

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Eleventh Legislature**  
**10th Day**

**Wednesday, February 23, 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. W.J. Patterson (Cannington):** — Mr. Speaker, on what is probably about the thirtieth occasion on which I have taken part in the debate on the address-in-reply to the speech from the throne, I may say that every new Legislature following a general election presents certain interesting experiences. I think in this House, Sir, there are some 29 members who were members of the previous Legislature; there are some 23 who were elected for the first time, but of those, four formerly belonged to this House. I don't know whether I have any right to extend any welcome to the members of the Legislature or not, but if I have any such right, I am glad to do so.

I would particularly wish to extend my congratulations to the members for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, Gravelbourg, Battleford and Saltcoats, who once again resume their places in this Legislature.

The average individual who is elected to membership in this august body is, perhaps, inclined to be a little optimistic about what he or the Assembly can accomplish. As time goes on, he or they find that the operations of a Legislature are fairly practical, and that the attainment of those high ideals which the members had in mind when they were elected are not so easily secured as might appear at first glance to be possible.

During the past four years, Sir, you have acted as Speaker of the Legislature of the province of Saskatchewan, and I congratulate you on being returned to that office. During that period, we have managed to get along fairly well. We have not had very many great or serious difficulties, and I presume and hope that condition will apply in the following four years.

I congratulate the hon. member for Watrous (Hon. Mr. Darling) on having been promoted to Cabinet rank. I am sure that in that office he will demonstrate and bring to fruition those sound and practical qualities which his addresses to the Legislature when he was a private member indicated him to be possessed of. Confidentially or frankly, I may say that I am a little jealous, perhaps, of the hon. member because over a long period of years it was my privilege to be Minister of one of the departments which he now has, and which is very dear to me; that is the Department of Telephones. I only hope he will continue in that department the same sound, practical methods of business administration which have been applied to it over the forty years that it has been in operation.

I would like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the resolution. The statements they made will come under consideration a little later on. I would say to them that I appreciate the difficulties which any new member, speaking for the first time in this Legislature, faces when he gets up to make an address on this or any other subject. I think they did credit to themselves. They spoke

with an assurance that, perhaps, is not altogether justified in view of the fact that neither of them represent a majority of the people of the constituency from which they come. Nevertheless, they did credit to themselves.

It is customary in the debate on the address to more or less review what has happened during the past year. That seems to be a very proper procedure. The House usually meets early in the new year and we have an opportunity, on this particular address, to review what has happened in the world, in Canada and in Saskatchewan during the preceding year.

One year ago we took the opportunity of rejoicing with and congratulating the heir to the British Throne on an apparently very happy and very prosperous wedding. This year we have the opportunity of extending congratulations on the birth of a son to that union, perpetuating, so far as human frailties permit, the continuation of the Royal line. I don't suppose that Prince Charles is greatly concerned, but I notice that he just barely got under the wire — he was referred to in the third last paragraph of the speech from the throne. However that may be, we hope and trust that he may enjoy health and prosperity and will ultimately take his place in a very distinguished line.

We regret, and every citizen on Saskatchewan regrets, I am sure, the illness which has affected His Majesty the King. We hope and pray that he will soon be recovered and be fully restored to carry out the onerous and exacting duties which are attached to his position, and that he may long continue to serve the people of Great Britain and of the British Commonwealth in the acceptable manner in which he has done so up to the present time.

Insofar as international affairs are concerned, the year 1948 has not been a very fortunate one. It has been a year of tension; it has been a year of threats of war or possibilities of war. We have seen some countries which elected a democratic government brought under the control of a communistic government. We have seen the iron curtain closed down, perhaps even more completely than was formerly the case. We have seen the progress of a communistic movement in China. A year ago, the Premier of the Province told us that Russia was bluffing. Whether that is the case or not, I do not know, but the fact does remain that the whole attitude and policy of the Russian government and its satellites has been one to make more difficult for the democratic countries of the world their aims of establishing better conditions, greater freedom for the peoples of the world throughout most of the nations of the world.

However, the year 1948 has not been entirely barren of pleasant results. Some of the countries, at least, that were overrun during the great war — Belgium, Holland — have made substantial progress towards recovery. There has been, more particularly in the United States, a stiffening of attitude and a greater willingness to assume responsibilities of world leadership to establish in this world, both by financial and economic assistance and by general attitudes to improve the condition of the nations of the world, to create a condition where we may enjoy peace and prosperity.

Probably the greatest development in that respect has been in the United States where men who, not very many years ago, were isolationists and who were disposed to put to one side any thought that that country had any responsibility to its sister nation, now show a disposition to relieve that policy and

to accept the general position that, as the wealthiest and the greatest trading nation in the world, the United States today has the responsibility for the maintenance not only of peace, but of world prosperity. Even in our own province and in our own dominion: a year or two ago we were listening to addresses by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Social Welfare, the Minister of Education, criticizing the Marshall Plan, criticizing the attitude of the United States, but even their own party, during the last year, has somewhat moved away from that attitude and has accepted as part of world recovery the idea that the democratic countries of the world must make their contribution to restoring the democratic countries of the world must make their contribution to restoring world well-being. Only recently, there has been much discussion about the North Atlantic Pact. That is a realistic approach to a practical problem, not tethered up with theory and ideas; an approach by those countries that face on the Atlantic to join together realizing that the United Nations has not accomplished what its sponsors and its supporters hoped for it; a realistic approach on the part of Norway, Belgium, Holland, France, Canada, United States and Great Britain to provide, as far as is possible within any organization they can create, for the protection of those countries and of their people. I say, Mr. Speaker, that is a realistic approach to the practical problems that face us in the world today.

In the United States, much to everybody's surprise, Mr. Truman was re-elected as President. That, it would seem to me, indicates an acceptance on the part of the people of that great country of truly liberal principles and truly liberal policies as their guiding motive and as the path they propose to follow. They had a candidate in the United States who proposed much the same type of policy that is proposed in Saskatchewan and Canada by the C.C.F. His name was Mr. Wallace — he didn't get very far.

In the past year, in the international sphere also, there was another important development — the establishment of the State of Israel. It has created a great deal of controversy, debate and argument. The fact remains that that state has been established. It has been recognized by most of the countries of the world, and I hope and trust that it will go a great distance in removing and eliminating what has been a matter of controversy for many years in this world of ours.

Insofar as Canadian affairs are concerned, the year 1948 has been probably outstanding for the reason that during that year the three major political parties held national conventions, and in two of them new leaders were appointed. In the third, the former leader was re-appointed. Well, that at least ought to give us this satisfaction, Sir. We should now know what the three major political organizations in Canada stand for, what their objectives are. We know who their leaders are, and we know what they are striving for.

Something that has not been mentioned in this debate is, I think, of paramount importance to us as Canadians; that is the admission of the province, or what is to be the province, of Newfoundland into our Confederation. I am sure that will be acceptable to, and will be welcomed by, all the people of Canada because we do feel that it is rounding out something that was attempted to be done 70 years ago. We welcome the people of that sister colony, or sister province as it is going to be, and we hope and trust that when they commit their welfare to the Parliament of Canada and associate themselves with the other citizens of Canada they will receive all they could hope or expect from that association.

So far as the province of Saskatchewan is concerned, the year 1948 of course, politically, was of primary interest because of the provincial election which was held in June of that year. There is a good deal of discussion about the votes, the percentage of votes, and all that sort of thing. I doubt if we will gain very much by wasting our time on that kind of discussion. There are certain fundamentals that emerge from that election. The first is that the present government of Saskatchewan no longer represents a majority of the people. The second important item is that its membership has been greatly reduced; in fact, two Cabinet Ministers went down to defeat. Thirdly, its loss of support was largely in the rural areas of the province, and fourthly, a very small further change in the vote would have resulted in the defeat of the government. They can take the figures and they can analyze them, but those are the concrete and definite results of the election.

The present government of Saskatchewan, at least the party which now constitutes the present government of Saskatchewan, was established first as a farmer-labour party. It is rapidly becoming a labour party. The farmer part of it is being eliminated, and it is becoming more and more, as I said in this debate in previous sessions, representative of organized minority pressure groups rather than representing the majority of the people or the welfare of the great bulk of the population of our province. It won't be very long until it can properly call itself a labour government.

In connection with the election, criticism has been made in this Legislature of the use of the Bureau of Publications for political purposes. But we have a so-called Film Board in the province of Saskatchewan, and it equally has been used for political purposes. Here is a bill that was posted in the constituency of Wilkie on behalf of Mr. Ovie Hanson — well, Ovie doesn't live here anymore. But Ovie had "The Wings of Mercy", a film produced by the Saskatchewan Film Board, and he had a farm film comic — I don't know what it was — and he had his picture on the bill; in other words, the use of government funds to promote the political activities and in support of the political candidature of, in this case, Mr. Ovie Hanson.

