

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Eleventh Legislature
12th Day

Friday, February 25, 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. I.C. Nollet (Cut Knife): — Mr. Speaker, I wish first of all to join with the other members of the House in extending congratulations to yourself in being again selected to preside over this House. Usually these congratulations leave the general impression, when everyone expresses the, that they are merely formalities, rather than an expression of the sincere conviction respecting the very impartial and able manner in which you have conducted the proceedings of this House during the last four sessions, and the very fact that you were unanimously chose again, Mr. Speaker, is a credit to yourself and a tribute to your impartiality and fairness in presiding over this House.

I should like also to extend congratulations to the new members of the Legislature on the very able addresses they have made. I do note, here and there, that there is evidence that some of the members at least hope to aspire to the laurels once held by that great statesman, Sir Wilfred Laurier. I have long since been discouraged in ever seeking to attain to that great ability in public speaking that that hon. gentleman displayed in his public career.

Mr. Speaker, in my opening remarks today, being the Minister of Agriculture, quite naturally I think in terms of agriculture and in terms of food. A good deal has been said by previous speakers with reference to world affairs. I wish briefly to focus attention on general world conditions in relationship to the ability of the world's land resources to supply food for a needy world. It seems to me that it is not necessary to point up a self-evident fact, one which is receiving ever-increasing attention from those people who are sincerely interested in the proper nourishment of the world's population. It is a fact that there are no more land resources. Land resources cannot be increased. They are here as the Creator made them; but the matter of great concern to agriculturalists lies particularly in the fact that the land resources of the world have been, and are being, seriously depleted at an ever-increasing rate.

I note that the objection of F.A.O., the World's Food and Agriculture Organization, is being set 2,600 calories per day for the population of the world, that being a minimum. They also state that this would mean an increase of 90 percent in the food production of the world, and every indication points to the fact that the population of the world will likely increase in the next century by 100 million souls. It is quite evident, too, that in the past too little attention has been paid to this all-important problem of a fair-distribution of food surpluses amongst the deficiency nations of the world. I need only make reference to the fact that it is estimated that in the last century almost 100 Chinese people actually starved to death, and to the further fact that one-third of the population of India, over the years, numbering over

February 25, 1949

100 million souls, has gone very badly undernourished, and on the verge of starvation. I wish to mention, too, that these are the sore spots, or trouble spots of the world today.

We were told, during the war and since, that one necessary prerequisite to permanent peace would lie in the ability of the nations of the world to keep nutritional values at a proper level, particularly in the problem areas to which I have just referred. This being so, we went into the post-war period in the expectation that the fundamental underlying principles upon which F.A.O. is founded would be implemented. It is regrettable that present indications and tendencies point in the other direction. At a time when it was expected our own nation, when returning to peace-time conditions, would step up agricultural productions, on the contrary, agricultural productions has drastically fallen off, particularly in those categories of production that are so necessary to a balanced agricultural programme in our own province. It is not necessary for me to quote the figures indicating the decline, for instance, in our hog production. At one time, in 1943, we had a hog population in Saskatchewan of approximately 1.9 million head; today we have something less than 400,000 head of hogs. The same can be said with regard to dairy production, and the same can be said with respect to beef production. We have seen the contracts with the United Kingdom gradually diminish, to a large extent because of our inability to produce those commodities Britain was prepared to take from us. At the present time, in spite of what has been said in this House, and all the pious, optimistic hopes for the future, the fact remains that our essential food contracts with Britain, with the exception of the wheat contract, have practically reached the vanishing point.

I have not been alone in my criticism of what is termed 'dollar policies'. The Rt. Hon. J.G. Gardiner made reference to the same impediment to world trade. To summarize briefly what I want to say, in the face of a tremendous world demand, our production here in Saskatchewan has been on the decline. This can largely be attributed to the type of policies that have been followed by the federal government. We should remember that the problems of agriculture fall primarily into two classifications: one is economic, and the other is a production problem. The dominion government, as everyone knows, exercises the responsibility for the economic problem. That is, federal fiscal policy will largely determine the type of agriculture we are going to have in our own province, and I submit that the policies that have been followed have not been in the best interests either of Canadian agriculture or the best interest of Saskatchewan agriculture. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I wish, first of all to deal to some extent with federal policies. I particularly wish to do so because the hon. Leader of the Opposition was a member of the federal government at a time when tremendous changes were made in federal agricultural policy, some of which did have a beneficial effect during the middle-war period, but others of which, particularly in the post-war period, have had a very adverse effect on the agricultural economy of the nation and upon our own province.

Before going into federal matters and federal fiscal policy to any great extent, I want, first of all, to congratulate the opposition for the supporting resolution they sent to the Hon. C.D. Howe, the Hon. J.G. Gardiner, and the Hon. Stewart Garson, in support of bringing coarse grains under the

Wheat Board. I can take it, therefore, that the Opposition, in this session have given their endorsement to Bill No. 113, which we passed in this House last year in support of the principle that coarse grains be marketed under the Wheat Board.

We have been told, and I wish to make some reference to it, that the Saskatchewan House was just a bit hasty in passing that legislation. An editorial appeared in The Leader Post — naturally we would expect it to appear there; you couldn't expect it to appear in a farm paper — saying that we were too hasty, that we went into this ill-advised, that we had not given due consideration to all factors. Well, I would like to say today, for the benefit of the Editor of The Leader Post, that we were not only ahead in that — we were not in a hurry; the trouble today is that other people were too slow. It took exactly two meetings of the farm organizations with representatives of the other provinces to finally get them to move and go down to Ottawa to discuss this matter with the federal government. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure either if the federal government was too fussy about bringing coarse grains under the Wheat Board.

Mr. Tucker: — Who passed the law, anyway.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I will deal with that. The hon. member will probably have occasion to be on his feet more than once before I get through with him and his record in that regard.

Mr. Tucker: — I am not ashamed of my record in supporting that Bill in Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I think silence would be the best course for the Leader of the Opposition to follow because his record at Ottawa speaks louder than any words that he could give in this House.

The fact that the hon. members opposite have given their endorsement and approval is not only welcome, but it brings them into the fold. It almost brings them into the C.C.F. fold. During the course of the election campaign many candidates, in order to bolster a weak cause, often referred to 'communism'; this is communism and that is communism, regimentation, 'Tucker and tyranny', and all the rest of it. The 'Tucker and tyranny' one sort of back-fired in my constituency. I met a French-Canadian one day, and he said, after looking at the poster and reading the article: "I don't know this man Tucker, so I guess I'll vote for tyranny. It was interesting to note what the Leader of the Social Credit party in Saskatchewan had to say about this very thing. Do you know what he said? It was reported in the Star Phoenix. In a speech made at Yorkton, under date of May 5, 1948, here is what he said:

Dr. J. Haldeman, Leader of the Saskatchewan Social Credit League, and the Yorkton candidate, labelled the C.C.F. Natural Products Marketing Act as the most diabolic totalitarian piece of legislation ever lined up to completely socialize the farming industry. Here is socialism in the raw. The Act provides that a farmer can be ordered to sell his grain, etc. . .” and all the rest of it.

