

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Eleventh Legislature
8th Day

Monday, February 21, 1949

The Assembly met at 3:00 o'clock p.m.

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

Mr. J. Wellbelove (Kerrobot-Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak in support of the humble address presented by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor. I think as I have a few minutes left of air time for a few moments I will dispense with the usual congratulations and deal with them at the conclusion of my short talk.

In 1944 to 1948 we heard a lot in this Legislature and out in the country that the C.C.F. party was returned on a protest vote. We heard that time and time again. Our good friend, the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) often used to remark without rising from his seat: "You wait until the election comes around and then sing." Well, we waited, Mr. Speaker, and we did not wait six years; we just waited four years. We were not afraid to go to the country at the end of the stipulated Legislature year end. In fact, we went before that. The protest vote that has been spoken of so much from the opposition side was consolidated into a very substantial corps of C.C.F. supporters. A majority vote throughout the province of Saskatchewan was increased by 25,000 over the vote that we held in 1944.

Then we hear a lot about the condition of farming; that we do not represent the farmers of this country. I think, when you consider that 52 percent of the sitting members of this party are farmers, that will compare very very favourably with the representation of farmers on the other side of the House. At one time we were government in this province, if my memory serves me right, with hardly a member of the Cabinet that was a farmer. I do not wish to discredit at all other vocational callings, but I do just wish to correct that statement in connection with the matter that we do not represent the farming community.

The seats of the Liberals asked for the consent of the support of the Conservative party from the leaders of the Conservative party. I do not think the rank and file were quite as happy about that. I have a clipping here from the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix of June 1, 1948. Mr. Hall says:

The Tories said the Liberals want to hog the whole thing in Saskatchewan. They want us to provide the votes but they will put in the members. The electors in this province will recall too vividly the 'do nothing' Liberal government which was thrown out of office in 1944.

I would like to draw attention to some statements that were made here sometime that we have lost the representation of the rural constituencies. If you take 34 of the predominant rural constituencies, the vote declined from 114,000 to 109,000; a loss of 4,000. For a party that was elected on a protest vote, that is a very small margin of loss, Mr. Speaker.

February 21, 1949

In the cities you hear a lot about this party having thrown into its ranks a substantial number of labour people. I am not ashamed to be associated with a party that has been able to draw to its ranks a substantial number of members and voting strength from labour's ranks. All the economic structure of this province is founded upon the farming population of this province and the labour people. Why should we be ashamed to work shoulder to shoulder with that class of people. Every time the Liberal party pokes the finger of scorn at us and says: "You have labour support", they speak with discredit on that vocational group who are deserving of a high sympathy and support. Then take this in connection with the cities. I would like to list what we had against us in the cities. First of all, we had the lawyers. If you doubt that you want to just hark back to the convention in Saskatoon and how the lawyers loved to get their teeth into that resolution which was sent up from Regina.

Mr. Korchinski: — Is the hon. member trying to promote class strife in this province?

Mr. Wellbelove: — I am rather surprised at a question like that coming from a member of a party that has fomented class strife. We are not endeavouring to foment class strife; we are endeavouring to heal a breach which you people have endeavoured to create in the representation of this province.

I would like to continue with regard to lawyers. Remember that resolution that came up from Regina — how the lawyers loved to get their teeth into that. I was rather surprised when the broadcasts came over where they specifically said: "The man that we are after is Dr. Shumiatcher." It is a good thing they came out in the open. The matter that was under discussion was an amendment which was passed to The King's Bench Court Act with regard to the addition of K.C. to the name of those who have earned it. I think Dr. Schumiacher's scholastic standing, his reputation as a lawyer, places him head and shoulders above the mill-run that breach made, who under the Liberal administration were allowed to attach the affix of K.C. to their name.

Then we have the Manufacturers' Association against us in the cities, as well as in the country. I do not think we need to dwell on that. The Insurance Agents' Association, they were very active. We have the officials of the Retail Merchants' Association; the officials of the Chamber of Commerce; the 'Liberal' press, and the old Gardiner machine was oiled up and brought into action again. We took out all comers in the three largest cities in the province of Saskatchewan and increased our vote by 26,000. If the Liberals can get any comfort out of those figures, Mr. Speaker, they are entitled to all the comfort they can get.

We hear quite a lot about communism infiltrating into the C.C.F. party. I would like to read the opinion of a capitalistic press that receives very wide distribution and is of considerable standing in this province. The heading is "C.C.F. Winning by Default". And then it goes on:

Old line politicians are talking too much and doing too little about the recent victories of the C.C.F.

That was just after the three by-elections. To listen to some of them, you would think the election returns the past two months were a personal triumph for 'Uncle Joe' Stalin. This is not only rubbish, it is the blindest kind of buck passing. The chief credit, the C.C.F. hat trick, goes not to 'Uncle Joe', not even to the C.C.F., but to the old line politicians themselves. Saskatchewan wheat farmers, B.C. fruit farmers, and Ontario factory workers are neither communists nor socialists. They are ordinary democrats who are fed up with the slope, the empty talk, the general inanity of the old party. In three federal by-elections and in Ontario, they voted against the government, past and present. In Saskatchewan they voted for a government whose chief accomplishment has been to improvise measures which Liberals and Conservatives have been promising for years. Hospital insurance is one example. The fact remains that Saskatchewan is the only province that has a hospital plan in operation. Every party in Canada, so far as we know, is on record in favour of it. The federal Liberals campaigned on the platform in 1945 with the health insurance as only one plank. Ever since then they have been introducing one excuse after another. The Dominion-Provincial Conference broke down. The doctors could not agree on a federal Act. There are not enough hospitals, beds, etc., etc. But if the C.C.F. is allowed to go on growing, sooner or later it will take power in Ottawa. If we want to avoid this — and the majority of Canadians still do — we will have to make the old parties pull up their socks. Let them do so. Some of the things which they paid lip-service for in the election campaign, won one election campaign after another. Let them bring in reforms that Canadians evidently want, and let them do it better and make a better job than the socialists. Both the old parties say they are not opposed to reform — what's holding them back.

I have here an editorial which appeared in McLean's Magazine of August 1, 1948 in connection with Liberal promises. We had heard a lot of the Liberal promises. I notice the Provincial Treasurer, in closing the budget speech last year, tabulated the promises made by the then Leader of the Opposition and the present Leader of the Opposition, and they totalled \$11,340,000 reduction in the provincial revenue — this was a combined reduction in royalty rights and abolition for reduction of the taxes.

I have a clipping here from the Western Producer, December 4, 1947, where the present Leader of the Opposition states about the reduction in taxes and the increases of grants to school districts and municipalities. The amount here totals up for the municipalities and the schools of \$3.6 million. That is, we were going to add a reduction in taxes and an increase in services. I think the people in Saskatchewan in June, 1944 gave a very good reply to that. But we had to wait a year before we got a reply from any Liberal of authority.

Speaker at Strasbourg Liberal convention, December 4, 1948, Finance Minister Doug Abbott says — he was referring to the Progressive platform:

Their platform is dishonest and irresponsible. They promise reduction of taxes and increase of services. It cannot be done. That is why I say their platform is thoroughly dishonest and thoroughly irresponsible.

It is very refreshing to have the appraisal of a federal Cabinet Minister of the promises of his Liberal compatriots here in the province of Saskatchewan.

February 21, 1949

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure my hon. friend would not want to have it go just as he said it. The Hon. Mr. Abbott obviously was referring to federal matters, not provincial matters.

Mr. Wellbelove: — The hon. Minister, as I stated, at the Liberal nominating convention was referring to the Conservative platform. He says the Conservative platform was thoroughly dishonest and thoroughly irresponsible because they have at one and the same time promised a reduction of taxes and an increase of services.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Just like the Liberals in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Wellbelove: — That is the inference. I will leave the hon. Leader of the Opposition to worry his way through that one.

Mr. Tucker: — With expansion in the north we would have got extra revenue — the way Alberta is.

Mr. Wellbelove: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition gave us a rehash of his election speeches. I do not know whether he wants to make another address now; he could have improved on that address if he would have given a little more time in the preparation of it. If he will just have the good manners to be quiet while other people are speaking, he possibly might set a better example to his followers on that side of the House in the future than he has been able to do so far.

I want to deal now in connection with the Saskatchewan Power Commission. I have read this extract before, but seeing that rural electrification is a matter which is taken up so much by our Liberal friends, I think it is worthwhile reading it again. This is the profession of faith of the Liberal party in regard to rural electrification. The hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) should get a copy of this book. It shows just what the Liberals thought of the Conservative party in 1929; it makes some very delightful reading. This is your Liberal profession of faith in 1929:

The alertness, vigour and progressiveness which characterized the Gardiner government is well illustrated in their tampering with the power question. Contrasted with the power situation in other western provinces, Saskatchewan's lot is a particularly happy one. The control of power in Alberta is already definitely in the hands of private companies. Quite a few public men were disturbed at the prospect. In Manitoba, where the provincial government has a limited hydro system, private interests are strongly impressed and the government system is operated at a loss. In Saskatchewan, on the other hand, the way is open to the creation of a great provincial system patterned after that of Ontario which has proved such an outstanding success.

That was the Liberal's declaration of faith as far as rural electrification is concerned. If there was any opportunity at all of carrying out that system of rural electrification, then it was necessary that private interests be kept out of the province of Saskatchewan so that a grid of high voltage lines could be set up to service the province of Saskatchewan. But what do we find: when this government came into power they first of all had to buy out Dominion Electric, Prairie Light and Power, and Canadian Utilities, before there was any opportunity at all to set up anything approaching a fair grid of high voltage lines to service the province of Saskatchewan.

Then our friends talk about what the Saskatchewan Power Commission did under the Liberal administration. If you take Votes and Proceedings of March 20, 1947, you will find there that from the year 1929 to 1944, there was an accumulated deficit of \$231,417 in operating the Power Commission under the Conservative and Liberal administration of this province.

Now, to come back to my own constituency and the extension of power in that constituency. Away up in the Wilkie constituency at Unity, there is installed a transferable diesel gas can rating unit. High voltage lines run down through from Unity and connect up with Macklin in the Wilkie constituency, and with Luseland in my own constituency, eliminating the necessity of buying power from the Alberta company. It links up then with Kerrobert, Scott, Kindersley, Broadacres and all down to that line. It links up about 14 urban centres with that one power line. The prospects are there that we are going to have quite a splendid system of rural electrification in the near future. I have checked up to see how many farms have been connected with that line, but I am disappointed because there are only 30 farms that have been connected this last year with that one new branch line of the Power Commission. As I read the Premier's remarks, where he was comparing the Power Commission with what had been done in previous years, one need not be disappointed. I noticed all the farms they connected in four years amounted to 23, compared with the 1812 which were connected up during the first four years by the Power Commission, under this present government. If there is any party that should say less about rural electrification, it is the Liberal party combined with the Conservative party. They have on record their profession of faith as to what should constitute rural electrification; that private enterprise should be kept out before there was any possibility of giving a real service; they forecasted that it should be set up on a basis similar to the hydro-electric in Ontario. What did they find? They found the private companies came in, and before this government could do anything at all with regards to setting up a high voltage grid, we had to buy out three of the companies before any attempt could be made along that particular line. I think if anybody should be quiet with regard to rural electrification, it certainly should be the members of the opposition.

Now, in connection with highways, that generally raises some comment from the other side. I was interested in meeting a commercial traveller in a hotel during an election campaign. He said: "I am not a C.C.F. My family are Liberals. I have never voted C.C.F. before, but I am going to vote C.C.F. That is on one basis, which is that this government is endeavouring to do something insofar as highways are concerned." From those impartial people, you get an unbiased opinion. I will give my hon. friend another one. It was my

luck to sit in with the committee of the United Church that was discussing the re-allocation of Presbytery boundaries. There was no shade of politics in it at all, and I was very much interested in hearing the Chairman say: "When our Presbytery boundaries were first allocated, their set-up had to be governed to a great extent by the railway communication. Now that we are getting a system of highways instituted I think we need to pay less attention to that and we can set up the boundaries of our Presbyteries in such a way that their contracting can be better services." I thought to myself that is not a bad contribution from an unbiased source; that, wicket misers that we are, we are giving some service as far as government construction of highways is concerned.

Sometimes we are apt to forget that in the province of Saskatchewan we have less than eight percent of the population and we have about 38 percent of the marked roads in the Dominion of Canada. When this government took over we had about 4,872 miles of gravelled highway — much of it entirely worn out, there was no gravel; 638 miles not gravelled to highway standard, and 138 miles a bit new on the surface. I went down to the Highways Department the other day and got the five-year construction. It might interest our friends across the aisle who say we have done nothing as far as highways are concerned to realize that construction and re-construction from 1944 to 1948 inclusive totals 2,100 miles; gravelling and re-gravelling — I mean 1944 to 1948 inclusive — 2,857 miles. That does not include the work done by the maintenance crews under the resident engineers. The cumulative surface and re-laying in that period, 1944 to 1948, was 414 miles.