Then, in this election for the first time we had the active participation in the election of members of the Civil Service, permitted and provided for by an amendment to The Public Service Act passed in this Legislature in the last session, as you will remember, Mr. Speaker. That was further implemented by a motion or a resolution passed at the C.C.F. convention in Moose Jaw in July last that the government could carry out more fully its avowed policy of employing only known socialists in key government positions. Well, we know something about the government's avowed policy prior to that convention, because during the provincial election a number of Civil Servants exercised the rights that were given to them by this amendment that I speak of.

We are discussing, Sir, the speech from the throne. Every once in a while during the course of history new political parties are organized, and almost in every case they start off by condemning the methods of the parties that are in operation at that time. One of their regular criticisms is that the old parties are caucus-governed, caucus-controlled. And the new parties, of course, are going to eliminate caucus-control of government. So far as we are concerned

— and I am not going to make any secret of it — the Liberal party, over the years, has held caucuses of its Liberal members, and we are going to continue to do that. But we do not propose to transfer to caucus, whether we are in government or in opposition, the right to direct and regulate legislation which should properly come before this Legislature. We believe that the elected representatives of the people should have the right, and it is their duty and responsibility to pass upon legislation and other matters in connection with the administration of government. What do we find? We find that in November, 1948, a caucus of the C.C.F. members was held in the province of Saskatchewan. No official announcement of what transpired during the caucus was given by Premier T.C. Douglas. He indicated that general legislative matters were discussed. Then in January, 1949, the C.C.F. members of this Legislature were called to meet in caucus, originally for three days — ultimately it carried on for six days, including Sunday. When it was over the Premier said the caucus which had just finished its sittings devoted itself entirely to discussions of proposed legislation and to long-term plans for the next four years.

**Premier Douglas:** — Shouldn't the members be consulted?

**Mr. Patterson:** — No, I did not say that. I would say that if the C.C.F. caucus can meet for a couple of days in November and six days in January and cannot discuss anything more than the speech from the throne that we have before us, they might just as well have stayed home.

**Premier Douglas:** — . . . more than you printed in four years.

**Mr. Patterson:** — Oh, yes, I must apologize; I missed the Minister of Labour. He put in his mite: "I have checked with the Chairman of the caucus and he confirms my own recollections that neither The Trade Union Act nor its administration was ever mentioned. There was no suggestion that any labour legislation should be repealed, and there was no criticism whatever of the administration of The Apprenticeship Act."

Can you imagine, Sir, the 31 members sitting on your right could hold a caucus in November and another caucus in January, after having just barely shaved through in the election last June, and paying no attention or consideration to the conditions which brought about their near defeat? However, we accept the Premier's statement. He says: "They devoted themselves entirely to a discussion of the proposed legislation." But I repeat, Sir, that if this speech from the throne is the best production that the 31 supporters of the government can produce after six days of deliberation, eliminating everything else except the future, the best evidence that they are not able and not competent to give this province good government.

**Premier Douglas:** — You did not produce that much in four years.

**Mr. Patterson:** — Now, that does raise a general question and I am not going to elaborate on it because, as I say and I have already admitted, all parties have their caucuses, but the surprising thing is that these reformist parties, these evangelical

parties that are most critical of the old parties for having caucuses, use that — exercise that right — to a greater extent themselves than was ever the case before. If this government wants to decide legislation and administration for the province of Saskatchewan in caucus, instead of on the floor of this Legislature, so long as they are the majority they will exercise that right. But I want to tell the people of Saskatchewan that the time will come when a decision with regard to legislation and administration will be restored to the elected representatives of the people.

**Premier Douglas:** — It will be decided in the Northern Crown Building then.

**Mr. Danielson:** — It won't be long now.

**Mr. Patterson:** — The hon. member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) analyzed the speech from the throne. He divided it into three sections: what was past, what was present, and what was the future — what was, what is or what is to be. I am afraid that the hon. member for Redberry, in his inexperience — and I don't criticize him for it — perhaps somewhat over-estimates the value and the worth of promises for the future. Some of us who have been in the House longer, and have analyzed previous speeches from the throne, do not accept what the government may put in the mouth of the Lieutenant Governor at face value. We know of cases where absolute mis-statements were included in the speech from the throne. We know of one case where His Honour was made to say that extensive grants had been made, and as a matter of fact, there had not been a single grant of any kind made. We know that in the speech from the throne of 1947, it was stated that the production of rock wool will be established or set up next year. We know that the speech from the throne of 1948 said: "Investigations are being carried on with respect to production of rock wool", and in 1949, rock wool isn't mentioned at all. We know that from time to time we have been promised a pulp mill, a soap factory, a paint factory . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — You'll get the soap all right.

**Mr. Patterson:** — No, no, my hon. friend from Redberry should not be too optimistic, he should not be too trustful about what the speech from the throne promises, because from experience we find they do not count for so very much. "The production of rock wool will commence this year," was stated in the 1947 speech from the throne. In 1948: "Research and experimentation in the production of rock wool are continuing." In 1949, rock wool has disappeared. So I would say to our members on this side of the House, if the supporters of the government are prepared to accept these promises for the future, that is their business, but I would warn the members on our side of the House not to be too greatly concerned or too greatly affected by what this government promises to do.

Now the speech from the throne says this: "Important steps have been taken during the past years to improve the economy of Saskatchewan." No speaker on that side of the House has yet quoted any of these important steps. They put that statement in the mouth of the King's representative; but what are the proofs or what are the supports for the statement. So far they have not been forthcoming.

As a matter of fact, Sir, this government has enjoyed a very enviable condition. They came into office when times were good, when there was nearly \$9 million in the provincial treasury, when unemployment and relief or social aid had been reduced to a minimum, when public revenues were buoyant, and all they have done is coasted along. When anything went wrong, that was the fault of the dominion government. So far as producing any policy provincially, what have they done? Nothing. But the people of Canada once a year celebrate Thanksgiving Day for the blessings which Providence bestows upon them. The Premier of this province should get down on his knees every day and offer up a prayer of thanksgiving, because his period of office has been placed in such pleasant places.

Now, we are told, after the actions have been taken to improve the economy of the province, that mineral production in 1948 reached an all-time high, and that the exploration for petroleum is assured in large areas for the coming year. There is nothing that this government has done that has produced either of those conditions. If those objectives have been reached or are to be reached, it is in spite of rather than because of any action of this government to bring them about.

In 1944 the then Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Phelps) issued a little booklet, "The Natural Resources of Saskatchewan, 1945". I think the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) quoted from it, but it is worth quoting again because it was the first and the official pronouncement of the C.C.F. policy in Saskatchewan with regard to the development of our natural resources. In paragraph 2 it says, first of all: "To be consistent with true socialism." One of these days we hope some of the members of the government will define for us who are true socialists and who are un-true socialists. When I say that I don't mean the fellows that make incorrect statements of facts, but I mean those who are theoretically true socialists and whose policies are true socialism and those who are not. "To be consistent with true socialism", that is the objective of this government. "Eventually, it is hoped to establish complete social ownership and management of key industries in the development of our resources.

So far as I know, that official statement of policy has never been corrected or never been changed. It still represents the attitude of this government as indicated by the Premier when he goes down to the Regina Forum, or some other organization of that kind. True, he may indicate something a little different when he goes to the Chambers of Commerce or something of that kind.

Does the speech from the throne that is now before us represent a change in C.C.F. policy, in socialist policy, with respect to the development of our natural resources in Saskatchewan, or are we still to accept the statement made by Mr. Phelps in 1944, and which has never been corrected or changed, as far as I know?

Last year we criticized the government of Saskatchewan because by their action or inaction, because of their attitude, there had not been the search for petroleum and gas and oil in this province that they had had in Alberta. When we said that Alberta had a Leduc, the Premier told us: "But we haven't got the Rocky Mountains in Saskatchewan, neither have we a Lake Superior." Well, the oil at Leduc is not coming out of the Rocky Mountains, neither is it coming out of Lake Superior . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Nor out of Manitoba.

**Mr. Patterson:** — It is coming out of an area very similar to thousands of acres in the province of Saskatchewan; an area that would attract the private investor — the fellow who is prepared to put some money in on the chance that he get recovery. We have thousands of acres in the province of Saskatchewan that appear on the surface, insofar as anyone can tell, of equal possibilities with Leduc in the province of Alberta. No, we haven't a Lake Superior, we haven't the Rocky Mountains, and that was the answer the Premier gave to us when we criticized his government for its lack of interest in, or its inability or its reluctance to promote petroleum search in this province.

Now, apparently, the government has somewhat changed its mind, and we are told that we are going to have exploration for petroleum in large areas. That is five years too late, that is all that is wrong with that.

**Premier Douglas:** — 25 years too late.

**Mr. Patterson:** — The speech from the throne makes reference to electrification. Well, that is only one of the things that was promised the people of this province back in 1944. I remember when Miss Agnes McPhail come out into my constituency, she promised them bathtubs. I don't know whether they would prefer rural electrification or bathtubs. The fact remains they haven't either. Others were going to get their houses painted. Well, the Minister of Reconstruction has gone a good distance. Last year, I think, he got 138 farm units painted. On the basis of the number of farm units in Saskatchewan, if he lives to be a little older than Methuselah, he may be able to complete his programme in the province.