The Leader of the Opposition has often said that the Social Crediters assisted in the election of this government. He may have his opinion, but I have my opinion in that regard too, Mr. Speaker. Firstly, I feel that the Social Credit split vote decidedly helped the Liberal candidates, as it was calculated to do.

Mr. Tucker: — It certainly helped to elect you.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We know that the Social Crediters have out-Toried the Tories. They have no use, according to Dr. Haldeman, for either the C.C.F. or Liberals. They put us in exactly the same classification, and now I welcome the hon. members opposite to the fold. Here is what Dr. Haldeman says:

Dr. Haldeman said that the Social Credit party was out to defeat socialism, regardless whether it was implemented by the C.C.F. or the Liberals. Both of these parties have been following the ten-point programme of the Communist Manifesto. If either are returned in the next election, you might better invite Joe Stalin here, as he has more experience along the lines the C.C.F. and the Liberals are now following.

Welcome, comrades. Perhaps we should have a united front against the Social Credit-Tory party . . .

Mr. Danielson: — You ought to know.

Mr. Tucker: — Most of the Social Creditors lost their deposits.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I often wonder, since the opposition has expressed support to the coarse grain policy of marketing same through the Wheat Board, what the attitude of our Conservative party is going to be. We all know what the attitude of the deferral Conservative party is. As a matter of fact, I do not suppose the Bill would have gone through the House if it had not been for C.C.F. support to offset the Tory opposition to it. I think that some of our Conservatives in Saskatchewan and Manitoba are going to have to do some pretty fancy footwork.

Mr. Tucker: — We had enough of a majority to carry it without C.C.F. support.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, there have been some Liberals, too, doing some fancy footwork. I notice one in particular, who was very firm in his demands last year, in wanting to know whether the provinces had to pass this complementary legislation or not, and he wanted a constitutional ruling. That hon. member is now the Minister of Justice, but he does not talk about any rulings today. Why do they not talk about any rulings today, and why did our friends opposite finally line up? Because they know that, as a result of the de-control policies that took place on October 21, 1947, the farmers in the entire dominion of Canada felt so resentful that they were going to take action, and they said so. They said they would change governments.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I feel sorry for the members opposite. You see, they are always straddling the fence. They are trying to satisfy two conflicting economic interests, and I suggest to them that you cannot support both without getting into difficulties. It is for that reason, perhaps, that we in the farm world have sometimes thought we made some gains. We would get a piece of legislation on the Statute Books, but then, after a tremendous counter-campaign on the part of those who are opposed to the best interests of agriculture, we would find we would again lose the legislation. And so it goes. When they are subjected to pressure from the organized farmers and labour, the greater pressure from the vested economic interests generally decides what the policy of the two old parties is going to be.

Let us review some of the attitudes of the administration at Ottawa regarding this whole matter of bringing coarse grains under the Wheat Board. First of all, I want to quote a statement taken from the Commons Debate, March 17, which can be found in Hansard, page 1446, a statement by the Rt. Hon. J.G. Gardiner.

Mr. Tucker: — What year was that?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — This was in 1947; you can mark it down. It was at a time when the price ceilings were raised on coarse grains, and apparently some of the members wanted to know what the policy of the government was going to be when the new crop year rolled around in August, 1947. Here is what the Rt. Hon. J.G. Gardiner said:

In any case in which a price increase or substitution of a price or a subsidy would have the effect of giving unwarranted profits to holders of stock, such stocks will be purchased by the government at the old price and returned to the holders, or sold at the new price. This procedure will make it possible to recover subsidy, or prevent chance profits to the holders of stock. I want to emphasize this point in order to discourage any hoarding in anticipation of an increase in the ceiling price or withdrawal of subsidies that may take place in the future.

That was the Minister of Agriculture's statement to the House in March, 1947.

I should also like to draw to the attention of the House that the organized farmers repeatedly, over the years, asked that, when a decision was finally made regarding coarse grains, those coarse grains should come under the Wheat Board. August 1, 1947 rolled around. Nothing done. Everyone was in an uncertain position. The feeder subsidies were discontinued on August 1, only to a minimum of some 300 bushels for any farmer that might require feed. At that time, as the hon. members know, we had a very serious drought situation in this province, and many people were unable to acquire the necessary feed supplies for the entire winter because of that ruling. That was the year, too, when we had the packing-house strike. I presume that complicated the decision a little. But, in spite of Mr. Gardiner's statement, in spite of the representations made by the farm organizations, and after the grain producers had delivered most of their grain, the federal government saw fit to

February 25, 1949

de-control coarse grains, thereby creating an estimated inventory value increase of those stocks held by the companies of some \$22 million. There is an action that can never be justified by any other action subsequently taken to make restitution. There is the record. There is the proof of what the attitude of the hon. Leader of the Opposition's government at Ottawa was.

The President of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture issued a statement when that took place. Here is what he said:

Nothing has happened in Canadian agriculture for many years that has stirred farmers throughout the dominion to such a high pitch of resentment as has the recent action of the dominion government in removing ceilings and subsidies from coarse grains at this particular time, declared H.H. Hannam, President of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. Mr. Hannam said he was merely expressing the feelings of the farmers, expressions which had been pouring in from all parts of the dominion.

Mr. Tucker: — Western producers gained \$20 million by it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I know this put the hon. member in a very embarrassing position in Saskatchewan. He would never be able to win the coming provincial election under those circumstances. A great mistake was made; a political blunder, in their desire to support and help out free enterprise, and as part of the dominion's de-control policy they thought they were going to put it over. But they forgot all about the hon. Leader of the Opposition in Saskatchewan, apparently. The whole party in Saskatchewan was thrown into a turmoil. The hon. Leader of the Opposition took to the air, and I presume the pilot said to him, as he said in the north: "Lean forward, Mr. Tucker, and hang on to your hat. We are headed for Ottawa."

Mr. Tucker: — I got there, anyway.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Away they went to Ottawa, and I suppose they said, in effect: "Look here boys, you can't do that. We will never win this election if you go and pull stuff like that at this particular time. We have to fix this up." So he came back and announced to the province that everything was going to be O.K. The farmer was going to be taken care of; the livestock producers who lost were going to be taken care of.