I want again to deal with the roads in my own constituency and the adjoining ones of Wilkie and Elrose. When this government took office, highway No. 31, running from Macklin to the No. 4 highway, had a piece gravelled in the centre; from No. 4 highway to a point south of Kerrobert; dirt highways west of Luseland going up by Salvador to Macklin. Most of that land was not constructed and the other was not gravelled. Today, Mr. Speaker, you can drive from Macklin, No. 31 highway connected with No. 4 highway — 178 miles of gravelled highway — whereas when this government took office there was just a portion south of Kerrobert and just north of Luseland with gravel.

In May, 1944, the Premier addressed a meeting in Kerrobert. After the meeting was over, about 11 o'clock at night, we were getting ready to make a trip by car and it had been raining very heavily. My hon. friend, the Liberal candidate in that constituency, came into the hotel and he said: "Where are you heading for, John?" I said: "Mr. Douglas has a meeting at Laporte tomorrow afternoon. We want to get down to Kindersley tonight so that we can get our journey behind us because with the heavy rain the roads are getting in bad shape." He said: "You will never make it." I said: "Well, it is your constituency, you should know, but we are going to try it." He was right as far as the highway was concerned. We had a local driver that knew some of the by-ways and the short cuts, and we were able to make Kindersley that night. Today, after the C.C.F. government took office, you can drive from Kerrobert down to Glidden, a total of 50 miles on highway No. 30. A highway gravelled up to 100-foot standard. Another one, highway No. 7 from Saskatoon to Alsask, leading through to highway No. 9 on the Alberta side to Drumheller — from time to time that has been quite a joke in the Saskatoon

Star-Phoenix, especially in 1947. They spoke about the mud-hole from Kindersley to Alsask, and they were quite correct. It was nothing but a mud-hole. For some reasons that road had been built — I think it was built under the Anderson administration because we were represented in this House at that time by a farmers' representative, and as you might well be aware, we were not over-burdened with gravelled roads in that constituency. The Saskatoon Star-Phoenix quoted some really genuine instances where people returning from their vacation on the west coast got as far as Alsask and had to load their car on the rail to get it to Kindersley so as to get on the gravel again. I am not challenging those statements because those conditions actually existed. Today, Mr. Speaker, we have 100-foot construction road from Kindersley to Alsask; two or three miles yet to be gravelled there on the face of the hill but that will be gravelled in the spring, and we will have a complete highway running from Saskatoon to Alsask, connecting up with No. 1 highway leading through to Drumheller or branching off south to Calgary, so the Liberal party will not be able to talk about the Alsask mud-hole any longer. That is done away with.

Highway No. 44 is a beauty. That ran right through the lower end of the old Kindersley constituency, which afterwards was divided into the Elrose constituency represented by my friend, the member for Elrose (Mr. Willis) and used to be represented by Mr. Handelman. You can well imagine we did not get any special consideration there. In 1944 I was talking to some Liberal friends and we were going to endeavour to see what we could do after this government was returned to power — and they were returned to power that night — to get highway No. 44 constructed, because in the Elrose constituency there is a town of over 1,000 inhabitants who are 23 miles from gravel. On that mud road there were three hospitals — Elrose, Eston and Eaton hospitals. If ever a district needed a road, it was that district. Talking with a Liberal friend at Mantario, he said: "Well, we have been promised that for 35 years. The Liberals a few years ago put up markers on this highway, but they have only been put to one use — they have been awfully good for the cattle and horses to rub on, but apart from that they have not served any definite purpose." Today, Mr. Speaker, you can travel from No. 4 highway at Elrose right through to Mantario on a 100-foot standard highway, fully gravelled.

Mr. Gardiner, when he was campaigning in the province, had quite a lot to say about the C.C.F. government who were surveying highways paralleling where surveys had already been run. I wish we could send our Liberal friends over the old Liberal survey. If ever you saw one of the most stupid surveys for an engineer to run — but do not blame the engineers; long before this government came into office the engineers ran the survey where the road runs now under a C.C.F. administration. Delegations came down to the Minister of Highways, and the road was run by the side of a heavy slough. It is a continual switchbank for about eight miles. It was the most insane place you could ever put a road. That was your Liberal survey. The C.C.F. then ran a survey, and if you want to try that road you should come and see the country and drive over roads you have never seen. You would come through the Elrose constituency and the Kerrobert-Kindersley constituency as far as Mantario. In the survey the C.C.F. ran we have eliminated in that mileage five railway crossings. There is reason and there is sense and there is method in building a highway system similar to that. Had we kept to the old Liberal survey we would have

February 21, 1949

had three really dangerous railway crossings, and two others not quite so dangerous. They have eliminated those five railway crossings, and shortened the mileage. So much for highways.

There is one other matter I would like to deal with, and that is in connection with "Clause 6". The Privy Council declared that ultra vires. I was sorry to hear that — I am not questioning their judgment at all, but I was hoping they would have been able to find the same ruling as Judge Taschereau did: that this legislation did not interfere with interest but primarily affected the matter as between the owner of the land and his creditor. It did not affect interest at all. It was a matter of civil rights, not affecting interest. Mr. Gardiner, when he was in the province, had a lot to say about his legislation. I am proud of that legislation, and I am proud of that particular clause because it is based upon true socialist democratic principles. We are not prepared yet to concede that the dollar has the divine right to control. We think that human rights should stand far ahead of dollar rights. Although we have not the power to re-enact that legislation yet the government at Ottawa has the power, and I think the farmers' organizations should channel their requests to Ottawa in no uncertain terms.

Our idea in bringing in that legislation was to prevent the pyramiding of costs. That is, when the human element earns nothing, the dollar element has no right to earn. It is a partnership between the man with capital and the man who is prepared to put labour into the land. If the farmer puts everything into the land and then loses practically all, then it is a heartless thing to say that the dollar should continue to earn interest, pile up indebtedness, and eventually put the farmer out on the road allowance.

I am interested in the statement Mr. Gardiner made. It was quoted in The Leader-Post, November 25:

The Saskatchewan farmer is borrowing money from the Canadian Farm Loan Board, and will probably have to pay between one and one and one-half percent higher interest rate had the province's Farm Security Act been declared intra vires by the Privy Council, the Rt. Hon. J.G. Gardiner said in an interview Wednesday. In Regina on his way to Nokomis where he was to address a public meeting, Mr. Gardiner said the Farm Loan Board now loans money to farmers across Canada at four and one-half percent. Had the Farm Security legislation been found intra vires, it would have been necessary to raise the interest rates to cover the extra risk.

This would be raising the interest rates before any challenge was made to the principle at all. So much for Mr. Gardiner's tender solicitude for the farmers.

I was interested in looking up the federal Farm Loan Board's annual report. I found that the first mortgage on land in the province of Saskatchewan totalled \$3,444,000. I had thought it was an amount that would probably bankrupt the Dominion of Canada if they took this risk, to give the farmer a fair show; but I find all there is in first mortgages is \$3,444,000, second mortgages \$176,000; 2,548 loans totalling \$3,620,000. I was interested, by way of contrast, to read in the Financial Post, December 25, 1947:

During November, 1946, some \$21 million in plants and buildings was sold. The largest building, the Welland Chemical Works which went to American Cyanide for \$4,750,000. Concluding this transaction, the total sales to date has netted the government \$26,800,000, plants which are listed as having an original cost of \$73,800,000.

Listen how they justify this. This is where 'big business' comes in, contrasted with the risk the government would have to take with the farmers. If the federal government was to take any particular risk with the farmers, they have to increase the interest rate; but we find where they wrote off that vast amount of money, reducing \$73 million to \$26 million. The Financial Post says: "This indicates a potential recovery of 36 cents on the dollar". When you are dealing with big business, it is a "potential recovery", not a loss of 64 cents on the dollar. When they are dealing with the farmers, to give them some security against the uncertainties they have to face, such as weather conditions, then you have to gouge another one and one-half percent interest out of them to make sure there is going to be no deficit showing up in the federal administration.

I do not want to deal to any great extent with the Department of Agriculture, but one thing I was interested in was February 8, 1949 — I think all the members got this list — there was a long list of fodder, 100 tons, 150 tons in lots of cases, surplus fodder in the province of Saskatchewan, owing to the foresight of the provincial government in its fodder conservation plan. This does not deal with the government's direct conservation of fodder but this just deals with what the farmers have done in providing for their own needs. Mr. Speaker, farmers are not looking for charity. If you give our farmers a fair chance to meet the uncertainties of weather conditions and insect pests, they will come through every time. Here, through the assistance and encouragement given to them by the Department of Agriculture, we find the farmers, on February 8, with all this vast amount of feed available in the province. I was wondering what it cost the government to assist those farmers to put up that feed. Thirty-six crews were moved to places in the dried-up area, and 56 carloads of hay and equipment. I find the dominion's share was 26 cents per ton, and the provincial share was 30 cents per ton; making the combined cost to the taxpayer just 56 cents per ton to put up that surplus hay and make it available to the farmers of Saskatchewan. The risk was tremendous, as far as the loss of crop was concerned, in a good many areas because I find 44,728 farmers will be receiving payments under the P.F.A.A.

It is very strange to find the members of the opposition so much concerned about the portfolio of agriculture, and the Department of Agriculture. It is a very important portfolio, but they administered it for more than two years by remote control with Mr. Taggart down at Ottawa sort of administering the portfolio 'in absentia'. It is not as good as having a Minister of Agriculture in his office administering his portfolio.

Out in the country you sometimes hear that this government has done nothing for agriculture. I recall in 1944 we did extend The Exemptions Act. At that time The Exemptions Act just gave exemptions for seed grain to 160 acres. That has been extended to cover all the land the farmer has ready for crop. Section 2 of the Act was further amended by inserting after paragraph 8 the following paragraph:

8(a). The crop of an execution debtor to such extent as is sufficient when converted into cash, along with any other means which he may have, to pay all unpaid legitimate costs of harvesting the crop, and to provide a necessary living allowance for the support of himself and his family until the crop of the following year is about to be harvested. To provide the necessary cost for his farming operations until that time.

We put in another amendment, you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that this seed, which was exempt from seizure, could not be disposed of by the farmer for cash or any other method. The seed exempted must be seeded to the land on which the exemption was made. The interesting thing about the whole thing is we had a recorded vote when that amendment to The Exemptions Act was voted on and we find that every Liberal in the House — and his name is recorded here — voted against the extension of the exemptions for the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan. We find it in the Legislative Journals, Session of 1944. Take it up and see what you think of the people who were representing the farmers on the Liberal side of the House during that session.

Then sometimes you hear we have done nothing as far as alleviating the debt burden of the farmers is concerned. I think you will find that seed grain advances amounting to \$21,833,000 — in 1935, 1936 and 1937 seed grain advances — the responsibility and obligation was assumed by this government to the extent of \$21,833,000. Those of you who transact business with the farmers will recall the 1938 seed grain indebtedness. We made the promise before we took office that if elected to office we would assume 50 percent by the province of the 1938 seed grain indebtedness and ask the municipalities to collect the other half. The province's share of that debt amounts to \$9,973,000. Other seed grain relief debts which were cancelled amounted to \$7,381,232. In addition, in November, 1944, we cancelled direct relief amounting to \$33 million; making a grand total of the net burden lifted from the farmers and the municipalities during the tenure of office of this government of \$72,187,000. When a man goes out and says we have not relieved the farmer of any debt burden, I wonder how he squares his figures with his conscience. That I would like to know.

It has also been said that no farmer has ever benefited under the crop failure clause. The Farm Loan Board's report was tabled in the Legislature, and you will see there that 751 farmers benefited to the extent of \$87,499 under the crop failure clause, through the Farm Loan Board, to people who had money advanced by the provincial government to the Farm Loan Board, to people who had money advanced by the provincial government to the Farm Loan Board. Since that legislation was enacted, there has been \$184,000 of debt lifted from the shoulders of the farmer under the Farm Loan Board, the 1,236 farmers have benefited. In the eyes of some people that is nothing, but I think in the eyes of the farmers it is.

I want to deal, for just a few minutes, with the development of our natural resources. I hope the Minister will be dealing fully with that so I will not go over the ground too much, but there are one or two things that interest me. Included in the Liberal literature which was sent out, it says: "Outside capital has been forewarned to stay out of Saskatchewan or else come in under threat of confiscation." We have heard that in the House, Session after Session, these words 'expropriation' and 'confiscation'. You see it in

the Liberal press, and if that is loyalty to a province I would like to know what brand of loyalty that is, where a party and a press endeavour to keep out investment capital which we so much need in this province. There is one great mistake the Liberals make and that is they think they are interpreting the C.C.F. policy. We are not tied down to any handbook of socialism. I have enough confidence in the people of Saskatchewan that they can evolve a brand of socialism to suit the needs of the people of Saskatchewan, without being tied down to anybody's text-book. I think you will find the people of Saskatchewan will evolve a brand of socialism which is fitting to the peculiar needs of Saskatchewan. I have stated before, and our speakers have stated on a good many occasions, there is a very definite place for private capital in the province of Saskatchewan; there is a very definite place for the development of the co-operative movement. I wish the hon. member for Arm River was in his seat because for the first three Sessions we met in this House, he used to draw dire pictures of the head-on collision that was going to occur between the C.C.F. government and the co-operatives of the province.