Now, we are going to have the co-operation with The Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act. Again, an action, if it is carried out — and as I pointed out, we cannot be confident of these promises made in the speech from the throne — is just five years later than it should have been. The Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act has been functioning in this province for many years. Under the Liberal administration, there was a very substantial measure of co-operation between the provincial and the federal governments. During the last five years the case has been the opposite. Now we are told that the provincial government is going to step in and supplement the policies of the federal operation and inaugurate a programme in this province to make them fully effective. That is very agreeable and very satisfactory except that it has taken them five years to work off their spleen and their criticism of the federal government before they are prepared to act with it.

We can scrutinize the speech from the throne, and we can come to the conclusion that in spite of the efforts of the C.C.F. caucus, in spite of the mental energies and mental efforts of the government, they have presented to this Legislature the most thread-bare and minimal speech from the throne that has, probably, every been presented to a Legislature in the history of this province. Maybe that is not unexpected for this reason: back in September, 1939, most citizens of Canada were very greatly concerned about the condition that was developing. At that time there was a C.C.F. publication in Manitoba



called the Manitoba Commonwealth. There was a publication in British Columbia called the Federation. I don't think, at that time, the C.C.F. organization had a publication in the province of Saskatchewan.

**Premier Douglas:** — Oh, yes.

**Mr. Patterson:** — Did they? What was it?

**Premier Douglas:** — The Saskatchewan Commonwealth.

**Mr. Patterson:** — In September, 1939? Well, how in the world did they not reproduce this editorial that appeared in British Columbia and Manitoba?

**Premier Douglas:** — You will have to ask the editor.

**Mr. Patterson:** — This is what the editorial said:

With the dogs of war unleashed, and the greater part of public interest focused on the conflict in Europe, the concern of the C.C.F. is to its own well-being.

Not the welfare of Canada; not the welfare of the world; the concern of the C.C.F. is to its own well-being. To show you what general approbation that sentiment enjoyed, it was published in the Manitoba Commonwealth on September 1, 1939, just a week before the war broke out, and it was copied from the British Columbia Federation. If the C.C.F. Commonwealth of Saskatchewan was published at that time, I cannot understand why it wasn't published in that, because it was a statement of party policy which applied at that time, and which applies equally today. The concern of the C.C.F. is not the welfare of the people of Saskatchewan; the concern of the C.C.F. is not the welfare of the people of Canada; the concern of the C.C.F. is to its own well-being.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Read the whole paragraph.

**Mr. Patterson:** — Well, I will read the other sentence:

Here in Canada our concern is for the C.C.F.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Read the whole editorial. I challenge you.

**Mr. Patterson:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I congratulated the mover and seconder on their addresses in moving and seconding this resolution. When I say this, of course, it does not mean that I agree with what they said. Both of them spoke with remarkable assurance for men who represent less than 40 percent of the people who sent them here. That is all right, I suppose. In this world a man who has a good deal of assurance maybe gets farther than he is ordinarily justified in doing. When a man gets up in this Legislature and pretends to represent a majority of the people of his constituency, and presents certain ideas, when, as a matter of fact, he represents considerably less than half of them, I say he has a considerable amount of assurance. It is quite proper for the hon. member for Canora

(Mr. Kuziak), or the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker), to get up and condemn the capitalistic system, a system of individual enterprise, saying it brings this about and that about, and all the rest of it. That is their privilege. We don't have to accept it because in most cases the facts don't bear out the claims that are made. But I would say to both of the hon. gentlemen, first of all, that when they come into this House and make the speeches which they used in the Community Halls of their constituencies during the election, they will find they won't carry anything like the same weight or the same effect, and they will have to modify their attitude and their approach to this thing. When they come into a deliberative assembly of this kind, it is not sufficient to just make general statements and general condemnations. They will find that they will have to back them up with facts and figures.

**An Hon. Member:** — They will do it.

**Mr. Patterson:** — As I said, this is about the thirtieth time I have spoken on this address, and I can remember more than one new member that came in here and made a wonderful speech on the address, using the same material they had been using out in the country schoolhouses and the little Community Halls, where there was no criticism. Everybody had to accept what they said. They can suit themselves, it is up to them, whether they get down to a more realistic basis or not.

I doubt very much whether the good people of Canora or Hanley differ very much from the residents of the constituency which I have the honour to represent. I imagine that most of them would prefer to work out their own salvation; that they are not depending on governments to help them out. I suppose if there is anything that I am proud of more than anything else it is that I come of pioneer stock. My father and mother did not come here to have pensions or aid of one kind or another. They came here to establish a home and they devoted their best efforts, sometimes under very difficult circumstances to establish themselves and to provide an education for their children. Now, if there is any hon. member in this House, whether he is from Canora, Hanley, or anyplace else, who thinks he is doing his people a good turn by encouraging them to expect help and aid and assistance from the government, then I say to him in all seriousness and as one who is just as much concerned about the welfare of the people and of the province as anybody in this province, he is not doing these people either justice or a good turn. I am satisfied that the majority of the people of this province only want an opportunity to own their land and to operate it and to carry on their private affairs with a minimum of government restriction and government regulation. If the people of Canora figure that they would be better under some form of government control and regulation, similar to what they have in Russia, Bulgaria and Hungary, the hon. member is perfectly free to advocate it, but he cannot get up in this House and say that he represents a majority of the people of his constituency, and I doubt, if he advocates anything of that kind, if he even represents a majority or at least a percentage equal to those he got in the election.

The hon. member for Hanley had a great deal to say about this so-called economic control. We have in Canada, and we have in the United States, a great many large corporations owned by thousands of individuals, and they do exactly what the people of Hanley did. They elect a board of directors to manage their

business for them. The only thing in those organizations is that a majority is required, but if some 30 percent of the electors in the constituency of Hanley elected the hon. member to speak for them, and he comes down here and presumes to express their opinion . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Big corporations were more democratic.

**Mr. Patterson:** — The big corporations are more democratic than the C.C.F., as I will show you in a minute, Mr. Speaker. I say this, here we have a large corporation composed of thousands of individual shareholders. From time to time they meet and they elect a body to represent them on that point. What else can they do? What other practical method can be followed? In the political field, we have an election every four years or so, and the electors of a constituency, in this case some 30-odd percent, said: “we will elect the hon. gentleman to speak for us in the Legislature.” He is just in the same position as the directors of the large corporations — more democratic or less democratic, we will leave that for you to argue.

One of the most noticeable things last year — it is represented in the speech from the throne — is the decline of the C.C.F. party in what you might call political aggression. It is much milder, much tamer than it used to be. On the other hand, physically it has become much more aggressive. During the year we had Mr. Coldwell grabbing the microphone from in front of Mr. Drew. We had Mr. Temple threatening to knock Mr. Drew’s block off. We had a Minister of this province kicking a newspaper reporter out of his office. And we had the Premier of this province threatening to knock somebody’s teeth down his throat and kick him out of office. What they have lost in political aggressiveness they have gained in physical aggressive. Whether that is a good thing or not, I don’t know.

**Premier Douglas:** — Wasn’t there a Liberal M.L.A. got scratched, too?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Patterson:** — There used to be a saying something about what you lose on the swings you make up on the roundabouts, or something like that. That is what happened in Saskatchewan. The C.C.F. has lost political aggressiveness and has gained a certain measure of physical aggressiveness.

The Premier quibbled a great deal about the use, by the Leader of the Opposition, of the terms ‘grants’ and ‘subsidies’. As the hon. member for Melfort properly pointed out, the public accounts list under subsidies from the dominion government under this very agreement, ‘grant’, etc. I don’t know that this is a very important point. If we wanted to make much of it we might refer to the fact that the Premier quibbled a bit about the titles of various governments which he credited as being democratic socialists. The only man that I can find in Saskatchewan who has ever used the words democratic socialist is Mr. Cadbury, the gentleman who was imported from Great Britain to advise the people of Saskatchewan how to conduct their business. I cannot find, in any

reference to the government of Saskatchewan, the words calling it 'Democratic Socialists'. It is usually referred to as the C.C.F. government. I looked up the Official Year Book for New Zealand which is the official year book of the government of New Zealand, and it calls itself a Labour Government. The Australian Year Book does not make any reference to the title of the government — Labour, or what have you; but I think, generally, it is regarded and referred to as a Labour government. Then I looked up the 'Who's Who' for Great Britain, and I find that Mr. Attlee, unlike the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan, does not call himself a 'Democratic Socialist'; he calls himself 'Labour'. So does Mr. Bevin, both Mr. Bevin and Mr. Bevan, and so does Sir Stafford Cripps. The only man I could find in the British government who did not call himself a 'Labour' member, was Mr. Alexander; he calls himself a 'Co-operative'. I mention that only for one reason, Mr. Speaker. You may remember the occasion when in this House two years ago, when the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) claimed that Mr. Alexander was a Co-operative member, the government side of the House booed, and laughed, and jeered at him; but if they look up the British 'Who's Who' they will find that Mr. Alexander still calls himself a 'Co-operator'. This jiggling around about what words mean — 'grants' and 'subsidies', 'socialist' and 'democratic socialist' — does not mean so very much.