Mr. Tucker: — And they were.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Now he says: "They were." And he has been saying that up and down the whole province. The federal Minister of Agriculture has been saying the same thing, in the federal elections. Restitution has been made, he says; but I wonder if restitution has been made, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Leader of the Opposition took on a great responsibility when he was going to make this restitution. I have gone over some of the records regarding the amounts of money that were paid by the various elevator companies on that grain delivered to them in the period from August 1 to October 21. I have, likewise, made some comparison between the

price gains that were made, and I notice that there was, for instance, an average increase in the price for oats, from October 21, 1947 to April, 1948, of 23 cents. The average increase in the price of barley for that period was 27 cents a bushel. The repayments amounted to, with the government subsidy, about 15 1/2 cents on the average for oats, and about 23 cents for barley. We still do not know how much the elevator companies got for this grain. A whole lot of it had to be sold in the American market, for the simple reason that, when the de-controls took place, the price of feed grain went so high that the Ontario feeder was not able to buy. The result was a tremendous liquidation of livestock in Ontario, as well.

I happened to be down in Ontario just about that time, and while talking to the Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. Mr. Kennedy, I asked Mr. Kennedy: "Where is Mr. Gardiner?" "Oh, he said, he is not here. This place is not very healthy for him. He has gone to the States to have a well-earned rest." I was told down there that the farmers were literally letting their hogs go. I was told of one particular farmer who drove into town in disgust. He had fourteen little pigs in his truck and he was going to be rid of these pigs at all cost. He put a sign on his truck, "Pigs given away free. Take all you want." Then he went in to have his dinner and expected the pigs would be gone when he came out. When he came out and looked in his truck, he didn't have 14 in his truck, he had 28.

Mr. Tucker: — They were listening to your cries of alarm.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The hon. member will have to listen a little bit longer, I am afraid.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of the tremendous resentment, and in order to fix things up, it is only natural the dominion government was going to bring in some legislation that would at least be a gesture towards bringing coarse grains under the Wheat Board, and they did that. But I want to remind the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) that in reality they reduced the authority of the Wheat Board. I would like to remind the hon. member for Arm River, too, that it was the Liberal government in Ottawa, in 1939, in the first session of that Legislature, who repealed Section 4 of the Wheat Board Act passed by the Bennett government in 1935, under which section provision was made to bring not only oats and barley under the Wheat Board, but all grains including rye and flax. So is it any wonder that certain newspapers in the east viewed this whole move as a political dodge?

I would like to give the House some quotations taken from the Montreal Gazette, and I think it pretty well illustrated the point. It is dated February 20, 1948, and here is what they say.

It is understood that Agriculture Minister Mr. Gardiner is the principal backer of the new state-trading enterprise, which is designed as a vote-catcher in the western provinces.

There is a whole lot more, too. It was designed to rectify a mistake that was made, because they knew full well that the federal government in any federal

election or any provincial election, would be done in Saskatchewan if they did not proceed to take some recognition of the organized farm people.

There is another aspect, too, to this whole matter. In that period of time, from October 21, 1947 to January 1, 1948, a tremendous liquidation of livestock took place. As we all know, there was a surplus of livestock awaiting marketing as a result of the strike, and as soon as that was over, and on top of that, with the feeder subsidy removed and the increase in coarse grain prices which amounted to about 60 cents a bushel for barley and about 35 cents for oats, there was no man going to be able to keep his livestock for any length of time. He had to push them on the market, particularly so when we had a feed deficiency in Saskatchewan at that time.

The result was a tremendous liquidation of livestock, and the same people who were drying crocodile tears over the lot of the poor farmer because of the strike of the wicket packing-house workers were not strangely silent. What happened? The dominion government, early in January, raised the ceiling prices on beef, and the inventory value of the beef held by the packing firms increased, I am told on good reliable authority, by some \$9 million. So the responsibility of making restitution is very wide indeed, and I think that the hon. Leader of the Opposition should devote all his time to it, and not carry on with the type of carping criticism he is making in this House; in addition going so far as to stick out his neck and suggest that the provincial government has not brought in any policy of any great benefit to agriculture.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I intend to deal with that in a moment. I notice the applause is getting a little weaker on the other side.

I think I have said enough to place on record the attitude of the federal Liberal government in regard to the Wheat Board, and in respect to the de-control of coarse grains. It is only because of that action and the subsequent resentment of the farmers, they have finally lined up and, of course, as I said before, I welcome their support because at least it is a step ahead. I do hope that all of the principles embodied in the Canadian Federation of Agriculture's resolution will be implemented, and will be used as a policy and directive to the Wheat Board when they take over coarse grains. This is essential and I have always argued so, because, if we are going to have a balanced agricultural industry, our farmers have to have stabilized prices and a proper price relationship between feed, livestock and dairy products. That is a must if we are going to have a balanced and sound agriculture. It is most vital, particularly in Saskatchewan where the whole tendency has been to a single grain economy, and, as I said at the outset, the land resources of the world were rapidly deteriorating in fertility. In the interests of good soil conservation and good farm practice, this is necessary. I hope, therefore, that we do have a federal fiscal policy in the future that will be of assistance to all the provincial governments and will result in a well-balanced agricultural policy for the entire dominion of Canada.

I would like to go back just a little bit further — I am rather like Dagwood, 'I hate myself when I do this', but these things are so obvious. I am sure my farm audience in the country will enjoy this repetition. You know,

Mr. Speaker, when you go back over the years to the close of World War I, we have had nothing but Liberal and Tory governments in power — free enterprise governments. We farmers got a good taste of it in that period of time. We witnessed a complete economic breakdown; we went through the hungry thirties. Of course this they blamed on the weather, and the economic aspect they blamed on world conditions; but they cannot talk around those things any more. They are beginning to realize they are going to have to take some responsibility for the well-being of the working people and the farm people as against that of the vested interests.

To go back, instead of having had a Wheat Board, as we should have had at the conclusion of World War I — as everyone knows the Liberal party at that time was absolutely opposed to it — they went through the motions in 1922, just as they are going through the motions this time. At that former time they called for complementary legislation from two provinces — I do not know why the two then, and three now on the case of coarse grains, but the whole thing was a failure. The result was that the farmers had to take matters into their own hands, and they organized the Wheat Pool as a marketing agency. We know, too, that the Wheat Pool was not strong enough to cope with world conditions. We do know they got into difficulties, and we do know that only under duress of economic circumstances, when governments did not know what else to do with the great surpluses of food, only then did a Tory government bring in Wheat Board legislation. I understand this was to be a 100 percent Board, but because of the actions of the Liberal party in Ottawa at that time, in Committee I am told, the powers of that Bill were reduced and all we got out of it was a voluntary floor-price type of Board. It was only under war conditions, when it was necessary to stop the upward spiral of agricultural prices that we finally got the Board to hold prices down.