I see the hon. member has returned and I would like to draw the attention of the member for Arm River to the fact that during the first three Sessions of this Legislature, he drew a dire picture of what was going to happen with the head-on collision between the C.C.F. government and the co-operative movement in the province, not realizing that they run parallel and implement one another's efforts. I drew his attention to it when I spoke in the fourth Session of the Legislature, and I have not heard him mention it since. He used to sit directly opposite me here, and I think he was wavering a little, I nearly got him converted, and that is the only reason I can think of why they put him away to the other end of the seating. I think I was beginning to work on him a little.

There is, very definitely, a place for private enterprise and a place for co-operative development, and a place for government enterprise to develop the natural resources of our province which would, if left under private enterprise, be used for the exploitation of the people of the province who own those natural resources. I think the first body-blow any thinking Liberal got was in 1946, or maybe before that, when the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company at Flin Flon decided they were going to make another million dollar investment in their plant at Flin Flon. I well remember how the Liberals on the opposite side of the House used to say: "If you go ahead with this collecting of royalties on the scale which you are collecting them, you will drive every private interest out of the province of Saskatchewan." The Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company increased their investment, and are contemplating further increases. But the first real body-blow any thinking Liberal got was when the agreement was signed with the Prairie Salt Company at Unity, and we got the million dollar salt plant. I was interested in the comment of the manager, Mr. Pounder. Shortly after the agreement was signed, the daily press quotes Mr. Pounder as saying: "The company is deeply impressed with the spirit of fair play made by the government of the province, and particularly by their desire to make an agreement beneficial to the people of the province." So you find — if the Liberals had their eyes open — here was a man who came in representing big business, very much impressed with the treatment he received in the investment of the capital on

February 21, 1949

behalf of his company, and the safeguards that were made in the public interest in the province of Saskatchewan.

I want to deal for a few moments with the Liberal government's statement in connection with mineral resources. One thing I think has been most amusing was started in the Legislature here, and has been echoed by every Liberal speaker out in the country. To hear them talk you would think the pre-Cambrian shield was something which was slipped in there on the quiet in the last couple of years, and the C.C.F. government had not found out anything about it. Here is what the Liberals were going to do in 1929: "Recent discoveries of mineral resources, the result of active prospecting throughout the northern area, revealed that area to be a veritable treasure chest. The efforts of the government, through the department, is being applied to the making of that area more easily accessible to the prospectors and mining men." I would like to hear the "prospectors and mining men" comment on that.

I briefly want to congratulate the government for their Prospectors' Assistance Plan. Under that plan, as many of us know, there has been several very valuable discoveries made. Under the plan they get free transportation from Flin Flon and Lac la Ronge into the area selected. There is a loan of equipment, 12 free assays for anybody, monthly visits while they are in the field, taking in supplies and bringing out samples, sole prospecting rights in a generous area surrounding the new discoveries. When you come down to the plan for allotting mineral exploration concession blocks I am quite in agreement with that, but I am not fully in agreement with that because capital is prepared to come in and develop the mineral resources and they should have adequate protection. I do hope the government will safeguard the interests of the public in the allotment of these mineral exploration concessions.

For the first three years a company has to put in \$50,000 in investment in those years. Then they have to, at the end of three years, stake and retain 15 percent of that area in three distinct groups or less. I think that is as it should be as long as the public interest is safely guarded.

What interests me is that on the one side you have the Liberals working tooth and nail to keep investment out of the province of Saskatchewan. I am also interested in the reports of some of our communists in the province of Saskatchewan, challenging that the C.C.F. government is hand in glove with capitalism and free enterprise. I heard a man say, in a question period at a meeting: "The C.C.F. government should take adequate safeguards with regard to the uranium development. They should get an iron-bound guarantee that none of the uranium shall be used for war-like purposes." I say to the government it would be very nice and desirable to be able to guarantee that all the uranium which is developed from the ore which is mined be channelled into avenues of peace, but I am afraid the Soviet Union is not as much concerned with channelling things into avenues of peace as their representatives in this country.

So we find, I think, that the C.C.F. government is on the right track for the simple reason we have on one side the Liberals who are thrown into the discard, using their best endeavours to keep investment capital

out of the province of Saskatchewan; and then we have the communists on the other side saying: "Now you have discovered a very valuable mineral, don't mine it; just leave it where it is in case it is used for the development of the atom bomb."

I want to go back for a moment or two, Mr. Speaker, and congratulate you on your elevation to that very responsible and important position in presiding over the deliberations of this Assembly. Your record will guarantee to the new men a sympathetic hearing, and a not too-exacting ruling. Some of us who have had the pleasure of sitting in the Legislature for a short time know that we will get justice at your hands.

I also want to congratulate the mover and seconder of the reply to the speech from the throne, for the very able manner in which they carried out their duties.

I would also like to congratulate our Premier, being the first man who has led a socialist government to victory on the North American continent, and increased the plurality of the votes by which his government was returned. That was no small achievement, either.

I also want to congratulate our new Leader of the Opposition on being chosen as the provincial leader of the remnant of what was once a great party. I am very much surprised to see the campaign literature "Tucker or Tyranny". No man, by any stretch of the imagination, who would allow literature like that to be circulated could be accused of undue modesty. If any man places himself in such a position, or allows literature to be distributed which implies he is the only man, the last chance, the only hope, to lead a government or the people of this province, as I said before, cannot be accused of undue modesty. But if, by the harsh dealings of fate, we should ever be faced with that proposition, after listening to the hon. member over the radio and in the House, I think the outlook would be far darker than anything he has ever described in the literature he has distributed. I was wondering why a man who has had as much experience in public life as the Leader should be so thin-skinned for the first couple of days. I think when he gets to know us better he will realize that a man who likes to hand it out should also be able, in the heart sense of the word, be big enough to take it without being needled into yelling in every few minutes. I wondered what could be the reason for it, and I was looking through my newspaper clippings, and I notice there was a meeting called June 22 in Saskatoon saying, "Have a date with Saskatchewan's New Premier". The Liberal press and the Liberal machine had already elected him. So I think probably that accounts for a lot of the chagrin which he has exhibited since he came into the Legislative Assembly. I am glad he did not get as far as Governor Dewey did. You know, Governor Dewey fell into the same trap, and a lot of us had a great deal of amusement on the 9th when the returns were coming in to hear Commentator Kalteborn saying: "Eleven to twelve hundred people, by special invitation, are waiting downstairs to celebrate the Republican victory." As he went on at 10 o'clock: "Something very definite should be coming"; 10:30 o'clock: "Something definite very soon now"; 11 o'clock he said: "The party is beginning to dwindle, some people seem to be leaving". The next morning we learned that the bodyguard which was there to protect the person of the new president had returned to Washington.

February 21, 1949

I am thankful the hon. member did not go as far as that. But to allow people to elect him two or three days before the vote was taken does look, Mr. Speaker, very much like presumption on the part of anybody.

I am supporting the motion.

Mr. L.L. Trippe (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, my first duty on speaking on this speech from the throne is to congratulate you, Sir, on your appointment as Speaker of this House, and I am sure there are many things we don't all agree on, but we find ourselves quite unanimous in this choice.

I must also congratulate the mover, the hon. member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak), and the seconder, the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker).

We have noticed, Mr. Speaker, that you have made a considerable allowance for some of us new members, and we are glad of that because we are not very parliamentary perhaps, sometimes. As for myself, I have not had the opportunity yet in my short political career to have addressed a gathering of such learned gentlemen in surroundings of such inspiring grandeur as this Assembly. We are particularly impressed, we new members, by the magnificence and the very well kept interior of your Building, and we find our accommodation ample and even, I might say, luxurious and practical. It looks a good deal like the board room of one of those monopoly capitalist corporations as we sit over there. I hope on the other side it is considerably plainer.

Mr. Speaker, when you look out over all of these boys, I suppose sometimes you wonder how in the world did they get here. Back home, we might say, the people all love them very much, and they must or else they would not be here.

We find the secretary that has been providing for us efficient and courteous and pleasant, and we are very glad of that; and your Clerk's office handles our business with expedition and a good business sense carefully, and we are very much thankful for that.

We were somewhat impressed by the filming of the opening ceremonies here, but it seemed to go a little too much Hollywood for the liking of some people, and I am not very keen on it myself. If it cost anything, the cost is perhaps wasted. They were very strong lights and the people who had business in this Assembly were almost blinded by them. There was a very partial coverage, and I would not say that we have any glamour boys on this side. They are, perhaps, all on the other side. We have no regrets about that, but when the filming started I happened to look over at the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), and there was absolutely a look of consternation in his eyes. I believe I was somewhat jittery myself because neither one of us had taken precautions to get our waves properly set, and we thought if that camera ever got around to this side we would be in a bad position indeed, but they did not get over here. They stopped at the door and gave the government

full publicity. There was no detail overlooked. It was well publicized in the press and in fact some infant did observe that her father had on a shirt and a tie too. This was put in in considerable detail. I believe it was very well advertised. But to show that some people think the same way that I do about this thing, I quote from the editorial page of The Leader-Post of February 19, 1949, in which it says:

So sweet are the uses of publicity not even the Legislature has proof against them. The Opening last week was positively enslaved by the paraphernalia of publicity. Up in the Press Gallery there were yards of cable to snag the unwary foot. There were klieg lights to dodge, cameras and tripods to duck, and broadcasting gear an additional hazard. Unchallenged, the cameramen appeared and burst in the doorway. Then and then flash bulbs went off with explosive regularity. A radio announcer stalked intent across the Chamber and babbled out testing double talk into a microphone. Through the solemn proceedings when a quiet hung over the Chamber, the newsreel cameras whirred and the voice of the radio announcer was a steady drone. In the midst of the rigid formality, that dictates so much of the Opening procedure, the men who cover the affair enjoy a kind of immunity. So accustomed is the public to their comings and goings, it occurs to no one to shush them, to glare them into inactivity. Possibly this is because the mechanics of publicity are as much a recognized part of public ceremonial nowadays as the ritual itself.

Shortly after the provincial election, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) came on the air with a broadcast and, by following it up, we were led to believe that there was going to be considerable measure of co-operation with all the new members of the government, or rather the members who were elected to this Legislature. So, being new at the game, many of us expected that this would come about. I might say we are willing to co-operate with anything that is good and can be done down here in this House, but, up to the present time, we have not had any offer. If anyone comes to us with a request for co-operation for something that is generally beneficial to this province, I am sure they will find us in full accord to co-operate on those requests.

It would suit me good, and members on this side of the House, if the Ministers, when they speak for their departments, would say we were welcome to come to their departments and get figures and facts as we would require them. But we have not been given that invitation as yet. The hon. Minister of Health (Premier Douglas) did show some disposition to co-operate with us in matters where his department had not done what seemed to be right. He told us to let him know about those things and we are going to do so.

We did come down here to co-operate in anything that is good for this province, and to get the business done in a most expeditious manner possible, and with the least friction possible. We naturally do not believe in socialism, and we cannot be converted to that in the matter of a Session, I don't think.

There were some pertinent facts that developed from the campaign and the election of 1948, and the most important fact —one of them at least —

February 21, 1949

is that this government does not now command a majority of the votes in this province. It used to be said, in the years between 1944-48, when they were jamming through their socialist legislation in spite of whatever protests went forward, that they represented a majority of the people and therefore they were entitled to go forward in any way they saw fit. I am pleased to see that today they are modifying a little bit — not quite so tough as they used to be. We notice this and we are pleased indeed. We don't notice in the speech from the throne that there is any contentious legislation coming up. It does not seem that they want to socialize anything just now. That will suit us, and you can get some measure of co-operation from us out of that.

As we heard the other day, figures are stubborn creatures. Therefore I am not going to quote figures at any great detail because it seems in spite of them being stubborn creatures, they can also be used here and there to magnify a proposition or certain parts of them can be used, and they do not give an entirely clear picture. The main thing that we notice, and that the people of the province notice, is that socialism is not advancing. It has stopped dead, and, in fact, I believe it is in retreat. They are not doing well federally. We used to hear about the march on Ottawa, how they were going to place the flag on Parliament Hill. I do not know what it looks like, but apparently the boys that have been carrying it got a little footsore. They are not going forward with this flag as fast as they used to. I don't believe they have gotten out of the province. They don't seem to make any very great progress outside of the province anyway. The very fact that this group has increased as it has, regardless of those stubborn figures, would indicate to the people of this province that something is taking place. They are just about three times as dissatisfied with the government today as they were in 1944. The theories of socialism do not work. They are not working here and they never worked any place else for any very great length of time. The thing is not new. The great trouble is, of course, that in a general way there are no practical people at the head of these socialist ventures. The 'planners' are chiefly concerned with planning how to help the government in office for a longer period, and they are not planning anything else.

The most disquieting thing that has happened since the election is that Nelson Clarke and Tim Buck are going to disaffiliate. I don't find that word in the dictionary "disaffiliate", but it was apparently defined by John L. Lewis to show that they are backing away from something, or something like that. And since Nelson Clarke and Tim Buck are going to disaffiliate, I am sure the Liberals will be quite satisfied with that. We have no wish to rub it in when we see people on the downgrade, and I am sure I am not going any further with that.