The Premier made a great deal about the Leader of the Opposition having, on one occasion, allegedly voted with his party notwithstanding that he did not approve of the motion. That criticism comes with no great force from a leader of a party which is the only party in Canada, outside of the Communist party, which excommunicates its members for not carrying out the party lines. Here I have a statement made on July 12, 1948, at Sudbury, Ontario: "Six members of the Ontario C.C.F. have been expelled for supporting R.H. Carlin who ran in Sudbury as an Independent C.C.F." The leader of the party, the only party in Canada except the Communist party which expels its members for not following the party line and not accepting dictation from the central office, has the nerve and the audacity in this House to criticize the leader of the Liberal party, one party which has never expelled any member for having his own opinions or voting as he saw fit. This case that I referred to isn't the only one. Members of the C.C.F. party in Manitoba were excommunicated; members of the C.C.F. party in British Columbia were excommunicated, not for having their own opinions and not for having a different idea of party politics, but because they refused to carry out the instructions sent down to them from the central office.

**Premier Douglas:** — For supporting the communists.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Oh no, no.

**Mr. Patterson:** — Then I find this too, Mr. Speaker. Very recently the C.C.F. party had a convention and they decided that nobody could be a candidate unless he had paid his dues to the party. That was the first condition. The second condition, as I have already outlined, was that he must comply with the party line, accept the party policy and comply with the instructions sent out from the central organization.

A good many members on this side of the House, and I think perhaps if some of the members on the other side of the House had expressed their opinion they would have agreed, make some reference to the vaudevillian attitude which the Premier took towards a serious debate in this Legislature, and his readiness to answer an argument with a quip or to meet a fact with a joke. Those of us who have been in the Legislature longer are not astonished at that. We have experienced that before. If it is sufficient for the Premier of this province to meet a vital argument or to answer a substantial fact with a joke or an evasion or repartee, that is his business.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Don't you wish you had a sense of humour.

**Mr. Patterson:** — At one time princes, princesses, potentates and rulers had an official attached to their court, called a Court Jester. That practice has very largely disappeared.

**Mr. Danielson:** — He missed his calling.

**Mr. Patterson:** — It seems to be re-instated in Saskatchewan to a certain extent, but I have not yet heard of any prince, potentate or ruler who was his own Court Jester.

Those of us, like the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), myself, and the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Marion), who were privileged to be here a year ago and to hear the debate on the address at that time have been greatly struck by the change in the attitude of the Premier. I am not going to deal with it this afternoon. It will more properly come up in connection with the budget. I refer to the financial agreement between the dominion and the province. These gentlemen will remember the references that were made last year to the Crown Corporations. Before I go on to deal with that, may I refer to just one little item; it is not so very important.

In May, 1948, in accordance with a motion of this Legislature, unanimously adopted, the government of Saskatchewan donated \$60,000 to the Canadian Appeal for Children Fund. Everybody was in agreement with that, and the Saskatchewan News made full publicity of it. The only thing that was missing was the fact that there was a condition attached to that, and that was that this Fund committee should buy an equal quantity or value of goods from the Saskatchewan Government Industries to balance the \$60,000 of a contribution. Notwithstanding that, the Premier now tells us that these Crown Corporations, the majority of them, are 'problem children' or failing that, they are in very doubtful health.

**Premier Douglas:** — Not the majority of them. I said three. Three out of about 18.

**Mr. Patterson:** — Here is the Saskatchewan News of February 16, 1948: "Crown Corporations show a net profit of over \$5 million, declares Douglas. . . In this report on the financial position of the Crown Corporations, the Premier said that all had shown a profit in this fiscal year ending March 31, 1947, before depreciation was allowed.

To analyze the positions in respect to Crown Corporations, we have to go back four years. In the election of 1944, not only our local C.C.F.ers but all of the imported carpet-baggers from Ontario, Nova Scotia, British Columbia, Alberta and Manitoba were in here promising the people of Saskatchewan certain benefits and certain advantages. When they were asked: "Where is the money coming from to provide these services," the answer was, first of all, they were going to impose special taxes on certain corporations whose profits went out of the province, and, secondly and primarily, the government was going to go into business and from the profit from these businesses, the people were going to have the bathtubs and the painting and all of these other things that I have mentioned.

When this government came into office, there were two public service utilities operating in the province of Saskatchewan. One was the Telephone Department which was established 40 years ago, and the other was the Power Commission which was established 20 years ago.

**Premier Douglas:** — Which was losing money.

**Mr. Patterson:** — Both of these were established on the same basis. When the government of the day went into the telephone business, it said to the people of Saskatchewan: "We are going into the telephone business; we are going to use public credit to finance it, but it won't cost the taxpayer a nickel because from the earnings of that business we will pay the interest and the depreciation on the money that is invested in them." Exactly the same policy was established in connection with the Power Commission. In both cases they said: "We are going to give the public service at cost." It did not cost the taxpayers anything, but, on the other hand, they were not established with the idea of making profits to meet the ordinary operations of government.

This government established certain Crown Corporations — I do not know whether it is 13, 15 or 18; the more there are the worse it is — on an entirely different basis. They said: "We're going into business. We're going to put public money into it; we are going to make profits, and we will take those profits to reduce your debts." What is the net result, Sir? The net result is that putting aside for the moment the two public service utilities that were established and successfully operated prior to this party being formed, prior to this government going into office, there has been some \$6 or \$7 million of the money of the people of the province of Saskatchewan put into a brick factory, shoe factory, tannery, sodium-sulphate plant, and woollen mill, and, contrary to the record of both of the public service utilities, not one of them has repaid one dollar of interest to the public treasury for the money advanced to them. They do not pay taxes to the municipality, to the province, or to the federal government. The Premier admits that four of them are 'problem children' and another five are 'doubtful', and one of these doubtful children has nearly \$2 million of our money invested in it up at Chaplin in a sodium-sulphate plant.

**Premier Douglas:** — I did not say it was doubtful. I said it was making a reasonable success and we thought it was well on the way toward being a permanent success.

**Mr. Patterson:** — The Premier spoke at Gull Lake, I think it was on April 28. He said: “As I was driving out here I saw the evidence of the money that had been spent by the government at Chaplin.” The only place that I know that you can drive in the province and don’t see some sign of \$2 million spent, is on the highways of the province of Saskatchewan. I would think that when the government spends \$2 million there ought to be some evidence to show for it. Then the Premier went on to say that this plant would make a million or two million dollars a year profit.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I don’t want to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but surely, when making a statement like that, he will quote something more reliable than that. My statement was that they would “sell” between \$1 and \$2 million worth . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Order. Nobody else is permitted to make a speech.

**Mr. Patterson:** — Well, let’s put it that way. I have a clipping here that says: “The Provincial income will be increased by a million dollars”. Now, Mr. Speaker, if every time this government spends \$2 million, it increases the provincial income by a million, it won’t be very long until we are bankrupt. That is not profits. They are going to produce 150,000 tons of this sodium sulphate — I don’t know its present value. I think it is around \$30 a ton.

**Premier Douglas:** — Oh no. It is about \$12 or \$14.

**Mr. Patterson:** — \$12 or \$14. Well, that is even worse. 150,000 tons at \$15, that is \$2,250,000 will be the value of the total production of this plant in a year.

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — I am sure the hon. member would not like to leave the wrong impression. There was approximately \$1 million, not \$2 million, invested in the plant.

**Mr. Patterson:** — It was a million and one-quarter last year. What have you put in it since? We haven’t got the reports yet, but it was a million and 200-odd thousand dollars when the Crown Corporations Committee met last year. At that time, Sir, the plant had not completed its dehydration machinery, or whatever it is called, and we were told about hundreds of thousands of its products they had in hand. We found out afterwards, however, they were damp and when they were dried out there was about a third of what was represented to us.

We were told by the Premier that the winterization of the brickyard at Estevan had not been successful. Last year, in the Crown Corporations Committee, we were told that process had cost approximately \$150,000. Imagine any sensible, practical business man spending \$150,000 to winterize a brick plant without first finding out whether there was some prospect of it being successful or bringing results. We have now, I think, roughly \$300,000 in a brickyard at Estevan, and half of that represents an absolute loss of investment.

**Mr. Tucker:** — No wonder taxes have gone up.

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — We will give the correct figures on the investment in Committee.

**Mr. Patterson:** — Well, I hope so.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Let's hope so.

**Premier Douglas:** — You won't understand them, I don't think.

**Mr. Tucker:** — You present them and we will understand them all right. So will the country.

**Premier Douglas:** — You will deliberately muddle them up again.

**Mr. Kuziak:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question? How is it that we have been spending money like drunken sailors and yet have reduced the old Liberal debt in the province of Saskatchewan?