As a result of the lack of attention to the needs of agriculture in those years — I mentioned we had the hungry thirties, and I want to remind our friends opposite that we had regimentation then; we had inspectors too, I would like to remind the hon. member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) — relief inspectors wherein our people had to get down to the point where they had to fill out a sworn statement in order to get sufficient to keep body and soul together. I know something about that. I happened to be the Reeve of my municipality at that particular time. I do not want to hear the members opposite talk any more about this fear mongering nonsense of regimentation, and all the rest of it. They are not in a position to do so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Tucker: — You aren't a dictator yet, thank goodness.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am quite a meek and humble sort of man, and I do not aspire to ever be a dictator, and I do not aspire to be a Sir Wilfred Laurier. The only reason I am in this House is because the organized farmers finally woke up and realize that they could place no dependence on either one of the old parties, and they decided to form their own party. That is why I am in the House.

Mr. Tucker: — The old bunk.

February 25, 1949

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I can at least say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that I can be consistent, in season and out of season.

Mr. Tucker: — Consistently wrong.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to move along and make reference to another policy and decision which I think the federal government could have done something about, and that was the 21 percent increase in freight rates. At least the hon. Leader of the Opposition thought the dominion government could do something about it, because, again, he was placed in a most embarrassing position when the announcement came that we were to have the 21 percent increase in freight rates. Rumours came first; but I have here in my hand a clipping from the Regina Leader Post dated April 7, 1948, in which the Leader of the Opposition is quoted as saying — I think they had a convention in Regina about that time, and again they were thrown in a turmoil because of this, and how were they going to live it down with the provincial election coming up; he said:

Prairie people had no need to become unduly disturbed over the potential 21 percent increase in freight rates for it was not a final decision, Walter A. Tucker, Provincial Leader, said in an interview Saturday. Whether or not a 21 percent increase will be permitted is up to the Cabinet to decide. The government can be relied upon to give fair consideration to the prairie west when it endeavours to reach a decision on the matter.

Well, he lost that fight.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, they were very pleased that the federal government . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! The hon. member is on his feet.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I am being compassionate to the hon. member. I do not want him to get up and embarrass himself too much.

Mr. Tucker: — You say they did not succeed in getting anything on all this.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It seems to me that when the railroads first made their request for an increase in freight rates, that would have been the time for the federal government to have instituted a full investigation. I do not know of any single thing that has done as much harm to western agriculture as that decision; and now with the hope of more to come. I want to commend this administration for the very vigorous and able manner in which they carried on the investigation with respect to that enquiry, and the very able manner in which the Saskatchewan government was represented in the person of Mr. MacPherson.

I would like to turn to another matter, Mr. Speaker, and that is the matter of irrigation. You know, irrigation should not enter into politics at all. It should not be a political football. I think, as a matter of right, the dominion government is obligated to do something in a province such as Saskatchewan, a province that is subjected more than any other province in the dominion of Canada to the natural hazards of nature, without trying to make a political football out of these issues. I note that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is quoted in the Star-Phoenix, under date of October 20, 1948, as having said, in connection with the Rosthern by-election campaign.

Mr. Tucker said it was now up to the people in Rosthern to give their endorsement by electing William A. Boucher, the Liberal candidate, if they want the project proceeded with. (That was the Elbow project.) He added, 'You certainly won't get anywhere by sending C.C.F.ers to Ottawa.'

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Just a minute. Have a little patience.

Election of Makaroff would be tantamount to repudiating a great scheme.

The great scheme, Mr. Speaker, hung in the balance. You know, for once, if it did hang in the balance, I am kind of happy that Mr. Makaroff is still here, and we will now get the project.

Mr. Tucker: — So we are in Rosthern.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We have sacrificed one seat, but if we get the project it will be worth it.

Mr. Tucker: — That is what I thought.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Oh yes, Mr. Speaker, between the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the Hon. J.G. Gardiner, they had water flowing practically all over Rosthern.

I now want to get on to provincial matters. I think I have said enough on federal matters.

There have been references made in the House — I have said it before — to the effect that this administration had not been paying enough attention to agriculture. First of all, I want to read to the House the estimates for agriculture, comparing the years 1943-44 with others. In the year 1943-44, the agricultural estimates stood at \$557,000; in 1945-46, the estimates stood at \$846,000; in 1946-47, they stood at \$842,000; in 1947-48, they stood at \$1,796,000; last year, \$2,098,000; and next year — well I won't tell you, the hon. Provincial Treasurer will. In spite of that, the Leader of the Opposition says we have not paid enough attention to agriculture. Well, we can place our record any time alongside any record of performance they might have had during the term of their office.

Mr. Tucker: — We judge by results, not by money spent.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I want to say that, in Saskatchewan, as a result of federal policies which permitted settlers to come into this province and settle indiscriminately all over the place, we have a tremendous problem of agricultural rehabilitation to which, in the years ahead, we must give due recognition. The experiences that arose out of the hungry thirties, that were already beginning to be recognized in the early twenties, have driven home the fact that we have to do something towards stabilizing our basic agricultural industry. I think all the hon. members will agree that that is an absolute 'must', as far as any government in the province of Saskatchewan is concerned. I want to say to the hon. members that we in our department are directing our expenditures towards overcoming the difficulties we found ourselves in those hungry thirties, when it was necessary to move seed, feed and relief from one end of this province to the other. I want to sincerely say that it is one of my ambitions and hopes that we can at least set in motion policies now that will be carried on by subsequent administrations, to the end that we do get stability and security for the farm people of Saskatchewan. With the assistance extended through P.F.R.A., and in working in close co-operation with them, we know that we can make this province one of the most stable agricultural provinces in the dominion of Canada.

I would like to point out that we are the biggest agricultural province in the dominion. Thirty-eight percent of the cultivated acreage of dominion of Canada is in Saskatchewan. We have a tremendous potential to increase our overall production, and at the same time achieve agricultural stability. I am certain that we should have, at least, an ordinary livestock population of some 3 million head in this province, all of which, in turn, will have a tendency to stabilize the services that are so vital and necessary, and are constantly being increased in the form of education, health and other social services. I know, and the members of this government know, the danger if two or three droughts hit this province. That, coupled with an economic depression, would certainly knock the props from under the services available under the former administration. This government had a heritage of indebtedness, carried-over relief indebtedness, which we cancelled, and, of course, we are still paying the carrying charges on the adjusted amount. We must keep these things carefully in mind, and I hope, as a result of the expenditures for the rehabilitation of our agricultural economy, we may never again face the necessity of having to spend enormous sums on relief.

Having made some reference to the increase in the agricultural budget, I would like to translate that, to some extent, into a progress report. For instance, in 1943, we had 21 agricultural representatives, largely living in the big centres. Today we have 36 agricultural representatives. Formerly the number of farms in each Ag. Rep. District was about 6,500; now the number of farms in each district has been reduced to 3,500. That, of course, is still high, and we recognize this to be a factor.

Mr. Tucker: — How many did the Minister say? I did not catch that.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — In 1943, 6,500 farmers per Ag. Rep. District; 1947-48, 3,500. The total number of offices in 1943-44 was seven; the total number offices now is 34.

