation for \$43; free pre-natal care for so many dollars. I just wish they would stop using the word “free” so much.

In conclusion, I would like to refer to one more matter. The hon. member for Canora criticized this country, how bad a country it was: the capitalists were upon us; they were exploiting us and the only way we can get out of this would be by establishing a socialist state in Canada. I think my friend should know better than to criticize this good country. His people and my people came from outside this country. They were immigrants. They fled from tyranny in central Europe, Austria, and Germany; socialism. When my family came to this country, before I was born, there was nobody in that district. They were pioneers, and came without any money; but they came with the hope that here, once and for all, they were going to be free; that, with God’s help, they would be able now to live a free life; that there would be no more overlords over them, forcing them to serf labour. They fled to this country, and they pioneered in this country, and they did their best, according to their knowledge. They maybe made mistakes. They were uneducated, but they tried their best. And, for the sake of those people of whom there are so many in this country, who brought us up, who fled once from dictatorship, we are trying to connive and help to establish the same kind of dictatorship in our free country here. Where are we going to go from here?

February 17, 1949

An Hon. Member: — I could soon tell you.

Mr. Korchinski: — The rest of the world, Mr. Speaker, is under this socialist, communist disease. The rest of the world is suffering and I hope we will be able, in time, to see the light and preserve this country for free individual freedom.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:45 o'clock p.m.