**Mr. Patterson:** — The Premier, in his address in this debate, referred to the bus lines and the unfortunate conditions that they had run up against last winter. This statement that the Premier made was made on February 16 — I think it was made a day or two before that — and surely we had just as much snow on February 10 as we had on February 16, and certainly conditions, so far as the bus lines were concerned were just as difficult, but at that time everything was lovely. Now we are not very sure whether the bus lines can continue to operate at cost or not. All I want to say is that no government or any other organization can enter into commercial activities and expect to make a profit unless they use practical, sound business judgment. This government jumped into a shoe factory, tannery, woollen mill and a brickyard without any serious consideration of the factors that were involved. The hon. member for Arm River and the hon. member for Athabaska will remember the Premier telling us last year that there was an opening in Saskatchewan for somebody to start a glove factory. His tannery was going to make these finer leathers which could be made into gloves. There was also an opening, according to his statement, for what he called the needle trade; his woollen mill was going to produce the yarn. A poor misguided youth or young man with capital, who, on the strength of the Premier's invitation, stepped into Saskatchewan and started a glove factory, would not be in a very good position today. Or if somebody else had come in and started one of these needle-goods factories, what position would that person have been in today?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — There is one in the province.

**Mr. Patterson:** — Well, I hope he is not dependent on the woollen mills for his supplies.

**Premier Douglas:** — He's not dependent on the Liberals either.



**Mr. Patterson:** — The Premier tells us there are certain activities that have been profitable. One is the Government Printing Office; another is the Fur Marketing Service; and another is the Insurance Branch, and the other is the Timber Board. Note this, Sir, that in each and every one of these operations, the policy of monopoly or compulsion is applied. It is only because of that that they are successful. Where they have to meet ordinary competition, as in the case of the shoe factory and the woollen mill, they fall down.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Would the hon. member permit a question? Would he explain how there is compulsion in the Timber Board?

**Mr. Marion:** — Read up your Act.

**Mr. Patterson:** — Don't you know yourself yet? Even some of those activities in which compulsion was applied were not successful. I want you to note that in every one of these activities that the Premier said has attained a measure of success, they either enjoy a monopoly or a very large measure of compulsion.

Take the Insurance Office: every hospital in the province, every school district in the province has to insure with the government.

If you want to go and cut some time, you will find that you have to sell or deliver your product to the Timber Board. If you want to trap fur in certain areas, the only place you can send your catch to be marketed is to the Government Fur Marketing Board.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — That is only a half-truth.

**Mr. Patterson:** — Half true. It's a hundred percent true.

**Mr. Danielson:** — All we can get out of you over this is half-truths.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — What about the Wheat Board.

**Mr. Tucker:** — You are the one that said they did not have to insure.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You have him on his back. Keep going.

**Mr. Patterson:** — The hon. Minister of Agriculture at Allan said he could not believe that any government could compel a school district to insure with the Government Insurance Office.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I wish to make a correction. The hon. member had quoted me incorrectly. The question was raised and I said I was not sure. I did not say anything to the effect that, in my opinion, the government should not compel the school districts to take out government insurance.

**Mr. Tucker:** — You said “They were digging their own graves”, didn’t you?

**Mr. Patterson:** — I don’t know how the hon. member explained himself to his audience when he was a member of this House that placed on the Statute Books of the province of Saskatchewan a stipulation that every organization — school district, hospital, etc. — that received an annual grant from the government was required to place their insurance with the Government Insurance Office . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Or they would lose their grants.

**Mr. Patterson:** — Some reference was made to the Government Finance Office, and the Premier has assured us that the profits of the Power Commission are not going to be used to bolster up the woollen mill and the shoe factory and the box factory. But the fact does remain, Mr. Speaker, that any government Crown Corporation — the Telephone Department, for instance — can pay half a million or a million dollars to the Government Finance Office and that money can be expended by the box factory or the woollen mill or the shoe factory, without any reference to the government or to this Legislature. You cannot get away from that. That is in the law.

**Mr. Tucker:** — And dictatorship.

**Mr. Patterson:** — I am not sure, until we get the report of the Government Finance Office, that that has not happened. But the fact remains that the Telephone Department can pay \$500,000 to Mr. Cadbury and his associates, and Mr. Cadbury and his associates can give \$100,000 of that to the box factory, to the Fish Board, to the bus lines or any other government activity without it coming even to the government, let alone coming to this Legislature.

**Mr. Tucker:** — That cannot be denied.

**Mr. Patterson:** — There is a lot of controversy about industrial development. It would be a surprising thing, Sir, if in the light of the improved revenues of the farm population of this province during the last four or five years, there would not be some industrial development. What it would have been under proper conditions, or where the investor did not face the threats of socialist expropriation, none of us can say. The fact does remain that the Premier goes to a Board of Trade and says: “We welcome industrial development. We welcome investment in Saskatchewan.” Then he goes down to a Regina Forum and says: “We are going to eradicate capitalism.” What is the policy of the government? What is the policy of the Premier in respect to these things?

**Mr. Danielson:** — They change overnight.

**Mr. Patterson:** — It is essential in the development of business, in the development of a community, or in the development of a province, that there should be a substantial measure of confidence, trustworthiness. When we hear the Leader of the Government making one statement on one occasion, and almost an exactly opposite statement on

another occasion, it is to be wondered at that people who have money to invest, and who are desirous of seeing the province of Saskatchewan prosper and do well, are at a loss to know whether they enjoy the security or the safety that this government sometimes tries to make out they have.

In this province, as in every province, the matter of labour relations is an important one. I think every citizen, in the main, is anxious to see the utmost harmony between employers and employees, because surely every sensible man realizes that a factory or a shop or a mine that is in operation is better than to have that shop, mine or operation suspend operation. Now, if there is one employer that should be outstanding in his relation to his employees, it is the government. We have the government of Saskatchewan employing men in bus lines, woollen mills, brickyards and various other activities. The surprising thing is that every week or two during the past year you read something about the possibility of a strike, or a strike vote being taken, or a strike vote going to be taken in some activity run by the government of the province of Saskatchewan. Despite our much publicized Trade Union Act and the Labour Relations Board, and Mr. Bryden and Dr. Shumiatcher, it finally culminated last fall into a strike at the Government Insurance Office when for some five weeks the employees of a profitable operation were out on strike. Who was to blame I do not know. They could not settle it until they sent for Mr. Pat Conroy. When he came to Regina, the strike was very shortly afterwards settled. There were threats of strikes in the shoe factory, in the bus lines, in the Power Commission. Surely, if the government of Saskatchewan is going into business and is going to indicate, which it has not done yet, the profits that are made in business and utilize those to reduce our taxes, surely another objective we might add is to give a lead to employers of labour in the maintenance of the best labour-employer relations.

That is not all, Sir. In the Public Service of this province we have many individuals who have been employed for ten, 15 or 20 years, and, generally speaking, there is a feeling among those employees that as long as they carry out the duties of their office and come to work at the proper hour, they are reasonably sure of permanent employment. During the past four years we have had four or five or six long-time employees, some of them with 25 or more years' service, discharged.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — How many did you fire in 1934?

**Mr. Patterson:** — The reason given in one case was, and this dismissal took place in November, that he had not fulfilled his duties back in April. The Minister only found out in November that this particular employee — a very senior employee with, I think, 27 years service — had fallen down on his job in the previous April.

**Premier Douglas:** — Would you mind stating what Minister made that statement?

**Mr. Patterson:** — You did.

**Premier Douglas:** — May I say, Mr. Speaker, that that statement is not correct. I made no such statement.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You forget awful quickly.

**Mr. Patterson:** — Well, I will accept the Minister's statement. Why did he fire the employee?

**Mr. Dundas:** — Yes, tell us that.

**Mr. Patterson:** — The criticism of private industry used to be that when slack periods occurred the employers discharged the employees. But when the fish plant had no more fish to fillet, when the shoe factory had made all the shoes anybody would buy, when the tannery had made all the leather that anybody was likely to use, when the brickyard wouldn't work in the winter, the government followed the same practice for which they had criticized private employers. They went farther than that in the case of these employees that I speak of. They discharged them either without giving any reason or giving a reason which dated back six, eight or ten months. That may be all right, but "people who live in glass houses should not throw stones".

Last year this Legislature passed an Act to create an Administrator for the northern areas. I think the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Marion) referred to him as 'Uncle Joe', but anyway he was given complete control and authority over the administration of that area. Very recently we received from the Bureau of Publications a little booklet called "The New North". We only got this in September and I was wondering if this had been printed before the July elections in Cumberland and Athabaska, and when we asked the question we found that it was printed some time before. I wonder if the government were getting out a new booklet on "The New North" if they would somewhat modify their statements.