Of these, the number of offices at country points, in 1943-44, was one; in 1947-48, 26. We are following the principle and policy of placing each agricultural representative in his own district, with his home and office located in his own district, as far as possible. The number of Agricultural District Boards was, 1943-44, none; 1947-48, 33; the number of board meetings, none in 1943-44; 38 in 1947-48. I should mention Agricultural Committees; none in 1943-44, but 315 in 1947-48.

I should also mention to the House that there was a tremendous organizing job that had to be done in organizing these local agricultural Committees. It is our thinking that, by working through local municipal committees, we can accomplish more in view of the large number of farmers in each Ag. Rep. District, and then, too, to tie in the local authorities in matters of agricultural conservation. More and more municipal people are beginning to become increasingly interested in the need for agricultural conservation and development. They are beginning to realize that some responsibility and some attention must be given to so organizing the agricultural economy within the municipalities that will tend not only towards giving agricultural stability in the area, thus overcoming natural hazards, but, in addition, to institute such policies as will increase the productivity of the soil in each given rural municipality.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, in the budget debate, to speak a little more fully and explain some of the policies we have in mind and the manner in which we hope to implement them.

I would like to say something about the Veterinary Service Districts. As you all know, in 1943-44 there were no Veterinary Service Districts. Today we have 27 Veterinary Service Districts organized, and we have at the present time 39 Saskatchewan students taking the veterinary course at Guelph, Ontario, against three in 1943-44. Those figures indicate that this government is giving very serious attention to this. I have only mentioned a few services for agriculture. We feel that, with our large livestock population, under the Veterinary Service District plan we are going to be able to give proper service to the livestock industry, thereby preventing the tremendous economic loss that takes place every year because of livestock disease. I especially want to commend the Veterinary Division of my own department for the very good job they did last summer in connection with Bang's testing, and the eradication of Bang's disease.

I would like to say something too about agricultural income. The hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) quoted some figures showing the cash income for the years 1944 — I think — to 1947; but the hon. member was quoting gross cash income. I would like to draw attention to the net cash income, and the position in those years. I think the hon. member referred to this in order to point out that things were so much better when this administration took over that we could more readily do the things that ought to have been done when the former administration was in power. I want to point out, for instance, that the net income in the year 1942 was \$301 million, and the net income in 1945 was \$219 million; in 1946, \$228 million; in 1947, \$273 million. After all, the best measure of prosperity and general increased revenue will depend upon the net income position of our agricultural people, and I wish to point out that in three years, 1945, 1946, 1947, net income was below the year 1942. I also want to say that if the

February 25, 1949

federal Liberal government had not been paying 70 cents a bushel for the 1942 crop, the net income for that year would have been infinitely higher.

I noticed on the Order Papers some questions regarding provisions for feed this year. Of course, I can readily understand why questions are asked in the House. I presume that the hon. members wish to have it appear that the administration is not too concerned about feed for the farmers this coming spring.

Mr. Tucker: — We want to see you do something.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — All right. Here is what the Liberal administration said and did in 1939 . . .

Mr. Tucker: — We are interested in what you are going to do.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I will tell you in just a minute. Just don't get excited.

On February 2, 1939, at a time when we had crop failures, at a time of economic depression, when incomes were at the bottom, here is what the Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. J.G. Taggart, had to say with reference to seed, and that was in connection with the 1938 seed:

This year the municipalities should let the individual know that it is up to him to scratch up his own seed, said the Hon. J.G. Taggart, Minister of Agriculture, to the Federal Convention of the Rural Municipalities Association, meeting in Regina.

Then he went on to say:

Out of the \$18 million loans in Saskatchewan for seed . . .

Mr. Tucker: — What date was that?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — February 2, 1939.

Out of the \$18 million loans in Saskatchewan for seed, of which only \$3.5 million was not guaranteed by the dominion, farmers repaid only \$250,000.

I think the hon. Minister of Natural Resources made some reference to why that took place. I can still remember the statement that was issued at that time by the then Attorney General, the Hon. T.C. Davis, I believe, in which it was stated the implement companies came ahead of municipal taxes, placed them ahead of this particular seed obligation, too. I have the full records on that, and I have gone over them on two occasions in this House, to the great embarrassment of the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), and I do not intend to do so again; but that is one of the reasons the 1938 seed advance was not repaid. The Hon. J.G. Taggart said: "Oh, we won't give them any seed this year."

Mr. Tucker: — What are you going to do? You fought two elections on that.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Here is what the government has already done. We have already paid freight on feed and seed in the amount of 112 carloads, under our emergency policy of freight assistance. We are in a different position in Saskatchewan with regard to the need for seed than we were last year. This year we have an estimated registered and certified seed crop of some 3,444,000 bushels of registered and certified seed wheat; oats, 1,347,000; barley, 923,000. The seed growers are somewhat concerned regarding the ability of marketing this seed. The demand outside the province has fallen off, and it looks as though we are going to have a surplus of registered seed. As the hon. members know, too, the Freight Rates Association have decided to abolish the preferential tariff we have enjoyed on the movement of seed grain, under which we could move this type of seed at half-freight. That has now been removed.

For the benefit of the hon. members, I would like to go over the crop failure situation this year as compared to last year. I might say, too, that we have not had any requests for seed, but we are watching the situation. If any need arises, we are assured of ample supplies in the province for the simple reason this is a surplus. There is also a surplus developing in feed grains. Twenty-three municipalities had an average of four bushels to the acre in 1947, against eight municipalities in 1948; three municipalities had an average of two bushels to the acre in 1947, and in 1948, none. This is taken from the P.F.A.A. records and pretty well indicates there will not be too great a need for, or serious deficiency of, seed in the province for the coming spring seeding operations.

Mr. Tucker: — Will the hon. gentleman permit a question. What provision is made for a man who has not the means of getting seed now for himself, to help him get it?

An Hon. Member: — That is not a question.

Mr. Tucker: — That is a fair question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I am not in a position to say whether it is a fair question or not. The rules of the House are that the member who is speaking, if he wishes to answer a question, will take his seat.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I will gladly answer the hon. member's question. Provision has been made, as has always been the case, under The Seed Grain and Supplies Act, under which Act the municipality passes a bylaw and they can obtain a loan from the bank under provincial guarantee.