Socialism, of course, is a planned economy. It is planned, in a great many cases, by people who have made no signal success in ventures that they have tried themselves. There have been various dates advanced in this Legislature as to the time of the start of socialism. I am willing to let it go clear back to 500 years before Christ; clear back to the time of Confucius. Confucius had some pertinent remarks to make about socialism in his day. Apparently some of the Manchu emperors got a little short of cash and they decided they would try it. There was quite an idea, at that time, that they would possess anything they saw around them, and divide it up amongst the people,

taking a fair cut for themselves. So they even worked it at the time of Confucius. Confucius, of course, was the eminent Chinese philosopher of the period, and he made some pertinent observations on this. The gist of his observations was that they took from those who had worked and saved and gave it to those who had not, and when they had exhausted the savings and the riches of those who had, and distributed them, that was the end of it. There was nothing creative done, and the whole thing folded up. Of course, it has been tried at various times and always with no very great success.

In connection with the planning in an agricultural province such as this, we wonder, sometimes, what they are going to “plow” us into. We are producers of agricultural products in a very large measure, and we produce them for export in huge quantities. In this connection, we have a comment by the Farm and Ranch Review of Calgary, of February 5, 1949, and I don’t believe anyone can accuse those people of being political or partisan. They say:

Our production of food is so great that if the urban workers ate a loaf of bread and two pounds of steak at each meal, they could not begin to consume it all. Three out of every four bushels of wheat grown in Western Canada must be sold abroad. It must be sold at prices which our customers can afford to pay. If they (the Eastern farmers) choose to buy the socialist theory that some nice, neat, painless system of marketing can be devised by Consumer-Producer Boards which will set prices that are both fair and satisfactory to both sides, that is their concern. But when Western farmers flirt with this nostrum, they are flirting with disaster. We are in the business of growing food for export. Double or treble the wages of railway workers, the factory workers and the store clerks, and it will not increase the income of a single Western farmer by a single dollar. It will increase his cost to such an extent that he will be driven bankrupt on \$3.00 wheat.

I believe that is correct. If we don’t find a proper market for our exportable wheat, at a price which is fair, there is nothing we can do about planning in this province to fix that up. This socialist planning has never been successful in a competitive business. There are certain times that it looks to be successful in the case of a monopoly, but not in any business that is competitive. The theory of various socialists in this, if you can catch the people at a time as was known as the hungry thirties and make them believe that everybody is after them and you will show them just who it is, and if you can get some pressure groups who are favourable to you, and then legislate in such a way that you will suit them with whatever legislation you pass, you will finally build up an organization around you that will keep you in power.

In the case of Czechoslovakia, as is amply proven by the events that have taken place, I believe, everyone will concede the country was run, just previous to the time the Russians took over, by the socialist democrats. After disposing of one or two of the outstanding ones, they found the rest of them most willing to co-operate and they are the people who are co-operating with them today in Czechoslovakia.

Premier Douglas: — How many?

February 21, 1949

Mr. Trippe: — The conditional . . .

Premier Douglas: — Would the hon. member permit a question? My hon. friend said that most of them co-operated with them. Would you mind telling me how many socialist democratic leaders stayed on in the communist-dominated government?

Mr. Trippe: — I think, outside of a few of them that they threw out of the windows, they all stayed on.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, in fairness . . .

Mr. Trippe: — You tell us about that when you talk to the House.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Premier Douglas: — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, no member has a right to malign people whose shoe laces he is not worthy to unloose. Only two members of the former government ever stayed on on the present government of Czechoslovakia.

Mr. Tucker: — I ask that the hon. Premier be asked to withdraw that statement. He has no right to reflect in that manner on a member of this House. He was out of order when he made the statement, and then he went further and reflected on a member of this House.

Premier Douglas: — There is no reflection on any hon. member. I do not need any lessons in etiquette from my hon. friend. He has shown himself as being a very poor judge. I simply said that no member has a right to reflect on people whose shoe laces he is not worthy to unloose. Some of the men he is referring to today have given their lives in defence of the thing they believe in, others are in hiding at this very moment in Czechoslovakia.

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. member continue?

Mr. Trippe: — Surely, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — I don't think the hon. Premier was reflecting upon the hon. member who was on his feet. If the hon. member feels that he is aggrieved by any statement that the Premier made, then I must ask the Premier to withdraw it.

Mr. Trippe: — I do, Sir. When he says that I am not willing to wear the shoe laces of some of these people over in Czechoslovakia, I don't think it is a very fair statement.

Mr. Speaker: — My ruling is that if the Premier was applying it to the individual who was on his feet, then he must withdraw it.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I was applying it to the House in general. I said no person, in this House or any other House, has a right to malign men whose shoe laces he is not worthy to unloose — I did not say to wear, I said to unloose. I said that men who today, some of whom have died and some of whom have gone to concentration camps for the things they believe in, ought not to be maligned in this manner by this member or any other member anywhere.

Mr. Tucker: — Unless the hon. Premier was referring to the gentleman who was on his feet, he had no right to speak at all. It looks like he must have been speaking about the member that was on his feet.

Premier Douglas: — I was not applying it to the hon. member. I was applying it in general terms.

Mr. Trippe: — Apparently we cannot reach him, Mr. Speaker. He seems to be able to say about anything he wants to and get away with it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Premier Douglas: — That is a remark which certainly ought to be withdrawn. That is a reflection on the Speaker and on the Chair of this House, to say that a member can get away with anything he likes. My hon. friend need not think he is going to make a statement like that and get away with it.

Mr. Trippe: — Well, he said it, Mr. Speaker, and he stayed with it.

Mr. Speaker: — Being 6 o'clock, the House will now recess until 8 o'clock.

8 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Trippe: — We were talking about the socialist democrats over in Czechoslovakia, and we must have made a little progress because we seemed to have made some people a little irritated, and we will go back to this point again.

It is a fact that when the communists came into Czechoslovakia, they did get the support of most of the social democratic members of their government. The point I was trying to make was that the 'Pinks' welcomed the 'Reds' for whom they had laid the groundwork. There is no doubt whatsoever but that the writings of Karl Marx formed the basis of most socialistic and

February 21, 1949

communistic ideas. It is interesting to read in Marx that he referred many, many times to Co-operative Commonwealth. Those were his words over and over again.

Premier Douglas: — Both of them were Marx.

Mr. Trippe: — In late years they have been brought up-to-date by adding the word Confederation to it, and there you have it.

Let us turn our attention for a moment to Great Britain. We heard a report on Great Britain after the hon. Premier returned from there, and there were a few things he did not mention. He told about how well they were getting on with a labour socialist government. He did not mention that there was an investigation going on at the time into graft among the Cabinet Ministers, and that some of them had to step down. That is, one of them stepped out of the Cabinet, but that is all; he still sits in the House.

Premier Douglas: — Who was that? Would you mind naming him?

Mr. Trippe: — It is a fact that the socialist government in Britain is not working so good as some people might think. They keep the food subsidies going so that the ordinary workers think they are buying something cheap. It costs them around \$2 million a year and it is anyone's guess as to how long this can go on. It can go along just about as long as we or the Americans or somebody else gives them the money and supplies to do it with. If you keep on printing paper currency forever and ever, finally your money depreciates where it does not buy very much. That may be the case of what will happen in Great Britain. I don't know; it looks something like it at the present time.

They have numerous planning boards and rules and regulations over there that they go by. They have some that are pretty good. They have some that affect agriculture, and among some of the peculiar rules that they have, the planners have figured out that you should not pick an onion too early. You should let it grow until it gets about all the nutriment out of the soil that it can get. So, in order to figure out exactly what you should sell, in the way of an onion, they have set a measurement of an inch and three-quarters. But to be sure nobody measures the onion in just the wrong direction, they have set up an elaborate formula for measuring an onion. You are supposed to take from a point on the axis and measure at right angles to find the diameter of your onion. The point to measure from is where you might find the greatest diameter of an onion. At a point at right angles from the axis. Perhaps some of our learned gentlemen across would set up in a text-book some geometrical theorem by which the children could prove just exactly how to measure an onion and be sure it is right.

Some gentleman, who had to go to work a considerable distance, made an application for gasoline to put in his car to go to work. Well, they could not give him all the gasoline he wanted, so they gave him half. They gave him gasoline to go to work, but told him that he must use public transportation to return. They have that planned pretty good. He made one trip and he did

not make anymore because his car is on the wrong end and he cannot bring it back. The lady who wanted to build a shed for her goat waited so long that finally when she did get the permission through five different boards of planners, there were so many goats there that she just had to shoot off the goats. That is all there was to that. Someone's housewife made the pertinent observation that we own everything but we get less and less every day.

There is one thing about the British socialists; they are sincere. They call themselves the labour party, and I would suggest that if ours would do the same thing we might know a little better about what they stand for.

In connection with socialism in Great Britain, it is probably to hear about it from somebody that is right on the scene, and a man whose word could not be questioned. That is Mr. Ivor Thomas. He is a member of the British House of Commons, a 42-year-old Welsh scholar, doubled first in Oxford, an athlete, cross-country Blue, and formerly Colonial Under-Secretary and Deputy Minister of Civil Aviation in the socialist labour government of Great Britain. I quote from an article in *The Leader-Post* of February 10, 1949, on a speech that Mr. Ivor Thomas made in the British House of Commons, and taken from that speech. He says:

It is always a painful matter for a man to separate himself from those with whom he has been associated for many years. I appreciate the way in which my colleagues in the Labour party have themselves treated me in this manner.

He was just going to quit.

But in the last resort, the value of our parliamentary institution depends upon the readiness of individuals to take what action they consider best for the country irrespective of the consequences for themselves. To bring in a Bill for the nationalization of iron and steel, at this time when there are such grave events abroad calling for re-armament, and when our balance of payment is in such jeopardy, seems to me a wanton and reckless act. The most obvious result of the government's activities, in the past three years, has been an immense weakening of the power of the individual to stand for himself. In the past three years, nationalization, economic planning, taxation policy and housing policy have all contributed to this result. I do not say that this concentration of power has been deliberate. Most socialist M.P.'s would be horrified if they could see the type of society they are unconsciously creating. If it was not the intention of the government's policy, it has certainly been the consequences of it. It has now reached the point where it must give anxiety to all thoughtful men. I am certainly not opposed to nationalization as such. I did, in good faith, pilot one nationalization measure, The Civil Aviation Act, through this House. The attitude of sensible men in all parties has always been that the public ownership of an industry is a question to be considered on its merits in each case. In the case of all the nationalization measures so far carried out, I believe, the reasons, unbalanced, were sufficient, but the nationalization of iron and steel, and still wilder schemes with which some socialist

February 21, 1949

M.P.'s are toying with, are in a different class from the public utilities. I refer to such questions as land, of course. This strikes me as nationalization for the sake of nationalization. This is dogma run mad. The nationalization of iron and steel, coming on top of all the other measures we have had, will give the state power to control over our economic life, through the control of essential raw materials, control with which no persons, however well-intentioned and however confident, deserve to be trusted. Frankly, after the experience of the past three years, I have some doubt about the confidence and intention of socialist Ministers. I am, however, more disturbed by something else than nationalization, and that is the economic planning to which our national life is subjected. This vague control exercised by gentlemen known as the 'planners' who are trying to make a land fit for zeros to live in. With nationalization, a man does at least know where he stands, or he would if the government could make up their minds about the relationship between Ministers and public boards. But with planning, nobody knows where he is, except that the private manufacturer would soon be on Currie Street if he followed the same methods as Whitehall. The system is supported by elaborate, private police forces of which we all know in our constituencies, and this is not the least disturbing feature of this system. In the past, some individuals, too few perhaps, have been able to resist the encroachment of the state, but on top of the universal control of our economic life, the government is now wiping out the last vestiges of independence by confiscator taxation. Hard work, thrift, honesty, no longer pay. The paths of duty today lead but to the tax-gatherer's office. The incentive to financial independence which has been the mainspring of our economic life for centuries has disappeared and nothing has taken its place. The government has created a paradise with a football pool in the bucket shot, but they have undermined the foundations of our industrial greatness. We should aim, not at the concentration of all power in the hands of the state but the widest possible diffusion of power. This wide diffusion of power can be achieved by refraining from further measures of nationalization; by making the planners our servants instead of our masters; by reducing taxation to a point where saving again becomes possible; by encouraging the widest possible ownership of all forms of property, especially a man's own house.

If I mistake not, this policy approximates to that which is described by the Conservatives as the property-owning democracy and by the Liberals as ownership for all. It goes on:

Is not this a far nobler ideal than the great leviathan that the government is creating? Does it not correspond more closely with human nature and have better assurance for the individual than the all diffusion of power? Socialist M.P.'s would like to think themselves as carrying up through a revolution. The French revolution did at least give the world ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity. The slogan of the labour revolution appears to be utility, priority and austerity.

Ivor Thomas was not a man who had recently been found grafting. He was not a man who was kicked out of the party, or anything like that, but this thing of nationalization had just gone to a point where, in his mind, he could not stand for it any longer.