The New North is represented in this Legislature by the hon. member for Athabaska, and the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Blanchard). In this section of the province, where socialization was applied more completely and more extensively than anywhere else in the province, when the test was made the people of those areas repudiated it. In that country if you want to catch fish you have to go to the government and get a permit; if you want to cut timber you have to go to the government and get a permit; if you want to get a road built you have to go to the government and get assistance; if you want a school or if you want a hospital you are completely at the control and the mercy of this government. The people of the new north, taking advantage presumably of the increased educational facilities that were made available to them, repudiated the government and defeated the government candidates.

I think you can say, Sir, and the hon. member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Wellbelove) notwithstanding, that if the same measure of complete socialization is applied to his farmers and to the farmers generally in the southern part of the province the result would have been the same.

**Premier Douglas:** — You mean they would have to sell their wheat to the Wheat Board.

**Mr. Tucker:** — That is not the same question. The farmers want that.

**Mr. Patterson:** — No, we won't have to sell our wheat to the Wheat Board or we can sell it to the Wheat Board, but here is a part of the province where they appointed their dictator to take entire control of the whole north under the Act passed at the last session, which the Premier will remember.

That same gentleman, according to the press, conducted the campaign in the north with the help of Natural Resources planes, with the assistance of Cabinet Ministers, the Premier included, and with some ex-members of the Legislature, spending days and weeks in the north country promising them all this and heaven too. The Premier in one address, as he was reported, virtually said to them: "If you don't vote for us, you will be sorry." It may not have been in those words . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — No, I am sure not.

**Mr. Patterson:** — . . . but that is what he meant. I presume those people understood what he was threatening them with and what he was promising them; what he was going to do to them if they did not do what he wanted. As a result, the northern half of the province of Saskatchewan that has had socialization is represented in this Legislature by two members who sit on this side of the House.

There is a good deal of discussion about the hospitalization plan, but I have taken more time than I had intended to and I am going to refer only to one phase of it, a very minor phase but still rather important to those whom it affects. There is a considerable number of young people in the province of Saskatchewan who are in a group that does not have a very real easy time. I am referring to the nurses-in-training. One of the conditions of their employment when they go into the hospital to train is that any sickness, either hospital or medical care, is provided for them. Those girls have to pay their \$10 just the same. There are probably a couple of hundred in the General Hospital and probably nearly the same amount in the Grey Nuns Hospital, and in hospitals all over the province. It is one of the conditions of their employment that if they take sick, they are entitled to hospital care and medical treatment. Notwithstanding that, they are subject to the hospital tax. Maybe the Premier might look into that and see whether that condition could be corrected.

**Premier Douglas:** — It is not a term of their employment now. The hospitals have refused to give them that because we made them pay higher wages to the nurses.

**Mr. Patterson:** — I don't know, Sir. All the information I have is from one or two of these girls that are nurses-in-training whom I happen to know, and they say that part of their condition of employment is that if they are sick they get hospitalization and that they are compelled to pay the \$10 tax. Maybe the Premier knows better than they do, but they are paying the \$10 tax.

**Premier Douglas:** — That's right.

**Mr. Patterson:** — Last summer there wasn't any issue in the province more generally discussed than the matter of highways. We are always told about the millions of dollars that have been spent upon our highways. Outside of Rosetown constituency and Weyburn constituency, we just cannot see where it has gone. I am going to give the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Douglas) credit; last year he sanded, not gravelled, about 15 miles in my constituency from Kipling to Peebles. Then down on route No. 16, coming out of Fish Lake and Kenosee he changed the route and he bought the right-of-way. He moved the telephone poles and the fence posts, and then he moved the road back onto the original road allowance — we have to give him credit for that. Then last spring there was a very bad mud hole on highway No. 13, and people were getting stuck there every day. One day a truck appeared there with four men and four shovels to fix up this mud hole. In the meantime, the local road man had arranged with the municipality to have its outfit fix up this mud hole. Those fellows would be working there yet if they had stayed on to fix it up. The road man said to these fellows driving the truck that there was a little hold down about half a mile and perhaps they could go down and do that with shovels. They said: "Oh, no, we were sent here to fix this big hole and it's fixed, so we're going back to Weyburn." They travelled 130 or 140 miles each way, with their truck and their shovels, and that is what they accomplished.

**An Hon. Member:** — That's the way you do it all the time.

**Mr. Patterson:** — All I am going to say is this, that this year as last the theme song of those who have to drive the roads of Saskatchewan is "Keep right on to the end of the road, the worst is yet to come".

I have some other notes here, Sir, but I am not going to take any more of your time . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — We heard them last year anyway.

**Mr. Patterson:** — I had wished to refer to a discussion of the dominion-provincial financial agreement. It is a fairly extensive matter and should more properly come on the budget debate, and when the budget comes down I will deal with that.

The Minister of Natural Resources had a good deal to say last night about materialistic capitalism and materialistic communism. We have in this province a good deal of materialistic socialism, and the experience and the record of the Corporations indicates that materialism appears to affect all political phases and all political parties, and I don't think the socialists can claim to be more exempt from it than any other political organization.

Last year the Minister of Social Welfare now (Hon. Mr. Sturdy) was talking about the Silkin's Bill. He wanted the complete control of the agricultural activities in the province of Saskatchewan. On November 26, 1948, he made a radio broadcast in which he appealed for support for the Chinese Communists. So he represents today in this province the Silkin's Bill in Great Britain and the Chinese Communists in China. As a matter of fact, it is rather

difficult to differentiate between socialism and communism, except in a matter of degree. The fundamental principles the two believe in are approximately the same. I presume, when the Chinese Communist government is established in northern China, the Minister will be its ambassador for the province of Saskatchewan.

But this is true of all of us, irrespective of whether we happen to be farmers or business men or professional men I think; we can safely and properly say that we are all interested in the welfare of the province of Saskatchewan and of its people. I think we can all agree that is our sincere and genuine desire. We all realize that agriculture is the basic industry of this province. We all want to see it prosper. We want to see policies adopted that will bring that condition about for the people engaged in that industry. We are all interested and we are all anxious to see a substantial measure of industrial and commercial development in this province, which we realize must always be secondary to our primary industry, agriculture. The major difference of opinion is how can that be best accomplished. Can it be accomplished by the government going into business, starting up industries here and there; drawing public money to carry on their activities; or can it, perhaps, best be done by giving the individual or groups of individuals the right to start up in business, and giving them a fair chance to make a success of that business and to reap a profit if their operations are successful. That, probably, is the major issue that divides the two parties in this House. Those who sit on your right are entitled, if they so see fit, to regard the government going into business, the government establishing and putting public money into activities of one kind or another, the government protecting and bonusing and helping this and that individual in one way or another. We, on our part, are still of the opinion that, by and large — and history proves it, Sir — if you will give the individual the maximum measure of freedom and opportunity, he will work out his salvation better than any planner or theorist ever could or ever did. We propose to continue to advocate that because we think that, in the long run, it will be in the interest and for the benefit of the people of the province of Saskatchewan. I cannot accept and I don't propose to accept government dictation, government regulation, government centralization as the solution for either my personal problems or for the problems of my community or my province. I am going to continue, Sir, to advocate that the government of this province should be conducted in such a way, and the legislation of this province should be of such a nature, that its individual citizens have a maximum opportunity to exercise their ability, their energy, and make the best of everything. If you do that, I haven't any worry or concern about the future of the province of Saskatchewan.

I shall not support the motion.

**Mr. Allan Brown (Bengough):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the motion which is now before the House, may I join with those who have extended congratulations to the mover and seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. They have shown their ability to make their contribution to this Legislature. It is particularly true of the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) who brings to this Legislature, on his side, the youth and views of the younger generation of today.

I would like, in passing, to make reference to the former member for Canora (Mr. Feeley) for whom I have the greatest respect and admiration. He was a man who, by his honesty, sincerity and integrity, has shown that it is possible to take part in public life and to, at all times, retain that sincerity and integrity. It is only fitting that the former member for Canora should be replaced with a man of the ability of the present member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak).

May I also, Mr. Speaker, congratulate you on once again being elected to the high position which you hold. The remarks I have made with reference to the former member for Canora can equally be applied to you, Sir, for you are one of those who pioneered in Saskatchewan and broke new furrows, not only in the soil of Saskatchewan, but also in the economic life of Saskatchewan.

In following the member for Cannington (Mr. Patterson), who has had some 30 or 31 years of experience, I believe he suggested, in this House, I hope if I am unable to maintain the decorum which you might expect in this Legislature, that you will not think it is just youth going to the dogs.

I was interested in some of the remarks the hon. member for Cannington made here this afternoon. I had expected, with his 30 or 31 years of experience that he would have been able to bring some concrete proposals to this Legislature; concrete proposals as to how to solve the problems which are facing us, and, indeed, are facing the people of the province of Saskatchewan. But once again, we see him satisfied, as the other members on the opposition have been, with petty criticism, and no proposals into which we could put our teeth. I might also suggest that it seemed peculiar, coming from the hon. member, when he made a reference to the fact that the hon. member for Canora and the hon. member for Hanley had not the right to express the opinions they did express, on the grounds that they did not represent the majority in their constituencies. Memories of the members of this House are not so slack that they cannot recall back to the election of 1944, when, at that time, the hon. member for Cannington sat in this House with, indeed, a very slim majority. It is doubtful if he had not taken advantage of a technicality in the law that he would not have sat in this House at all.