I now come around to grasshoppers. We have had quite a bit said about grasshoppers. You know, with all these things — de-control of coarse grains, freight rates increase, and all the rest of it — the hon. member had

to find a scapegoat some place to cover up, so he picked on grasshoppers. But I would like to state, with reference to this, that as far as the Department of Agriculture is concerned, we did our very best to inform people as to the situation, and also to advise municipalities to get their sawdust supplies early, pointing out that the early movement of supplies would mean, not only a reduced expenditure on our part, but would place materials in position when the outbreak took place. We do not have to pass the buck to anyone. Our record is pretty clean and pretty clear. We have done our part. We were supplying the sawdust and the bait free of charge with the exception of the first ton of mill-feed. The responsibility for the rest of it is beyond our control. There is a reason for that, and we cannot blame municipalities or anyone else. You only get a grasshopper outbreak about once in ten years; they gradually build up, and everyone more or less lives in the hope that weather conditions will be such that a severe outbreak will not occur. Everyone does take a lackadaisical attitude, and we do our best to try to arouse interest to have the municipalities take the necessary precautions. Of course, there is general interest now, and we expect to have a very good and efficient campaign in the coming year.

Then, too, there are some handicaps to moving sawdust in the winter. The sawdust we get up in our northern bush, for example, is green and wet, often freezes, and people dislike having to pick it out of the boxcars, and that sort of thing. Those are some obstacles, and, of course, no good reasons why it should not be moved early. There is another phase too. The entomologists in the Dominion Entomological Services were surprised; they, too, did not realize the infestation would be quite as wide as it was. The early maps we go by told just as good a story as they could; but the Entomological Services, too, are limited in staff, and it is surprising the amount of work they do with the limited staff at their disposal. The other point is: weather conditions last spring, as everyone knows, were ideal — dry with no rain, which is a perfect condition for a first-class grasshopper plague.

Mr. Tucker: — How much did the Entomological Services underestimate?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — They do not underestimate very much; they did to some extent. That is, severe outbreaks occurred in some districts where they did not anticipate there would be an infestation. I can say it is largely due to the fact that they have not sufficient staff to properly cover the whole province. I am told by these Services that the campaign we carried on last year was one of the best and most efficiently conducted campaigns that has ever been carried on in the province.

I am going to make some comparisons. Since the hon. member raised the question in the House, I found occasion to look into the records to see what happened in the past. He was very anxious that we should supply everything gratis to municipalities.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I did not suggest that at all. On a question of privilege. I said some substantial assistance should be given.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Our assistance, Mr. Speaker, is very substantial; but I would like to point out that when infestations took place in the years 1919 to 1923, the then provincial government charged half the cost back to the municipalities. I would like to point out, too, that this last year we spent \$313,859 in the grasshopper campaign, which is the second highest expenditure in the history of the province, the only higher being 1937.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition made reference to the fact that possibly the Minister of Agriculture was too busy in the hustings to properly attend to business; and he mentioned the loss sustained by the farmers as the result of these grasshopper plagues. Well, I know that the losses are great, but I noticed, in going over the records, in the year 1938. I believe, Mr. Speaker, there was an election that year, and the Liberal party had quite a tough tussle — the C.C.F. was on the ascendancy — and they did not seem to be worried about grasshoppers. As a matter of fact, they said the C.C.F. would disappear with the grasshoppers, but we are both still here.

Mr. Tucker: — You think you will go with them, eh?

Mr. Danielson: — I'd rather have them as a pest than you.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — In 1938, in the grasshopper campaign, they, the Liberals, spent \$118,000. Do you know what the loss was? It was the highest on record, \$33 million. I wonder who was negligent in that particular year? I do not think the Leader of the Opposition is in a position to criticize.

Mr. Tucker: — What was the loss last year?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We have not the estimates yet. I will be glad to send them around to the hon. member when we have them.

Mr. Danielson: — Take lots of time.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The loss in 1940 was \$9 million — I think you quoted that figure; and the only other high year was 1939, when there was a \$14 million loss; 1935, \$5.5 million, and 1936, \$3.5 million loss.

I want to say something about what we intend to do about this campaign in the coming year. I should say, too, that last year we did subsidize spray chemicals. I notice that the hon. Leader of the Opposition thought we were following — I think he said — horse and buggy methods in controlling grasshoppers. I want to say we cannot get away from sawdust baits. It might be horse and buggy methods in the mind of the Leader of the Opposition, but I do not think he knows too much about grasshoppers. The entomologists tell us that it will depend largely on how well the baiting campaign is carried on in the early stages, before green growth develops, as to whether or not we are going to check a serious infestation. We brought in the spray chemicals last year to be sure, and we subsidized half the cost to the farmers.

There are two kinds of insects that prey on the farms: one is the human type — I call them the capitalist type; the other, the insect type. The capitalist type were charging up to \$3 per acre. It would have cost the farmer \$3 per acre to use those spray chemicals. It became a question whether you preferred the capitalist type or the insect type, and, therefore, we subsidized by paying 50 percent of this cost so the farmer could use the spray chemical last year. Now, any sensible government would not continue to do that. My attitude was that if we could not get spray chemicals in here at a cost within reach of the farmer, we would depend entirely on the old sawdust bait method. We were able, by bulk purchases and by becoming the sole bargaining agency for spray chemicals in Saskatchewan, to bring down the cost to the farmer this year to 68 cents an acre, and we are handling it at cost. I think that is mighty good business from the point of view of the provincial expenditures, as well as giving assistance to the farmers. In addition we are going to . . .

Mr. Tucker: — You bought it from the capitalists, anyway.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We eliminated them. We are not subsidizing capitalists and never will.

We hope to use chemical chlorodyne in our bait in the coming year. It is just as effective, I am told, as arsenite. As you all know, arsenite is very poisonous; the other is not so poisonous and is less dangerous to handle, less dangerous to livestock. The only difficulty we are going to experience is that the mixture will have to be done more carefully and fine. That is, we use a whole lot less chlorodyne than we do arsenite; but we are going to give it a trial.

I could say a whole lot more about the campaign, in general, Mr. Speaker, but my time is rushing on, and in deference to the hon. member for Milestone (Mr. Erb), I must at least give him a little time. I hope to deal with these problems more fully during the course of the budget debate.

Mr. Tucker: — Before the hon. member leaves this: is anything being done, as is done in Manitoba, to look after the spraying of highways and roads along the fences, and so on? The government there pays half the cost.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I am very glad the hon. member brought that question up. We have often been compared with Manitoba. Manitoba has no infestation at all compared to Saskatchewan. Sure they are doing it.

Mr. Tucker: — They say they expect 30 out of 50 municipalities to be infested.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I will give you the figures: the total acreage infested in Saskatchewan is 41 million, affecting 200 municipalities; in Manitoba 3 million, affecting 16 municipalities; Alberta 12 million acres, affecting 60 municipalities — and in Alberta the municipalities pay half the cost. I just forget what the set-up is in Manitoba. They could afford to be more generous, to be sure.

Mr. Tucker: — According to my information there are 30 municipalities in Manitoba.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Our records show 16. The hon. member may get 30 with possibly a light infestation.

I would like to talk for a little while about bees. I have never been stung by bees, and I do not hope to get stung by any remarks made in this House by any member of the Legislature when speaking about bee inspection work.