Another thing that the high command of the British socialist party believes in is the liquidation of the British Empire. Sir Stafford Cripps has preached that since 1935, and his opinion against a man of the stature of Churchill, I would say, does not amount to very much. Winston Churchill once said, when they were trying this, that he did not become His Majesty's first Minister to preside at the liquidation of the British Empire. Apparently now they have somebody that is willing to preside at the liquidation of the British Empire. How in the world can these little Islands ever remain as a great nation when all of their colonies are gone, I am sure I don't know.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Trippe: — Yes, go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Do you think it is a good idea in these days, or a right idea, that any nation should have a whole lot of colonies all over the world?

Mr. Trippe: — I think it is a first class idea that the British Empire should have colonies all over the world. They have never done anything but good.

Premier Douglas: — Is that the doctrine of the Liberal party?

Mr. Trippe: — It is a sure thing that wherever they have gone with their colonization, they have improved the lot of the people. They have built roads, canals and brought a higher civilization to every country in which they colonized. Eventually they saw disposition to govern themselves, they gave them complete freedom.

Premier Douglas: — That's what Cripps is doing.

Mr. Trippe: — I believe, as history unfolds itself, that most everyone will be more in favour of the doctrines of Winston Churchill and, perhaps, Sir Stafford Cripps.

Almost everyone that has spoken here has told us something about his constituency, and surely the Turtleford constituency is one of the most noted in this province. To start with, I must bring it out of the class of God-forsaken constituencies because it is not God-forsaken. The constituency is populated by pioneers who are very good people and always Liberals, except from 1944-48, and have returned to this House such outstanding men as Mr. Dan Finlayson, who was the oldest member of this House at the time that he stepped down, followed by Mr. Archie Gemoul, Mr. Arthur Ayre, Mr. W.F. Kerr, and then Mr. Robert Wooff. Mr. Wooff and I are very good friends. He sat in this House and I expect all of you who were privileged to sit with him were impressed by him. I find him to be an honest, kind, Christian gentleman. I

February 21, 1949

cannot say he was always, perhaps, satisfied with everything that this government did. Mr. Wooff is an absolute teetotaller and I am quite sure he was not fond of the government's biggest business, the liquor business. I suggest that he is not the proper type of a man for a socialist. The people of the Turtleford constituency certainly did not vote against Mr. Wooff. They voted against socialist regimentation in that territory. I expect some day when this socialism blows up and Mr. Wooff sees the light of day that we are going to have him in the Liberal party. If he wishes to sit in this House I will be one of the first, under those conditions, to support him.

The campaign that we conducted up there was a clean and well-conducted campaign as far as the candidates were concerned, but we had a little help by some C.C.F. canvassers up there and that did not clarify the situation. They circulated around and camped around my town particularly, and made very numerous bets out on the street. It did not make much difference what they were as long as nobody asked them to put up any money. They bet everything from ice cream to iced beer, and anything stronger if you wanted it, on all such propositions that I could not carry my own poll and that I surely would not carry the constituency. When the thing was over and the results were counted, nobody could find them. I am kind of keeping my eyes open to see if I can see any of them around Regina to see if I can get any of them to pay up any of those bets they got out of.

They did another clever trick. They were there around the 20th when the family allowance came out and they circulated around amongst some of our new voters and told them the family allowance originated with this government. To prove this they said: "Get your cheque and we will show you. You see on there, it comes from Regina so it must be the Regina government who sent it to you." Person after person came to me and said: "Is it right that the socialist government are sending this money. It is a good thing; we like it." I said: "Who told you that?" They said: "Somebody." We had quite a job explaining that away, and I don't think we ever really did it quite thoroughly.

Then they also told them about the P.F.A.A. "The P.F.A.A. have a branch office in Regina, and that comes out of Regina." So they took credit for that. I may tell you they got a good many votes on that. They did not go around this time with any patches or holes fore and aft. They had first-class clothes and first-class cars — things are looking up. They are in the chips these days I think, and they are doing all right. There was one thing that was sort of a serious set-back to us, and that is, we had a very short campaign. We did not get around very much, but the socialists beat us to the draw there. They got in a week ahead of us. Apparently they knew better than we did what was coming off.

In the provincial constituency of Turtleford, which is approximately 60 miles wide and approximately 90 miles long, we have had a succession of four very poor crops in the southern part. It just did not rain and so they were dried out. In the northern part things were almost as bad, but they have a character of soil there that produces alfalfa seed in abundance. This year there was a very good production of alfalfa seed by those people who had it, with a result it was very gratifying. Some of those pioneer settlers who had lived on relief just a matter of a very short time ago were now able to have a very substantial income. I met a lot of people who had \$4,000, \$5,000 and

\$8,000 income from alfalfa seed. As a matter of fact, one man had \$40,000 income from alfalfa seed alone, grown on his own land. In fact this gentleman was so overwhelmed that he went to the bank to get the cheque cashed to see if they really had that much money in there. Somebody told him they did not have money in there. This was just paper they passed around. He almost caught them there because the bank did not have enough money to show him \$40,000, and he almost believed the socialist theory that big business was mostly all done on paper. Anyway, they got the money and passed it on to him. After he had a good look at it and counted it up, he put it back on deposit. He is very prosperous and it is nice that he is.

The northern part of the constituency of Turtleford has no railroad. When you get to the town of St. Walburg and you go north of there, you go 88 miles to the village of Pierceland and there is absolutely no railroad. There is no way of travelling up in there except by buses or cars or slower methods of transportation. I would say, Mr. Speaker, to this House, that as a matter of business and as a matter of generosity you should be particularly indulgent towards us there because we do not have any means of transportation other than roads. I will give the government of today credit for maintaining a very nice bus service in that country, and the snow plows get out and keep those roads open under all conditions. This is an indication to me that it could be done quite a bit more, especially in the north country where you do have shelter belts.

As far as the matter of roads goes in the Turtleford constituency, we do not have, at the present time, any particular kick about that. You have treated us quite well. There are projects under construction which, if completed, will give what I would consider to be our fair share of road appropriations up to the present time. But, since they were started before the election, I am going to watch very carefully and see if they really are completed. I trust if they were not an election dodge they will be properly completed.

I would especially draw attention to this government of the necessity of opening some more land to the north of the hamlets of Goodsoil and Pierceland. There seems to be, according to the views of the settlers there, some very valuable land that would make first-class settlement. I believe if it is looked into you will find some barriers of land now in what is known as forest reserves, or something like that, that have practically no forest on them, that could be opened up and would make good agricultural land. When you do, I do hope you will make it possible for a man to own his land and not put him on some kind of a life lease.

The snow clearance, as I have said, is done and it shows it can be done in other places. I would say to this government, if you open a road that is not too terribly tough between any two fair-sized towns, that is not a matter of expense. It will bring you revenue. Drawing, as you do, ten cents a gallon out of all the gasoline that is burned, you will immediately start traffic on these roads and it does not take you very long to pay back everything that it cost. We have the co-operation of the government., I am pleased to say, in opening some side roads. They do tell us they spent most of their snow clearance money for flood control in the spring, and they did not have anything much to do it with. Some of our enterprising communities have gone

February 21, 1949

in and put the actual cash outlay into this, and the government has supplied us with the machinery, and at the cost of about \$2 an hour for wages and fuel we have opened up some of the roads. The government should not regard this as a matter of dead expense. When you open this particular road from St. Walburg to the Brightsand territory, big trucks immediately commence to run and haul the mail, supplies for the stores and bring in a lot of wood. This wood is deadwood that comes off Crown lands. It produces a revenue to the Crown, and it also produces a revenue in the gasoline tax. If you keep these closed, or permit them to remain closed, you don't get the traffic over them and you cannot haul this wood by horses from a distance of 15 to 20 miles. You must have trucks to do that.

I believe some of the road machinery manufacturing companies have constructed a small rotary plow that can be attached onto the front of a tractor, and the power taken off the tractor to run it. In fact I know these things can be done on a very small scale. A man I know has a little one that he has just had on a push-hand sleigh, with a couple of handles sticking out behind it. For power he has just a little bit of an engine that goes under his gasoline washer. He pushes this around and it throws the snow clear and he cleans every single road and walk around his premises. You would only need to enlarge upon this just a little bit to have them put on the front of road machinery. The men who maintain these roads in the summer have worked generally for about seven months of the year, and a lot of them are good men and maintain their roads properly, but it is not very much in the way of employment to employ a man for just seven of the best months in the year and then turn him loose in the winter time when he has not very much to do. I would suggest that you don't get a very high grade of employee on that kind of a basis. If you could use this same machinery and rig up one of those rotary plows on the front of it, small though it may be, and let him go out there and keep these roads open, even, perhaps, during storms, and keep them open continuously and all the time. I submit, Sir, that it would not cost anything; that the revenue would come back to the government in the form of gasoline tax, and it would not be in the same classification of maintaining roads in the summer time where it is just a dead expense and does not produce any particular revenue.

The operations of the government in the fur, fish and timber, as usual, is very hard on us. We did have the famous 'King of the North' operating there, but we got rid of him with no regrets. He did not know of the conditions; he had no proper experience in any of the lines, and he made some rules that were entirely phoney for the things they were supposed to cover. In fact, one night when he was making a speech, he amended the forest regulations three times to suit the audience. First, he told them they could burn the brush as they went along cutting ties. Someone told them they could not do it, so he fixed that up two different ways after that so that everyone was satisfied but after he got home nothing happened. We do know that we have to change and we do hope we will get some sympathy and some relaxation in these very rigid rules as effect what surely might be called the basic industries of the very far north.

The grants to the rural municipalities in my constituency are not bad. They are not bad if they continue after we get back, but we have been nicked out of keeping our share of the public revenue tax that we overpaid.

After we got that back, and if they continue, the grants to the municipalities will not be bad.

With regard to civil servants that are working up there, as far as I am concerned personally, I have had very good co-operation with them. I have been able to go round to men working for the Fur, Fish and Timber Boards, as well as the secretaries of the L.I.D.'s; just as far as their rules would permit them to go, they have all shown a degree of co-operation which I appreciate very much. We have some nice things done up there, and we are working together and I certainly don't want to interfere or say anything about these civil servants.

The bus lines are serving us very well — as long as they run. There is a very nice grade of a bus, and I am sorry to hear the hon. Premier tell us the other day that they might be slipping behind a little bit. I had hoped they would do good and, perhaps, under new management they might. If they do come to a point where the government cannot run them and somebody else takes hold of them, I am in great hopes that they will continue to run.

The Larger School Units are a bone of contention. We have two of them which cover my constituency entirely. The worst thing about them is that they were put over on us without the chance of a vote.

An Hon. Member: — How about B.C.?

Mr. Trippe: — We are not living in B.C. Let's live in Saskatchewan for a while, and try and fix that up.

The Larger School Units are, perhaps, all right. I don't know if there is anything wrong with them. I am not going to say if there is. Maybe we had better give them a little more chance, but the people of my constituency tell me it has doubled or trebled their taxes. They take this idea; they go ahead and take a school district as was formerly established. They take the boundaries of it and see what taxation they could raise under the present form of taxation. They add to that the grants that are given by the government to the Larger School Units, and they find they have enough money on hand that they could do an awful lot with. They could raise the teachers' salaries at least 50 percent, and they could go a long ways if they had any control of the money.

The question there now, Mr. Speaker, is: "Where in the world does the money go that is raised for this purpose?" A very serious situation arises from the fact that this year, after four years of socialist government, we are getting teachers in our schools that are not teachers at all. We are getting what is commonly known as 'sitters'. That is about all they do is sit for \$5 a day. They maintain a semblance of discipline and try and get the children to follow the courses as sent out, and, perhaps, that is all that can be done, but it is unfortunate indeed that the Turtleford School Unit, I believe, has eight and the Meadow Lake School Unit has nine, or vice versa, so that in the Turtleford School Unit practically one school in eight has no teacher. This is a condition that even in the most serious times this province has known did not exist in that country before.

With regard to agriculture, I might say that whatever help we get out of this government for agricultural purposes just does not amount to anything. The time when we really needed them last year, when there was a real hay shortage, they just did not have any hay located for us at all. The municipal secretaries had to get on the phone and phone up Manitoba to find out where there was some hay. Sometimes they located it and sometimes the government located some for them. It was brought out there and sold to the farmers for \$35 a ton. When they took it home the cattle would not look at it and they starved to death. That is the help we got from the provincial Department of Agriculture when we really needed it. I would dare say 25 percent of the cattle and horses starved to death last year. This year, of course, there is no over-all shortage of fodder in the province, and so everyone has it to offer. There are certain localities that are short, but the government does not need to take any credit for the fact that there is an abundance of fodder in other districts.

There was quite a nice highway built up there and when it was done it was seeded to grass by the department. The next year, up comes a great mixture of weeds and grass — noxious weeds that had never been seen in that locality before. There had never been Russian thistle anywhere near adjacent to this road before, but they grew in abundance after this seed was seeded. There were odd patches of sow thistle, but the road was simply decorated with Russian thistle, which many of the people did not know what it was, tumbled onto the adjacent land until you can just drive along this road today and see where it has gone. I submit to you, Sir, that the Department of Highways should have made some provision . . .

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Would you mind giving me the location of that section of road where these woods are?