In making this address, Mr. Speaker, I would like your permission to deviate a little bit from the subject matter of the speech from the throne, and refer in passing to certain events which have taken place since last we sat in this House.

In the world sphere many events have occurred, and we are still in the stage where we hear of wars and rumours of wars. It has been suggested that we are possibly on the threshold of another world catastrophe. I am not one of those who accept the philosophy that war is inevitable. I maintain that a policy of international affairs can be worked out by which we can avoid war; but that policy must entail the principles of firmness with patience. In Great Britain, at the present moment, we see the greatest experiment along political and economic lines being conducted. Great Britain, at one time, was in a position to give leadership to the formation of her Empire. Today Great Britain is in the position to give political leadership to the rest of the world, and it would be fitting that we should at times turn our eyes to what is taking place in that country. I do not suggest that we should condone all that the Labour



government is doing in Great Britain, but I think we should approach it with the idea in mind that they are conducting an experiment which, if it is successful, will have far-reaching repercussions.

Within our dominion several events have occurred. Possibly two events which may have far-reaching effect on our economy in Saskatchewan are the changes of leadership in our two old-line parties. The one of outstanding interest, at least, was the one in which Mr. Louis St. Laurent replaced Mr. Mackenzie King as Leader of the Liberal party and, as such, became the Prime Minister of Canada.

Mr. St. Laurent has an easy task in one respect. It was not necessary for him or his party, when he was chosen leader, to undertake to draft a new Liberal policy; they simply have to pick up the platform which they drafted in 1919, and dust it off, and commence to use that. Here was a platform which was as good as new; it had never been used.

In connection with the Tory part, it is hardly news when the Tory party undertakes to elect a new leader. The Tory party in the past few years has chosen leaders much in the same way as Mae West has chosen husbands.

With the retirement of Mr. Mackenzie King from the leadership of the Liberal party, we may see a change in that party. In Mr. Mackenzie King was the 'Grand Old Man' of the Liberal party, unquestionably one of the smartest politicians which Canada has ever produced. He was, indeed, a mastermind of political strategy, and it is not unreasonable to suppose, with the loss of Mr. Mackenzie King, that the great Liberal party, the party which has been a national party, may descent to the same position it is in so far as the provincial parties are concerned, and that it will no longer represent a national party. The Liberal party, as such, has no government west of the Maritimes, and no official opposition west of Ontario. So, in the provincial political field, as a political party it has sunk to a second-rate party, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that in the national life it may sink to a second-place party.

In Saskatchewan we had an election last year, and various analyses have been given of that election — I will make reference to that in a moment. In passing I would like to make reference to some of those M.L.A.'s who formerly sat with us on this side of the House, and who are no longer with us. I only make reference to three, but what I say of these three are implications I make to the other members equally. I refer to the former member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Warden Burgess) who has by his ability in this House shown himself to be a true parliamentarian. His ability and his opinions will be sorely missed in this House. I also make reference to the former member for Meadow Lake, my former seat-mate (Mr. Howell), a young man from the northern part of the province who came down here and rendered indeed valuable service to the constituents he represented. I make reference to the former member for Gravelbourg (Dr. Houze) whom I knew personally very well, and who, by virtue of the fact he was one of the pioneers of this province and had spent a hard physical life in helping to build up this province, made a great contribution to this House. As I said, what I have said of these members I apply to the other former C.C.F. members who are not with us. I suggest, although these individuals are not with us in this House, that they are making their contribution to society in the way in

which they can do so in their own communities. I also suggest that the loss of these people to the House is only temporary. History has shown that while reaction has attempted, in the past, to stop progress, history has shown that reaction was never entirely successful in stopping that progress. These members, and the counterparts of these members, will, in the very near future, come back and sit with us in this Legislature.

Another event which took place as a result of the election is that we have a new leader of the official opposition in this House. It has been suggested that we have three. I will just refer to the one who is known officially as the Leader of the Opposition. He is Leader of the Opposition by virtue of the fact that the Liberal party, or possibly I should say that Hon. J.G. Gardiner, chose him as Leader of the Liberal party in Saskatchewan. I suggest, if the representation on the opposite side of the House indicates or is any reflection on the ability of the Leader — I suggest it is not — but if it is, I suggest the Hon. J.G. Gardiner made one serious mistake when he made this choice.

We have seen in this House the ability of the man who stood for nomination at that convention, and his ability was shown very clearly in his speech on Monday; and from his other activities in this House. It is not unreasonable to suppose that if Mr. Gardiner had made a different choice, and if there are any grounds for assuming there is any reflection on the Leader of that party, it is not unreasonable to suppose that if he had made the other choice there might have been more members on the opposite side.

During the campaign, I imagine it was peculiar in many respects. I was rather interested in listening to the remarks made by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Dundas) in his contribution to this debate. He referred to the strenuous campaign he conducted in the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley; and I am not questioning that he did conduct a strenuous campaign. I am not just sure which campaign he is referring to. If it is the campaign which terminated on June 24, I am not so certain he put on such a strenuous campaign as he suggests, for during that period, up to that date, he had the Liberal political machine working, and working very hard, for him. But he must have conducted a very strenuous campaign when he was successful in unseating Mr. Staines who had the nomination in that constituency.

In this campaign we saw an election fought on economic issues in which there was practically only two sides. You could not sit on the fence; either you were for the C.C.F. and their way of life, or else you were against it. I think we have seen something unique in the political economy of Saskatchewan. We saw a government which was prepared to go to the people on the basis of the performance in the fulfilment of its commitments to the people. That is indeed unique in our political economy here in Saskatchewan. And no doubt there were many promises made. I could not help but think, as the day of the election approached, that many on the opposition side were very much afraid they might win the election and would be compelled to fulfil some of the irresponsible promises and commitments they had made.

**Mr. Tucker:** — You vote right in this vote and we won't be afraid to take over.

**Mr. Brown:** — There is a fundamental difference between Liberal and C.C.F. candidates when they are in the field. The Liberal candidates represent a political party, and strictly a political party. The C.C.F. is the outgrowth of a great people's movement. It was formulated because this people's movement realized, before they accomplished what they set out to do, it would be necessary for them to take political action. And, indeed, a C.C.F. member in this House must conduct himself and his arguments in such a way that he cannot bring discredit or disrepute not particularly upon the C.C.F., but upon this great people's movement of which the C.C.F. is an outgrowth.

Much has been said by the so-called Liberals in the opposition for the Tory support they received during this election. In passing, I would refer only to the report of the Royal Commission to enquire into statements made, to statutory declarations and other matters printed in 1930, and I refer to a statement made by one Thomas Johnson. This is only part of his declaration: "No. 10. It is well known in the jail a different treatment was meted out to Liberal and Conservative prisoners. The Conservatives were put on the rock pile and the Liberals held the best jobs." I would suggest to the Tories who have come into the Liberal party that there is very little difference, where any self-supporting Tory is concerned, whether he is in jail or whether he is in the Liberal party. I would also suggest to these Tories that they may very well end up on the rock pile of the Liberal party.

I suppose that every constituency had rather unique situations in it. We had a rather unique one in the Bengough constituency. We saw there a Tory candidate elected by a Liberal party. He was a life-long Tory who, as late as 1945, had actively supported the Conservative party. A few days before the election, a few days after the Hon. J.G. Gardiner came into the town of Assiniboia, we saw born a new political party, known as the Independent Voters' Association of Assiniboia; not of the constituency of Bengough, but rather formulated around a point in which the Hon. J.G. Gardiner had spoken. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I have attempted to find out what they were independent of. The official Tory party in the Bengough constituency completely disassociated themselves from the Independent Voters' Association; so it appears, if that was the case, they were independent of only one party, and that was the Liberal party.

In analyzing the results of this election, I believe the analysis submitted by the Minister of Education is correct. In 1944, the people of Saskatchewan voted for us mainly on three grounds: first, they believed in our philosophy; secondly, they believed we had a platform which could solve our social and economic problems; thirdly, they were disgusted with the corrupt and laissez-faire attitude of the former Liberal government. They had four years in which to see us in operation, and in 1948 they voted for us on the record of our performance, and on the record of the fulfilment of our commitments and of our philosophy. I doubt if any other true analysis can be made of that election. We have a net result; for the next four or five years we have in Saskatchewan a government dedicated to the principles of democratic socialism.

**Mr. Loftson:** — There is no such thing.

**Mr. Brown:** — One of the members of the opposition suggests that democratic socialism is an impossibility. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he is unaware of the philosophy of the west; a philosophy that has made the west great. That philosophy is that the difficult is done immediately, but the impossible may take a little time.