You know, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members of this House have some responsibility in connection with the administration of legislation that is passed by this House. I think, when some hon. members raise some of the matters they do, it is bound to have a tendency towards breaking down confidence in the enforcement of legislation passed by this House. Before I get through, I think I will prove to the hon. member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) that every precaution has been taken in the particular case he referred to, and that it was far wide of the mark. The hon. member should at least come and see the Minister. Any time any member wants to come and discuss any particular problem with me, I will be glad to do so. Those things do not have to be raised in this House. But, apparently, the hon. member did want to make a little political capital. I do not like that type of criticism.

Mr. Tucker: — You've done your share of it anyway.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I want good, constructive criticism, but I certainly did resent that.

I am not going to refer to the statements made by they hon. member because they were certainly grossly exaggerated in every regard. I do want to point, first of all, to this legislation which has been on the Statute Books for years. It was devised to protect the bee industry against the dread disease of foul brood, just as similar legislation has been passed with respect to the health of animals. Naturally, enforcement measures must take place. You are not going to let every individual be his own judge, and, naturally, in that legislation there are safeguards for the individual and for his protection. That being so, there is only one government agency responsible for the enforcement of that Act, and that is the Bee Division of the Department of Agriculture. They are the ones who do the diagnosing; nobody else does it. Surely, we are glad to take a sample of any comb and send it anywhere else for a test, provided that sample is taken in the presence of the bee inspector, and the owner as well, and it is more desirable to have someone witness this action. We know — the inspectors know and the whole service knows — that this thing of enforcement is something you have to handle in a very diplomatic manner.

In that particular year, 1946, the foul brood was on the increase; 24,000 colonies were inspected. We had at that time some 12,000 beekeepers and 7,000 apiaries were inspected that year. That is a terrific lot of inspection work, and the reason it was done was because inspection work had been neglected during the war years. Foul brood was on the increase, but because of the good work done by the Bee Division we enjoy a preferred position among the western provinces in being free from foul brood. Out of all that inspection, Mr. Speaker, we only had one complaint, and that was the one referred to by the hon.

member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski). It was not 17 hives at all — 2 hives were destroyed. I intended to bring the file on this particular case, but I do not have it with me. I will, however, be glad to go through it with the hon. member for Redberry, and I think he will agree with me that he did not have very good justification for raising the point in this House.

Mr. Korchinski: — May I ask the hon. Minister a question? Is it not true that in one of your letters you admitted your department made a mistake in destroying those bees.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I made no such admission in any letter, and all my letters are on the file. As I said, the hon. member is privileged to come into my office and go over all the correspondence in this connection. I will say this: when the complaint came in, I was concerned as to how the inspectors conducted themselves, and to see that everyone received protection. I was very much concerned about this particular case, so much so that I made a trip out to Fort Qu'Appelle and interviewed the inspector and the other inspectors as well. We went over the whole record very carefully, and we found that the sample had come in, was checked very carefully with the Bee Division, and found the sample was properly diagnosed, and the letter of confirmation sent back to the inspector in that particular area. Everything was done, and the complaint being raised again, I went so far as to make sure we did not miss anything — this is not in line with the work done by the R.C.M.P. in the regular performance of their duties — but I did ask the R.C.M.P. to go and take statements from all the individuals concerned. I want to say to this House, after having checked the reports from the R.C.M.P. there appeared no basis at all for the contention held by the person involved.

That was the only complaint out of 24,000 colonies inspected that year. You know, Mr. Speaker, there are people who at times are rather difficult, and in deference to that area we were especially considerate in sending an inspector into that area the following year who could speak the language of the people, as we thought they would feel better and more friendly about inspection work. As to the inspector himself — I suppose the hon. member for Redberry knows the inspector — I have never seen a more meek and mild man in all my life I could not imagine this man going in and arbitrarily destroying anything. The inspectors are pretty well-posted and briefed as to what their public relations should be. I want to assure this House, I was just as much concerned about this particular case as the hon. member opposite was, and it was gone into very, very fully. I think he should at least have come to me before he made the statement in the House. I might say, too, that the former member for Redberry also had an interest in this particular case.

I think, Mr. Speaker, I have gone on long enough, and I will draw my remarks to a close. I presume everyone has come to the conclusion that I am going to support the motion, but in drawing my remarks to a close I would once again like to say, with all the references being thrown back and forth across this House, some of them quite hastily, some in anger, I wonder sometimes if we should not just sit back and try to appraise, not only our own situation within our own nation, but the reasons why we are sitting on this side of the House, and the hon. gentlemen opposite are sitting on that side of the House. I think that we are certainly all caught in a tremendous change that is taking place the world over, and we cannot ignore the fact of change. As a matter of

fact, a gentleman once said to me: "There is only one thing permanent in this world, and that is change, and that goes on in spite of you and me, and in spite of what any of us have to say." As a result of the tremendous technical advances that have been made, quite naturally economic and political readjustments are going to have to be made.

References have often been made to the ideologies and philosophies held by this group. We have been accused of following the line of communism, I have been accused of being a fascist, and everything else. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I just had a letter from a Catholic priest, a good friend of mine, who has told me that he was accused of being a communist. We hear Mr. Haldeman now says we are all communists because we support the idea of a Natural Products Marketing Board. I want, once again, to reiterate what the Premier said: we cannot meet these challenges by calling names; we cannot meet the changing conditions in which the whole world is in upheaval by throwing angry words back and forth. It is only on the basis of reason that we are going to finally find a solution, not only to our problems, but to the problems of the world as a whole. It is only on that basis.

I want to say to this House, as I have said from different platforms, that I have no fear of any 'ism' in the world, whether it be materialism, atheism or any other 'ism'. I am guided entirely by a fundamental philosophy handed to us by one of the greatest individuals who ever trod this earth; an individual who never had a university education, was never over 200 miles from home, who only enjoyed public life for some three years; a leader who enunciated fundamental profound truths in relation to human survival. It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that the Christian principles expressed by the founder of our Christian faith are of such fundamental importance that they can never be banished from this earth, and it seems to me that if we would follow the teachings of that great Saviour, we would be a little bit more tolerant and less fearful of all of these so-called enemies that are closing in on us. What is the best armour? I think the best armour is the example shown by this great teacher, and I think that was: "Go about and do good. Be kind to your neighbours. It is always better to meet hatred with kindness." That is the antidote, and that is why, in my opening remarks, I mentioned that one of the great problems of the world today is charity in its broader sense, a sense of responsibility for people everywhere, realizing that all of these people everywhere are created in the image and likeness of one Creator.