Mr. Trippe: — Yes. We have taken it up with the agricultural representative. The section of road is highway No. 26, between Turtleford and Spruce Lake. If you want to come up there I will show you the situation, and it is a dandy. They have seeded the whole adjacent land to Russian thistles in no uncertain way, and you can see exactly the tracks of them where they blew out. We find now, after some investigation, that the Department of Highways will do something in trying to cope with those weeds. We are glad they will, but in our case it is too late.

There is another condition which is very serious in my constituency where they have had a crop failure for four years. I am going to tell this House that they absolutely had no seed to plant in the spring, and I would just like to know before I go home what you are going to do about it. I would suggest, if you would lend them the money to buy seed, that they would be very pleased and their honesty is about equal to any other section of the country. I am sure the great majority of them will pay you back, and don't think you will suffer any loss on that account. I will give this government credit if they will do that very kindly gesture of supplying these people who have no seed and no funds with seed on credit next spring. That would be something you could do and it would cost you very little.

The older farmers, who are wishing to sell their land, are dubious about doing it on time, and very many of them are held to their land these days by the fact that they are afraid if they do sell it on time they will never get paid for it. I think they have something there.

We have heard considerable in this debate about monopoly capitalism. Monopoly capitalism in the hungry thirties were the main themes of discourse and we will hear them, I suppose, every time anyone on the opposite side gets up to speak. I wonder what we would call monopoly? Monopoly, according to the definition as given in the dictionary, is the exclusive control of a commodity or service in a particular market. I don't know, Mr. Speaker, that we have one effective monopoly in the Dominion of Canada, with a possible exception of some that the government has. They are legal, and if anybody has any information about a monopoly, all they have to do is lay a charge and the thing will be investigated. There are shadows of monopolies which people would like to call a monopoly, what they think is a monopoly, and someone has said that the retailers know all about this. They held on certain lines for a certain price and certain distribution of the goods of the company. I have been a retailer in the province for a number of years, and I handled some of the most important lines manufactured by some of the biggest capitalistic monopolies that you talk about in this country, and there are absolutely no conditions on the sale whatsoever. There are absolutely no conditions on the way you are supplied. You can get them just about as fast as the manufacturers will make them, and you can sell them for anything in the world you feel like. A genuine monopoly is carried on by the government; such as the Post Office, where no one knows whether anyone else could do it for less money or not, because no one can do it. It has never been tried out and never been found whether anyone could run a posting system for less money or more money than the government. The Canadian National Railway is another half monopoly; not quite, because they have some competition. They have some competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway which is a smaller railroad, and less territory from which to draw traffic. The peculiar thing about it is that the Canadian National lives on relief most of the time, and the Canadian Pacific makes money.

The liquor business is a monopoly in this province, and, as such, it is very profitable and no one could doubt that. There is absolutely no evidence of any better service or better price by any monopoly, whether it is in the hands of private enterprise or whether it is in the hands of government. I don't know any reason why it should be tolerated in either case. There is a possibility that you could tolerate certain ones in government hands, simply for the purpose of producing revenue and nothing else. Not because they could not be run as well or better in the hands of private persons.

If there is one criticism of the Liberal party that is valid, it is that we have gone too far into business — we may have done that. But I can tell you if we make a mistake we will go on forever and maintain the same conditions and never admit that we did make the mistake. If we get into a business that we should not have been in, we will get out of it as quickly as possible.

There is a partial monopoly on fish in this province. It is not quite effective because there is little competition, but in some ways it is

February 21, 1949

effective. In spite of that, Mr. Speaker, there is every evidence that points to the fact that it will not work under normal conditions. With the terrific margin that they have in the fish business, the difference between what they pay the producer and what they charge the consumer, a matter of a fraction of a cent a pound, the other that they thought the express rates were going to raise threw them into real consternation. I am glad it was taken off because we would have had an excuse for all the failures of the Fish Board here in this fraction of a cent per pound that they intended to raise the express rates on fish.

The producer is victimized and the consumer has no benefit. The situation is serious there. A price-spread, as taken by the Fish Board, in the hands of any private individual would be at once condemned by everybody as a monopoly of the worst order. This income is wasted and it makes no money. In connection with this, one of my constituents — and he isn't a Liberal either — wrote a letter to the Free Press Prairie Farmer, which was published on January 26, 1949, and I thought it was pretty good. It said:

It is bitterly cold north of '53' these days; down in the 40's with a nasty sub-arctic wind, but hardy fishermen are busy hauling jacks and whitefish from the ice-bound Saskatchewan lakes. Licensed fishermen blast holes in the ice through a piece three feet thick, work through the feeble light of short winter days. The fish are frozen hard as a rock a few seconds after they are hauled out. The fisherman are kept warm by three-ply underwear and their political opinions.

What do they get for their fish? A jack is worth three cents a pound and a whitefish eight cents. Glen H. Myers of Flat Valley, Saskatchewan, writes to the Free Press weekly about the fishing situation.

Lac des Isle, 60 miles north-west of Meadow Lake, is open for commercial fishing December 1 (writes Mr. Myers). The Government undertook to buy fish and they built a packing plant on the west end of the lake. They paid the fishermen, so help me God, eight cents a pound for frozen whitefish. Fishermen had to gut the fish themselves, and freeze them. Jackfish had to be gutted and headed, and they were paid a whole sum of three cents a pound. Fishermen had to sell their fish to the Saskatchewan Fish Board. They cannot take a whitefish home to eat. Now, I am a non-fisherman. When a fisherman brought his fish into camp I could go up and buy some fish to take home to my wife, but I cannot buy from the fisherman. I have to pay the government 18 cents a pound right there just for taking the fish from one box and putting them in another. The government claims they are for the small man, yet they had a Co-op in Pierceland buy and truck the fish to Meadow Lake. Across the line in Alberta buyers were paying fishermen 16 cents a pound for fresh fish which weigh almost a third more than frozen fish. This (writes Mr. Myers) is what has been happening for several years.

His great personal complaint is over the Saskatchewan trapping regulations. They are worse, apparently, than the fish. I do know that Mr. Myers runs a mink ranch, and he used to get some of these low-grade fish to feed his mink, but he cannot do it anymore so he is thinking of getting out of the country.

Capitalism is, of course, the ability to accumulate something from your savings. He who is a capitalist is he who possesses savings and wealth. And, of course, with all of us, the fellow just around the corner is the capitalist. We are never he. So it would be interesting if we could get from the socialists a proper definition of what a capitalist is. They define it for you over in Russia. They say a capitalist is a man who employs any labour. He is an oppressor of labour, and, therefore, they call him a capitalist because he employs, even if it is only one man. An awful lot of farmers would fall into that category if they were really going to properly define capitalists, according to the Russian definition. So we never have any proper definition of a capitalist.

It is almost impossible to accumulate any amount of capital in the Dominion of Canada. If you make \$100,000 in any one year, 80 percent of it is taken away from you in income tax. It is well known by every member of this House that a person who would make \$100,000 must have a considerable set up and a considerable amount of expense, so how far would your remaining \$20,000 go to pay off the expense you would have in accumulating or getting in \$100,000. Then, if you do jump this hurdle and do get yourself any money, along comes the succession duty and it breaks up and takes the very biggest part of all the big estates. I do not know any schemes, Mr. Speaker, by which you could reduce capital any faster than the way it is taken away from people who make money in one generation. There is no possible way you could reduce excessive money in a person's hands any faster than 80 percent in income tax and practically eight percent on these large estates in succession duties.

I know one large English estate that was worth about \$3 million; the government took \$2 million in taxation. That is about the way they tax them. I don't know how we could possess large amounts of money from these so-called capitalists any faster than we do with the income tax and succession duties. Profits, of course, from business are depreciated by our friends in this House, and I don't know why they should do that because profits for the most part go back into business; they build bigger premises; they provide tools for the workmen, and provide for more jobs for everybody that works. I should think that is a very good thing. I believe the capitalist is wanted and needed for the development of this province right today. It is unfortunate that our financial set up is not such that we could attract it, as the other provinces do, in large quantities.

Something has been said about retail profits and the dominion government, through their statistical branch, has come out and told us something about retail profits. The retail profits, after the expense of operating the premises, averaged something between six and seven percent on the sales dollar all over the dominion. The net profit, after paying expenses, where expenses were required, were between two and three percent. I don't think any of you would say that is excessive. In my particular line of business I have seen very many retailers start and nine out of ten of them, I can assure you, do not make a success in business. They must compete, and when they compete, naturally some of them fail. Big business is depreciated by the socialist government, apparently, but I am sure big business, here or anyplace else, under proper regulation is good business. It produces goods in

February 21, 1949

quantities and at a price that nothing else can equal, and distributes them in abundance which nothing else could do. Socialism can never compete with big business as it is conducted in Canada today. Every time they try it they automatically wind up. The packing houses have been looked on as some big business that might be taken over by the government. The field is not closed. If this government thinks the field is profitable, there is nothing in the world to stop them from starting out in the packing house business, but everyone that has studied the thing knows that their profit is a very small fraction of one cent for a dollar's worth of business done, and certainly no socialistic enterprise could exist on that amount of profit. They will fail in competition and they will succeed only where they have a monopoly. That has been proven to us right here in this House, that the government's projects which have any competition are getting weak or are closing up. The tannery had competition and they closed it in very good time. The boot factory also had competition and it suffered the same fate. The woollen mill, we hear, is beset with rising costs and lower selling prices. That should be a healthy sign. If it was in hands of anything but the government and big business, we would all think that was a pretty good thing; competition had reduced the price. Apparently socialism cannot take that kind of competition and perhaps something is going to happen to this woollen mill. They could take care of it quick enough if they had full control. It would be no trouble at all. If they could handle the wool the way they handled the fish there would not be any trouble at all. If they could cut the price in two to the farmer and double it to the consumer, there would not be any trouble at all to make the woollen mill or any of these projects succeed. Unfortunately, they have to compete, and when they do compete they cannot take it. I would say this should be a lesson.

There is one thing we have never been able to find out in this House — and I hope some day we may be provided with the figures — and that is what it costs to sell the products of these government factories. Those of us who are in business see men running around this province, and I understand they go around others too, and all of them that I know are good socialists, and they must draw a lot of money. We know what it costs to maintain a traveller on the road. We also know that you don't do it cheap, but we never can find out what it costs. This is a business that belongs to the people of this province and they are entitled to know any facts in connection with it. If it was big business, you would immediately make them produce the balance sheet and show the stockholders of that business what was going on. I suggest to you that you should do the same thing in the government industries. If there is any figure that the people want to know, you should supply it to them, and we would like to know very much what it costs to keep these travellers on the road that go out and sell the products of these companies. The answer, I estimate, of course, would be \$300 a month anyway. I don't believe you could maintain them on the road for any less.

We heard some comments about the Sifton Press. The main sore spot is, I suppose, that it is not controlled by socialists. The one they control does everything they want it to do, I am sure. They exist as a result of free competition in the field. If the government could produce anything that is good they would have no trouble at all in getting the circulation, but they cannot produce anything other than something with biased, one-sided political

opinion. I don't think you ever saw the Commonwealth come out and say anything good about the Liberals, but I will tell you that the government gets very favourable and equal mention in the press of this province, along with everybody else. If the proprietors of this press don't happen to see eye to eye with the government in politics, that is no reason that I can see to bear down on them. When the government wants to put over a message in the form of an announcement, that is exactly where they go. When we sit on this side of the House and the debate gets a little dull, we see the gentlemen across reading papers, but we don't notice any Commonwealths sticking up in the air — it's all Sifton Press. As I say, there is absolutely no monopoly on the press in this country. So if anyone can do a better job, all they have to do is to go ahead and meet fair competition and help themselves. They can get a wide circulation if they present the news fully and unbiased. I must say that the two main leading papers in this province do present the news very well, very concisely and unbiased.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes during the course of our Session, I hope that as a matter of diversion you might arrange probably what we might call an "Indian debate". We could have that at one of these night Sessions like we had during the last night Session we had, and we might stir a little interest over across. I notice there were up to eleven of them in their seats the one night that we did sit here before, and those who were staying seemed to be extremely jittery. They turned backwards talking to their neighbours, and they did not seem to be paying very much attention to what was going on. We might liven it up a little bit if we had a debate on something unusual. They did have the Minister of Social Welfare with his stentorian voice to interject every three lines practically in what a man was saying. He does not need to do very much except give fairly loud grunts in order to disrupt most anyone that is talking, and he could be used. We might at this time appeal to Chief Wee-ogashaw for some things we want to get done. The translation of that is 'Red Eagle' I understand. I would suggest that we get him up here in full ceremonial regalia, and we would be willing to give him the picture rights.

About two years ago, when things were lagging a bit, along with members for Ottawa, the C.C.F. set out to do a little missionary work in this province among the Indians. The main object of it was, I expect, to embarrass the federal government . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a question of privilege? The hon. member has no right to impute motives to any member of this House or to any other persons who are seeking to better the lot of the Indians in this province. Many people who took part in those discussions belong to his own political party.

Mr. Trippe: — I don't wish to impute any motive, Mr. Speaker, I was just reciting a series of facts as I see them.