**Mr. Tucker:** — You admit it is impossible?

**Mr. Brown:** — I can assure them we will show them that it is not impossible to have democratic socialism. We cannot live in a state that is half free and half slave. We need democracy in both our political field and in our economic field. I would suggest if he considers democratic socialism an impossibility, he should look to the other nations in the British Commonwealth of Nations. He will find that either everybody is out of step but him, or, at least, that the Liberal party in Saskatchewan is certainly out of step with the times. We cannot go to bed under capitalism and wake up under socialism. There are problems to be solved; problems in this province which have been accentuated by the laissez-faire attitude of the former Liberal administration. I suggest the choice before us is not a choice of planned and unplanned economy; but a choice of whether we are going to plan our economy in the interests of all, or whether planned economy in the dominion of Canada. We have a government here in the province of Saskatchewan which is out to foster the development of social ownership. I can say, without the fear of being questioned, that the record of social ownership in Saskatchewan has been good, whether in the public field, co-operative field or the municipal field. In the overall picture, when we compare the record of social ownership with the record of private ownership, or capitalist ownership, I can assure you the record will very well bear out the statement that we have accomplished much in the development of social ownership.

There is a theory behind this development of social ownership; a theory which says it is morally wrong that through the accumulation of wealth we should have the right to dominate and control the destiny of an industry or of a nation. That moral wrong was clearly indicated at the outbreak of the war which has just passed, when big business, which had accumulated wealth, was able to say to our government that they would not produce the munitions of war for our soldiers on the basis of cost plus five percent. I suggest that that is morally wrong; and that is the theory behind the development of social ownership. Capital investment represents the sweat of somebody's labour, and that is particularly true under our present financial structure. That is true whether it is invested by private capital or whether it is invested in the form of social capital. What interests us mainly is the return on the capital investment, and how it is used. Irrespective of how the investment is made, privately or on the basis of social ownership, we are partners in every enterprise which is developed in Saskatchewan. One of the things that will be developed is the natural resources, and those natural resources belong to the people, and we are partners in their development whether they be done privately or socially. It is our duty, as a Legislature and government, to see that our interests in these natural resources are protected, and that we get our rightful return from them.

The Opposition has stated, on several occasions, that profits from the Power Corporation for instance, should be used for hospitalization. I agree with the theory behind that suggestion. I suggest that the increased wealth

which we get from developing our natural resources should, naturally, be used to extend our social security. That is exactly the policy of this government — that the wealth we produce should be used to increase our social security and standard of living.

It has been suggested that, since the C.C.F. government took office, the taxes have been raised. I am not questioning that statement. In the overall picture, in the province of Saskatchewan, in terms of dollars and cents, it is true that we are paying more taxes; but, by and large, we are paying them to the federal government. I would refer them to a statement made by Mr. Drew the official Leader of the Opposition at Ottawa, as reported in Tuesday's *Leader-Post*, of February 22, in which he stated, speaking to the throne speech debate: "The dominion has given the provinces solemn undertakings to restore their taxing powers undiminished at the close of the first fiscal year at the end of hostilities. That undertaking has only been honoured by its breach." Mr. Drew said that in 1939 the dominion government collected 51.2 percent; municipalities, 30 percent. Now, he added, the dominion is collecting 76.7 percent; the provinces, 12.5 percent; the municipalities, 10.8 percent. He continued: "If it were possible to imagine greater centralization than that, I would find it difficult to imagine what it could be."

I am not particularly quarrelling with the increase in taxation which has taken place on the federal level, but I do think it is unfair they should suggest that the C.C.F. government in Saskatchewan has raised the taxes and, on the other hand, condoned the enormous increase — particularly the increase in percentage of taxes — which is now being collected by the federal government. As I said, I am not particularly quarrelling with the tendency towards increasing our taxes, for we are continually, and rightfully so, expecting the government to supply increased services; and we are continually reaching that stage where we realize that it is simpler and easier to do things collectively than it is to attempt to do them individually. What we are concerned with is the dollar value which we get back in the form of services for the taxes which we have paid. We are going to have to do more things collectively than we have in the past, and, by so doing, we are spreading the cost of our services over a larger number.

Much has been made of the measures which the federal government has introduced; measures which they suggest have brought a fair amount of stability to our agriculture. They enumerate such things as the P.F.A.A., the Wheat Board floor under our farm prices, family allowances, P.F.R.A., and they even suggest the South Saskatchewan River to be developed. I would point out that there is not one of these that is not socialistic in principle, and, to a certain, extent, socialistic in application. I would suggest that no government that introduces stability and security to our industry and people is not socialistic in principle. These principles have been brought in by the pressure of the common people, through their own organizations. It is only logical that it would be much better to elect a government which believes in these principles rather than to elect a government which does not believe in them but is forced to bring them in by public pressure.

It has been suggested that this government is not prepared to co-operate with the federal government. There has been criticism regarding the resolutions which the private members on this side of the House have placed on the Order Paper, making certain recommendations to the federal government. As members of this House, we have a responsibility that exceeds the boundaries of this House, and we have a responsibility to the industries and people we represent, that their views should be brought before the proper authorities. When it is suggested that this government is not prepared to co-operate with the federal government in attempting to find a solution to our problems, that is indeed a bad state. The record of this government at the inter-provincial conference indicates very clearly that we are prepared to co-operate with anyone who is prepared to submit a solution to the problems which faced that council. This was the only socialist government in Canada at that time, and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this government did not go to that conference with any socialistic chip on its shoulder.

In this Legislature we drafted a health programme which, in some respects we created from our own principles, created so that we could be in line with proposals we thought would be forthcoming, and so we could be in line with the promises made to the people by the federal government which, so far, have not been fulfilled. This was the first and only Legislature which passed the complementary legislation requested by the federal government. If the opposition wish to criticize anyone for failure to co-operate, they have only to go to Manitoba, and criticize Mr. Garson for his failure to take action a year ago, when he had the opportunity — the same Mr. Garson who is now a member of the federal parliament.

We are not dogmatic on provincial rights and autonomy. We are not as the Tories of Ontario, and their Tory friends under Duplessis of Quebec. We are not prepared, as they were prepared, to wreck the foundation of our Federation simply on what they said was provincial autonomy, but which I suggest was simply political strategy. We, in the C.C.F., are national in scope and indeed we are international in scope. We are prepared, in attempting to find a solution for world problems, to delegate certain of our sovereign rights to an international government on the international level. The principles which we advocate can very well be inaugurated in any level of government, whether it be the local governing body of a municipality, provincial, national or international.

Reference was made in this House to the \$8 million surplus which the former administration was supposed to have left for this government. They do not tell us that, while they left us \$8 million of a surplus, they also left us \$214 million, or somewhere thereabouts, of accumulated funded debt. When we analyze the net worth statement we find that the physical assets failed to come anywhere near meeting the liabilities which that government had entailed to this province. I am not suggesting that the Liberal government of that day, the Liberal party in Saskatchewan, was to blame, but I do suggest that the type of economy which my hon. friends advocate, and will perpetuate, can assume the entire responsibility for the fact we have that enormous burden of debt on the shoulders of the people of Saskatchewan at the present time.

The Leader of the Opposition suggests we are not a wealthy province, and with that I will agree. I would point out that during the period they were in office, in the early days in this province, we had a group of people who

produced more new wealth per capita than any other group of people anywhere in the world. Yet the policies of the government of that day allowed that wealth to be drained out of the province, and concentrated in other portions of the dominion, and other portions of the North American continent.

Agriculture should not be a poor relation; with that I agree. Agriculture is entitled to a fair share of the national income of the dominion of Canada. This can be accomplished only through socialized marketing schemes which suggests a parity price for our products. We, in Saskatchewan are engaged in breaking new furrows, and in breaking these new furrows some people were the people who had assumed they had the right to exploit their fellow-man. I don't doubt, if I were in their shoes, I would holler too, because it must be very difficult for them to get off the backs of the people, and not only walk, but at the same time help to pull the load along with the rest of the common people.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I wish to support this motion, for through this motion we are extending the principle of economic freedom and social justice. We are continuing to build on the foundation we laid on the last four years; we are continuing to break new furrows, and we are in the vanguard in advocating economic equality and social justice. For we, in this Legislature, have a responsibility, not only to those who elected us, but also to those people who, by virtue of their age, have not the right to vote; we have a responsibility to that generation still in their mothers' arms, or as yet unborn. Through the actions of this government in the past, and the proposals in the speech from the throne, we are sowing the seeds of economic freedom and social justice; and we shall reap in our time, I hope, and if not in our time at least in the time of the following generation, the fruits of a complete co-operative commonwealth federation; that through the medium of legislation and collective action, we shall have a greater amount of security, and that security shall extend from the cradle to the grave; that we will have a more abundant life; and that we shall have, as common people, a greater share of the production, and a greater production to share.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:50 o'clock p.m.