Within a serious vein, Sir, I would say this. The Indians of this province are getting a very raw deal. The original Indian in this province is a noble person. They are honest, faithful, brave people. They have a roving nature and if they had never been interfered with by the white man, they would be a solid, substantial people today. We know that the federal government

February 21, 1949

has responsibility for them, but we also know that the white race in this country have robbed and murdered and pushed these people around something terrible, and they have a grievance. The Indians of the Thunderchild Reserve, up in the constituency where I come from, complained to me about the restrictions that they have to conform to with regard to game and fish. In fact, they have a conservation area that borders there, and their main complaint is that the managers of this conservation area, with whom they have to do business, immediately adjacent to them, don't read or write the English language and they cannot do very much with them. I would suggest, in fairness to these people, that the government give them more rights on Crown lands and on lakes so that they can maintain themselves. I might say that they would be very, very poor indeed today if it wasn't for the family allowance paid to them by the federal government. There are no political implications in this. If this government wants to show a little sign that they are really doing something for humanity first, then I would suggest they treat these native Indians of this province a little more kindly. They have not votes and they are not a pressure group and, therefore, I do not know whether they will be considered or not, but I sincerely hope they will.

With regard to the matter as what was known as the hungry thirties, anyone who is a poor sport insists on a full comparison between those days and these days. The difference is very apparent and the people of this province know better than anybody else that the farmers did not have the income, that it would amount to the same thing in comparison with the gross income of the farmers of this province, that if you had \$75 in your pocket or \$450 in your pocket, what would you do? The condition was in those days that they had the \$75 and today they have the \$450. There is no credit to this government for doing considerably better when they are able to tap the \$450 for revenue when others were only able to tap the \$75. Fair people in this province recognize that, and I believe they can see through that, and I don't think they can be fooled by that kind of an argument very much longer. The thing that really set our wheat market on the skids was the fact that their chums over in Russia were putting wheat on the Liverpool market for 48 cents a bushel. That properly demoralized our wheat market. The English people have to buy their food in the cheapest market they can get it, and when this wheat was brought in at that price it was less than you could pay transportation charges across Canada and water charges across the ocean. That is what put the wheat on the skids. The province at that time was absolutely too poor to pay for the essential political services. It is well known by people who were in the government in those days that sometimes it came pay day for the civil servants and they did not have the money, and they could not get it very easily either. They went around to the gasoline companies who collected gasoline taxes and asked them to make a remission before the end of the month so they would have some money to carry on. Of course, this is fertile ground for the spread of socialism. You get these people properly disgusted with hard times, and you go around and tell them that you can do better for them, they will take a chance anyway and you could not do any worse. You finally get people to think that most anything else might be better. But the thing that happens is this, that their prosperity rises as their income rises, and there isn't anything very much that this government can do about it. If things would decline, as they did at that time, there is no better set up here today than there was at that time. The federal government has done some things that would ease the shock but the provincial government has done absolutely nothing.

In connection with the fact that there is easy money these days, and the fact that things are expensive, the Prince Albert Herald makes a very pertinent observation. They say: "A dollar will not do as much as it used to do because we do not do as much for the dollar." Well, that is, undoubtedly, the condition in times of high prices. I don't know what we can do about it. I believe everybody is on a fairly even keel as far as the high prices are concerned. The farmer is getting a pretty good figure and everybody else is not doing bad. I don't see that this government could have the slightest thing to do with claiming any credit for the prosperity that is taking place in the country today.

Sir, I have no confidence in the government and I will vote against the motion.

Mr. W.S. Thair (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, in opening my remarks this evening I would like first to extend congratulations to the hon. member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) and to the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) who so ably moved and seconded the address in reply to the speech from the throne.

Like the preceding speakers in this debate, I would like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election as Speaker of this Assembly for the second term of office.

I would first like to make a few general remarks regarding the world situation, because it reflects on every citizen in Canada and every citizen throughout the British Empire. The past year, since this Legislature last met in Session, has been one of great concern for the maintenance of peace throughout the world, and great confusion and strife have existed in many areas on the two great continents of Europe and particularly Asia. I feel that world conditions are better today than at any time during the past year. I would like to quote a short article from The Leader-Post by John Gunther, author of "Inside Europe" and "Inside U.S.A." — I am sure many of you have read these books — who has recently returned from an extensive trip through Europe and whose articles, as I said, recently appeared in The Leader-Post. He has this to say:

The most important single thing to say about Europe as a whole is that, barring unpredictable accidents, the outbreak of open warfare is unlikely.

I trust that this becomes a fact.

Many nations, including Canada, believe that true and everlasting peace can be found only through understanding and co-operation; honest dealings, not only in our province and our dominion, but throughout the entire world. We seek friendly relations with all countries. At the same time, I believe that at the present the best hope for world peace and security is a policy of adherence to western union, or a North Atlantic pact.

At this time we are also to welcome a tenth member to our Canadian family, the newly-created province of Newfoundland.

February 21, 1949

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks about farm problems in this province, in my own constituency particularly, and in other areas in a general way. As outlined in the speech from the throne, Saskatchewan harvested an average crop in spite of drought. A total of some 191 million bushels of wheat were harvested, which is nearly half of all the wheat grown in Canada in the year of 1948. The average for the province was about 13.3 bushels per acre.

Some idea of the intensity of drought conditions in this province, as compared with the other provinces, may be gathered from the province of Alberta where the wheat yield was some 18 bushels per acre on an average; the drought area was small. Manitoba, with heavy rainfall or precipitation very similar to that in the eastern part of this province, had an average yield of 22 or 23.8 bushels per acre — a remarkable crop. It only proves that moisture is, of course, very definitely the limiting factor in crop production, and that reduced yields are caused by lack of moisture particularly.

Increased P.F.A.A. payments to the extent of some \$12 million were an indication of the drought area in Saskatchewan particularly. However, there are many farmers with low yields in some areas, whose farms were on the edge of some higher crop yielder, who found themselves unable to qualify for the grants under the Act as it now stands. Increased payment per acre, I might recommend, is also needed to keep pace with the very greatly increased cost of agricultural production at this time. I would like to say, quite frankly, that Saskatchewan farmers, with the threat of scanty markets for their wheat on the one hand and on the other hand uncertain growing conditions because of an exceptionally dry summer and fall in 1948 and the possibility of a heavy grasshopper infestation over a large area of western and southern Saskatchewan, are looking toward 1949 and even 1950 with a certain degree of anxiety. In addition to that, I would like to emphasize the first statement I made, that we are faced with scanty markets for our wheat.

Livestock prices have, on the whole, remained high until some few weeks ago when they weakened somewhat. I might say, quite honestly and frankly, that the lifting of the American embargo in Canada in August of 1948 very definitely stepped up prices for a time, and, according to Professor Van Vliet of the University of Saskatchewan, the sale of cattle has increased Canadian exports by over \$100 million. It is well known in the south and the west that the ranchers had asked for this embargo to be lifted by the federal government more than two years, which action has meant so much to the farmers and the ranchers in the past six or eight months.

It is customary sometimes for a member to review conditions in his own constituency in the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I would like to review the 1948 crop conditions in the constituency of Lumsden, which I have the honour to represent for the second term in this Assembly. Incidentally, like many others in this Assembly, I farm and live on my farm for nine or ten months of the year, and like it.

On most of the heavy clay soil on the Regina plains, which comprises a large area of my constituency, also in the area of Belbeck and in Tuxford, the crops were good. The range in yields ran from 18 to 30 and even 35 bushels

per acre on good fallow land. But the whole area of farm lands, north of the Qu'Appelle Valley in my constituency, and practically all over into Arm River — unless it be up around Girvin and Davidson where the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) lives and farms — practically on to Saskatoon, showed very definitely the effect of drought conditions during June and July, and with it, of course, went low yields in wheat and coarse grains in all these areas.

I might also mention that other tremendous areas outside of that, the whole south and west of the province also, were severely hit by drought.

I believe the planned policy of the Department of Agriculture of self-help with regard to putting up reserves of feed and fodder has been a good education for the people, and of great assistance. The assistance of the Ag. Rep. Service, and the municipalities co-operating with Ag. Reps., has resulted in larger reserves of feed and fodder, in my constituency at least, and I am sure in many others throughout these low crop-yield areas. I believe that the farmers in this province have responded favourably to this policy of putting up reserves of feed and fodder, in addition to what the government has been doing in this regard.

I believe that the best, indeed the only, solution, in my opinion, of the farm problems in southern Saskatchewan is the stabilization of agriculture through greater diversification and mixed farming — livestock, cattle, hogs, sheep maybe in some areas — accompanied by smaller irrigation projects and feed and fodder reserves.

I would like to speak of the new Conservation and Development Branch which was announced Thursday in the speech from the throne. It has been outlined, I think, on numerous occasions by the Minister of Agriculture, Hon. I.C. Nollet, during the past few months. This new department, I believe, should fill the gap in a much-needed plan to deal with the many urgent problems of soil conservation. I would like to enumerate some of the problems that come under soil conservation, such as soil erosion, reclamation, feed and fodder reserves, smaller irrigation projects, the re-grassing of pasture lands, re-settlement of farmers who are now in submarginal areas, and small water conservation and drainage works. All of these measures will be of immeasurable assistance in the plan for greater diversification in agriculture and, hence, greater economic security for the farmers and a much higher farm production income within our province.

Practically every country in the world today is faced with the problem of soil erosion, and soil conservation — under which comes the problem of soil erosion — attracting the attention of the governments of most countries in the world today, particularly in the United States to the south where there are tremendous ravages by soil erosion. I believe that in this province the government, through this new department, will stress now more than ever before active steps to counteract the wasting of our top six inches of soil upon which depends the whole economy of this province in the main. Better soil and cultural practices could easily step production and increase the average yield in any year in this province, perhaps even to one to two bushels per acre. That would mean an increased production income in agriculture of possibly 30 or 40 million dollars in one year by better control and cultural methods.

I would like to take a few minutes if I may to speak of some other of the worthwhile achievements of our government during the past four and one-half years. The legislation along the lines of social welfare and health have been costly because of rising costs. Of course rising costs affect everything; but these services have provided greater protection and security than every before to our citizens, a large percentage of whom could not afford these services if the costs were not spread over all the people of Saskatchewan. We believe we can do collectively for all the people of this province what they cannot each one do for themselves; and that applies to many of the achievements of this province, particularly the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan, which I believe has been one of the most humanitarian pieces of legislation ever placed on the statute books of the North American continent.

During this past year, I might say that rarely, whether it be Liberal, Conservative, Social Credit or C.C.F. — naturally we would not expect any criticism from the C.C.F., but from the other three parties — has there been any criticism whatever regarding the hospital services plan. I have been amazed in this House to see the attacks and criticisms against the hospital services prepaid plan. I am glad to note that British Columbia and Alberta have taken action to set up the hospital services similar to Saskatchewan's. In fact they came down here, as the Premier intimated the other day, and stayed for two or three weeks to copy our system. I was out there for a month and the people are paying the tax out there very gracefully, and there is very little criticism. Likewise, there is very little criticism of the sales tax three percent across-the-board. It brought in around \$12 to \$15 million. I heard very little about it. I heard little of anything about this hospital tax; the people were paying it. They were having great difficulty getting it started at the first of the year. They were charging \$15 per person in British Columbia as compared with \$10 in Saskatchewan. I believe \$12.50 is correct in Alberta, with some limit of 21 days. I am not going into any detail of the services being given under this plan; but I repeat again, it is the most popular piece of legislation placed on the statute books since Saskatchewan became a province, and there is no real opposition to it. In this province the opposition knows just as well as I do, or anyone else in this House, that they would never dare to remove it from the statute books if they ever had the chance.

During the two years of operation, including the old age pensioners and newborn babies, I believe that some 270,000 or 280,000 patients have received hospitalization under the hospital services plan. It is true that we have raised it to \$10, but even at that is it not bargain-price protection and security to all our people?

When the C.C.F. came into power in Saskatchewan, the hospital bed accommodation, I believe, was 3.9 per thousand. In 1946 it was increased to 5.8. Today it is 6.8 per thousand. 850 beds will be added this year, which will make the hospital bed accommodation almost double what it was in 1944, and one of the highest, if not the highest, in Canada. The B.C. plan started out, Mr. Speaker, and sent out a circular to the effect — I think it was afterwards withdrawn — that they had the highest hospital bed accommodation per thousand people of 5.5. I think, perhaps, that was just an error.

The federal government, as both sides of this House are aware, has been making a special payment or grant to the province for health services, of \$30 million, a portion of this to be devoted to increasing hospital accommodation. It is hoped that Saskatchewan, having gone ahead on its own and stepped up its hospital accommodation, will benefit to the same extent as she would have done had her hospital accommodation remained as it was in 1944, as in the case of most of the other provinces. I trust that she will participate in this hospital grant even though we have gone ahead of all the other provinces and built our hospitals. This government has contributed, I believe, \$1 million to aid hospital construction in the last two or three years in this province.

Another health service I would like to mention is the air ambulance. I re-emphasize those things because I realize, as do members on the other side of the House, that it is not possible for every member to make new statements of what the government is doing, and it is not possible, even on the other side, for the opposition to do anything but to reiterate their criticisms, each one giving more or less the same criticism of the government's programme. I mention the air ambulance which, during its brief three years of operation, has covered about a million miles and carried about 2,000 patients. The people appreciate this great protection and the security it has been giving them at a minimum cost. It is a remarkable security and protection to know that in the long winters, such as we have in Saskatchewan, patients can be taken to the nearest hospitals.

I would like, also to mention the protection and savings to the public through the operation of the automobile accident insurance. Since this legislation was put into effect, the estimated saving to the public for automobile insurance has run into hundreds of thousands of dollars, not to mention the protection given to every person in Saskatchewan, and particularly to the relatives of those who lost their lives in automobile accidents. In comparison with British Columbia or Manitoba, it would simply mean that extra cost and that the people taking out insurance would be forced to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars with the big insurance companies for high-priced automobile insurance with no protection to the public or its citizens only in motor car accidents.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Power Commission — so they tell me on the other side of the House — was set up by the Liberal government. I thought it was set up by the Anderson government. Anyway, it is a fine system of social ownership which they do not believe in. Electrical power is now a big question in the minds of Saskatchewan people. I would just like to set down a few facts as to the record of the power commission in this province during the past four years. I know something about power, at least from the standpoint of rural electrification, because the Anderson government was good enough, some 16 or 18 years ago, to run a line north towards Grand Coulee to Lumsden and on up; I just happened to be on that line. It was put in by the Montreal Engineering, which was a subsidiary of Sir Herbert Holt of Beauharnois — a name known, I believe, to the Liberal party. I might mention that, anyway, I have had power on my farm for 16 years. I was rather fortunate. This power line was purchased by the Saskatchewan Power Commission two or three years ago. Up to that time the average monthly rate that I paid was from \$9 to \$11 per month. There have been four cuts in rates during the past two years, and even the Liberals on that line are convinced that they are getting a pretty good deal. They have had four cuts in rates, as I previously stated, and they are

February 21, 1949

now paying the minimum of \$5.50, and they rarely go over \$6.50 a month. I sometimes wonder, Mr. Speaker, if we hadn't cut the power rates four times, if the people would have been satisfied if we had even cut them twice, and then we would have had another \$1.5 million of surplus. It is a point worth considering. We have cut them four times. If we hadn't cut them four times we would have had more than \$1.5 million more surplus. Even so, Saskatchewan is not in the happy position of Manitoba which has had available an ideal hydro-electric source of power. But even at that, the Saskatchewan Power Commission, since it has been trimmed up and put into shape during the last three years, and with the increase in the plant there using lignite screenings at 76 cents per ton delivered to the power house, Mr. Coles, the engineer, who was with the former government, stated that this is almost as cheap as power created in Manitoba.

I think I stated that at the present time the power plant at Estevan has been greatly increased. That only of course covers a small area of the province, but I believe it is to be further increased and a good deal of it will be extended to rural lines.

I re-emphasize what has been done: when the C.C.F. government came into office in 1944, the Saskatchewan Power Commission had accumulated a deficit of between \$200,000 and \$300,000, and had an outlet of 12,989 users with 1,600 miles of electrical power lines in the province. At the present time it has over 60,000 power consumers, and over 4,200 miles of line. In the past year, the accumulated surplus, after paying off this accumulated deficit, was \$1,412,000.

As outlined in the speech from the throne, plans are being made to introduce a rural electrification plan during this Session. I believe there will be a more rapid growth of power lines through the province, and particularly in the rural areas wherever it is feasible. I would like to draw to the attention of this House that in Manitoba they are requiring four users per mile; the farms are smaller there. In Ontario they get from six to ten users per mile. Saskatchewan is a province of large farms, and the Power Commission finds it difficult to extend power into many lines to get even two per mile, and one and one-half would be the very least they could do. South of Regina in the Milestone constituency and in my own constituency on the Regina plains, there are areas where it would be difficult to get one electrical user in two miles on an average. That makes it very difficult to give cheap power under rural electrification plan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about a different subject that I don't think even the opposition has touched on; that is, the farmer. I would like to say a few words about the oft-repeated criticism that food is too high priced. Because there are so many farmers here in this Assembly, on both sides of the House, I am speaking particularly of bread, butter, milk, eggs and meat. The farmers, as a class, are disturbed and indeed resent the criticism of many consumers and the press on food prices. At a meeting of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture in Saskatoon in January, 1949, a resolution was passed designed to fight propaganda for cheaper foods. I will read the preamble first. The resolution preamble said:

There is a tendency for the consuming public to welcome lower food prices without realizing that urban income will surely follow farm income in a downward trend.

Then the preamble went on to say:

There is evidence of an attempt to control inflation by the introduction of a cheap food policy without regard to the injury this would do to the agricultural industry, and the suffering it would cause farmers.

Further, at this recent convention in Saskatchewan, which I attended as a visitor, mention was made that a section of the press had given considerable publicity in editorials and otherwise to the furtherance of decreased prices of food. I think that was the Ontario press, to be frank and honest.

Finally, after the preamble, the following resolution was adopted:

That the Canadian Federation of Agriculture use every effort to place before the public the importance of the agricultural industry to the whole economy, the factors involved in producing and supplying food, and the wisdom of maintaining fair incomes to agricultural people to maintain a decent standard of living for them.

This is a question, I think, that may best be discussed by farmers and by this Legislature more freely, and the real facts laid before the consumers of Canada.

The spread in prices, of course, is a big thing. I could give you some figures, if you will bear with me just a few more minutes. The spread in prices between producers and the consumer has been investigated by a Committee of the House of Commons in some products such as breads; but I would like to give you some idea of the spreads in prices between the producer — the farmer who produces the goods — and the consumer.

Eric McKay, in the House of Commons the other day, made a statement regarding the spread in prices in Ontario. Tomatoes, which sell at 25 to 27 cents a tin, actually brought the producer 3 3/4 cents a tin; on peas at 16 cents a tin, the producer would receive 2 1/2 cents a tin; rolled oats sells at 14 cents a pound, the farmer gets 2 1/2 cents a pound.

I think I have said enough with regard to prices, but I can give you some examples in this province. I would like to cited a case, and not an extreme case at all; there were hundreds of them at that time, in 1932. This is a case of a farmer in the Tuxford area who told me that he had hauled wheat into the local elevator in June or July, 1932, and he had received the price of 19 1/2 cents a bushel net — No. 1 wheat, the best wheat in the world. On that same day the mills quoted prices net to farmers of oats at 5 cents a bushel, and barley at 8 cents a bushel, and cattle sold from 3/4 cents down to nothing, or up to 3 cents. Eggs were sold for as low as 5 cents a dozen. During the war agriculture accepted more restrictions on markets for the benefit of the consumer than any other industry. Remember the days of 1939 and 1942 while wheat was 67 cents a bushel, the net price to farmers was from

February 21, 1949

48 to 53 cents per bushel. I would like to quote from the Ottawa Journal with regard to these prices in 1939 to 1942 — I am not blaming Mr. Gardiner right now, we will blame him later — and I am not playing the game for the farmer particularly because I happen to be one; but it is the basic industry in this province and I am very much interested in farm prices, and I know something as to what the farmers have suffered in the past.

Mr. Gardiner was speaking the other day to the milk producers in Ottawa. A quotation from the Ottawa Journal makes this statement:

The whole idea in preventing high food prices in Canada during wartime was to allow a levelling out afterwards.

Mr. Gardiner remarked he was inclined to agree with the popular statement that consumers did not appreciate what wheat farmers did during the war in keeping the cost of food down. Mr. Gardiner said he was surprised that the farmers had not been able to sell the idea more fully. Later on, Mr. Gardiner said:

To reduce the cost of food would mean bringing down returns to farmers. People are inclined to forget that farmers, and dairy farmers in particular, were asked to hold their hand on prices during the war at a time when they might have charged almost whatever they wanted.

I would like to quote a recent statement if I might from Mr. H.H. Hannam, President of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, on an opinion he was giving on farm prices:

We are in a boom, a North American boom, and everyone is in it and sugaring it.

I would say, except for those who had no crops this year and other years.

Even so, farm prosperity was not outstanding. After 14 years in which farm prices were far below costs, it was not until 1944 that Canadian agriculture caught up with the others. For the past five years the farmers have enjoyed a favourable margin on parity ratio, but that margin was so small, according to the speaker, that it would take 30 years at the present rate to make up for the losses suffered during the thirties and the early war years. The farmers have, until recently, subsidized the millers for years from 30 to 60 cents a bushel possibly.

Reading through Hansard, one man has put it at 67 cents a bushel — below its market price. But I would like to quote right here — and this is the point I am perhaps getting to rather slowly — the policy of the C.C.F. national office in a C.C.F. pronouncement from the National Council at Ottawa on January 31.

In view of this, we urge the government of Canada to pay to the producers an additional sum for the 1946 and 1947 crops as compensation for their contribution in providing wheat to the millers at a low price at home and also in helping the economic recovery of western Europe.

I trust that the hon. members on the opposite side of the House will give full support to this proposal. I wonder.

I would like merely to mention that, at the present time, the C.C.F. is the official opposition in five Canadian provinces, and the government — and will remain the government of course — that is understood — in this sixth province of Saskatchewan. We, as a group, believe in the principles of social democracy in a government that is not tied to big business, although we have had a recent speaker who does not believe there is such a thing as big business, monopolies, cartels, national or international. I am amazed. We, as a group, believe in the principles of social democracy, and a government that is not tied to big business, not controlled by great monopolies. What about the Massey-Harris, Imperial Oil, heaps of others? Who knows but that the Liberal party may indeed be swinging to the left along with the C.C.F. More and more people are being convinced of the wisdom of the stand taken by the C.C.F. on the important questions of human welfare. For example, this view is contained in a recent publication, to which I would like to make reference. This article is written by a very famous Canadian statesman. In it he speaks of a new social order. I quote from the Canadian Welfare Magazine, the 25th anniversary edition, January 15, 1949:

In 1939 came the Second World War. The war, while it soon provided jobs for those who were able and willing to work, brought still more strongly to the fore the social injustices that had existed for too long a time. Men and women were compelled to think deeply on the social problems of life and the causes of human injustice. There came to be a growing belief in the necessity of a new and a better order. The new order seeks to shift the emphasis from the sacredness of possessions to the sacredness of life; to weigh more heavily the values of personality and its rights than the values of property and its rights, and to contrast with natural resources the too long neglected but much more precious human resources. The new social order seeks to recognize industry as a public service rather than as a private business, and to stress community well-being rather than individual self-interest.

And at the close of this article this very fine statement is made:

The state must recognize it also has a part to play, a part in furthering social justice much more definite than it has ever taken in the past.

That is not the end of the article, but that is the end of the quotation that I am making.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it might interest the hon. members to learn who the writer of those words actually was, and they were written within the last six weeks. He was none other than the Rt. Hon. W.L. McKenzie King, former Prime Minister of Canada. Here he advocates a degree of state intervention for which the opposition members in this House continually criticize this government at all times. It is high time that the hon. members opposite moved in step with the national policies of their own party.

February 21, 1949

Mr. Speaker, in a like manner, President Truman has recently made his position clear. I would like to quote from a recent article in a great American magazine, the Saturday Evening Post of February 9. This editorial is a definite and a bitter condemnation of the socialistic trend of President Truman's policies. This article is quoted from a statement made by Mr. Truman. Remember this is a condemnation, but they are quoting Mr. Truman as saying this:

Americans have abandoned the 'trickle down' concept of national prosperity, and believe that wealth should be created for the benefit of all. The government must see that every American has a chance to obtain his fair share of our increasing abundance.

Now the editorial closes its criticism and condemnation of Mr. Truman's policies with this statement. I quote again:

Despite all the lip service to private enterprise the President's programme leads straight to socialism as must any programme which rests on the assumption that the government is responsible for the economic welfare of every citizen; that the government must give him federalized medical care and subsidized housing, underwrite farm prices and dictate the minimum which people may accept as wages.

There is also a distinct trend to social democracy in Australia, New Zealand, Great Britain and other countries in Europe and throughout the world. I appreciate very much a series of articles in The Leader-Post by John Gunther. I make no apology for re-emphasizing this little quotation from John Gunther, which was given before in this House by the mover of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I am sure everybody has read it. I was surprised to read it. I think The Leader-Post is making progress because they have printed this grand article. I quote John Gunther's article:

The chief hope for Europe, outside the immediate respiration provided by E.R.P., is the growth and the consolidation into power of moderate socialist governments.

John Gunther is not C.C.F., but he is fair. I am going to read that again if I may:

The chief hope for Europe, outside the immediate respiration provided by E.R.P., is the growth and the consolidation into power of moderate socialist governments like that of England; of coalitions between the moderate socialist and moderate Catholic groups as in Belgium and the Netherlands. The one thing to be said firmly is something that Americans from their fortunate vantage point may not like to hear, namely, that old-style capitalism is as dead in Europe as Nebuchadnezzar's Aunt.

The C.C.F. has proven by its policy that it is a truly humanitarian movement which is interested only in social and economic justice for the masses of its citizens, and not for the privileged few.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, in closing, that the C.C.F. is the one party in Canada, and the only party in Canada, that is in line with this great world movement towards social democracy as outlined by the Rt. Hon. McKenzie King or President Truman or some of these others that I have mentioned, such as John Gunther; the movement with which our future Canadians are inevitably bound up.

I shall support the motion.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.