Sometimes I am very much alarmed at the tendencies to, and the fear of another world-wide war. I certainly do not want to be atomized, and I do not think anyone else wants to be atomized. I think that if we, of the western democracies, began to think in terms of distributing the surplus production, particularly of our continent, to feed the world, we would be giving a far greater contribution to peace than we can in any other manner. I do not want to be critical of the things that have already been done in that direction, but I think it is high time we began to think in terms of laying a permanent trade basis that will facilitate, not only good relations, but the exchange of goods between all people. I believe that is the best way to meet totalitarianism.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Mr. J. Walter Erb (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in this debate, I should first like to associate myself with the members of this House who have preceded me in expressing to you my congratulations. The fact that this House was re-named you Speaker for the second time is eminent proof of your ability, your fairness and your integrity. It is my hope, Sir, that as the session progresses, you will increasingly have the co-operation of this Assembly.

I should also like to commend the mover, the hon. member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak), beside whom I have the pleasure to sit, for this excellent and forthright address, and also the seconder, the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker), for his equally fine address in seconding the speech from the throne. The people of Canora and Hanley constituencies, Mr. Speaker, should be congratulated upon their excellent choice of these two young, able men, and I am confident that they will continue to make contributions on a par with what they have made in future. I am also confident that the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. Patterson) will have to revise his figures upwards as to the percentage of the number of people these two young men will represent in the Legislature after 1952.

I also want to congratulate the hon. Premier for the confidence and the trust that the people of Saskatchewan have placed in him and his government. His re-election was not only a personal victory, but it was a victory for democratic socialism in Saskatchewan.

The speech from the throne has engendered a lively debate, and I was impressed with the eloquence of many of the members who have participated therein. The repartee has, at times, been delightful and of course has tended to relieve the monotony, shall I say, of the debate. Both sides of the House have given and taken criticism which, of course, is as it should be, but I am wondering whether the debate would not have been improved or perhaps shortened if we had included in the rules of the debate a proverb which goes like this: "If it is very painful for you to criticize your friends, you are safe in doing it, but if you take the slightest pleasure in it, that is the time to hold your tongue."

The hon. Leader of the Opposition suggested that if a provincial election were held this year that the C.C.F. would not be returned to office. I suggest that if a provincial election were held, might it not also be that the hon. member for Rosthern and his colleagues might find themselves out of this House entirely. I suggest that the hon. Leader of the Opposition leave well enough alone.

I want to congratulate His Majesty's loyal Opposition upon their increased numbers in this Legislature, but I should like to suggest that the strength of an Opposition does not always lie in numbers, but rather in the quality of the constructive criticism that it is able to offer. The Opposition, as most of us know, in the past Legislature has not only lacked in numbers, but in constructive criticism completely. It is to be hoped that not only will this Opposition 'labour and bring forth a mouse', but that by its unbiased efforts enhance the deliberations so that all in this House and beyond will benefit thereby.

It has been customary, Mr. Speaker, among the liberties taken by the members in the address-in-reply to mention in passing one's own constituency. I, therefore, take great pride and pleasure in doing so at this time.

Milestone constituency, which I represent, is about 60 miles long and 42 miles wide. It lies about eight miles south of Regina on No. 6 highway. It begins, shall we say, at Yellow Grass in the south, and runs west to Kayville, and from Lajord in the north to Drinkwater in the west. It is endowed with some of the finest, most fertile land in Saskatchewan if not in the world; and it is, therefore, a predominantly growing area. That portion, of course, as to grain growing is taken in by the northern portion of the Sioux line which cuts diagonally through my constituency. Considerable mixed farming and some ranching is done in the southern portions. The people of my constituency have experienced both favourable and economic conditions. The dry and hungry thirties had disrupted their general plans for progress, and even today marks of the depression are still visible. The general economic picture today, however, is one of recovery and prosperity in large measure due to the indomitable spirit and resourcefulness of the people of Milestone constituency. While talking about my constituency, I should like to pay special tribute to the old timers of my constituency who, with the burden of passing years and a life fulfilled with useful and honest toil, are leaving our midst one by one. It is to them that we owe our deepest gratitude and high esteem. Their contribution to the development of the west cannot be measured in any material sense. They made the foundation of modern agriculture as it is today. The spade work is always the least glamorous, always the least remunerative and probably the most arduous. It is a far cry from our present agricultural mechanism of today to the time when with a yoke of oxen and walking plow they first turned the dark, rich, virgin soil. Notwithstanding their hardships — and they have been many — and the meagre first fruits of their toil, they held firm to the faith in the good earth and in their purpose, and in the hope of one day building a thriving and prosperous community. The result of that, Mr. Speaker, I might say that today throughout Milestone one might find the finest farm site buildings in the west; a tribute to the courage, the faith and the resourcefulness of these old timers. I believe that no more fitting memorial to them can be found than in the waving fields of grain and the sunny western skies under which they toiled.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to the people of Milestone constituency, whom I have the great pleasure, honour and privilege to represent, I want to express my thanks for the confidence and trust they have placed in me, and I, cognizant of my responsibility, shall not break faith with them.

At this point I want to commend the government for its excellent administration during the past four years. I am proud of its accomplishment in every field where human welfare is concerned. In 1944, when the C.C.F. government was elected to office it was faced with a tremendous task. To apply even remedial measures to 35 years of the neglect of past administrations was even a great task for a C.C.F. government. As soon as elected in 1944 this government went to work to implement that platform upon which it was elected. I need not go into the details of the most progressive legislation this province, for that matter this continent, has ever seen. The record speaks for itself. The hon. members of this Legislature know it, and what is more, the people of Saskatchewan know that record. I want to say this, when the government went back to the people in 1948 with that record, the people of Saskatchewan endorsed that record even more emphatically than they endorsed the platform in 1944.

In the 1944 election, Mr. Speaker, both the Liberal party and the C.C.F. party made commitments. The people of Saskatchewan had to choose between these two parties. It seemed, in the past, that the party making the most glamorous promises was the one that was usually elected. I dare say any promises that the C.C.F. could make would look pretty drab alongside of those of Liberal promises. But in 1944, and after 35 years of listening to Liberal promises, the patience of the people was exhausted, and so a C.C.F. government was swept into power. Let no one be so presumptuous as to think that the C.C.F. by this landslide was led to believe that everyone in the province was a C.C.F.er. It was obvious that to a large extent this election, or this large vote in favour of the C.C.F. was a protest vote. The Leader Post I am sure would concur with me in this. If I remember correctly, in 1944, after the election, The Leader Post made a commentary to this effect: that the people of Saskatchewan voted against the Liberal party in protest, or some of castigating the Liberal party to wake it up out of its lethargy, and that in due time, of course, the Liberal party, having taken cognizance of its punishment, would be re-elected. Well, a peculiar political metamorphosis must have taken place in a great many Liberals, and Conservatives for that matter, because in 1948 when this government was re-elected, it went back into office with a larger number of votes than before. In spite of the high-powered propaganda of the Liberal party, backed by the financial resources of the Chamber of Commerce, the banks, the mortgage companies, the packing houses, and the Grain Exchange, newly enriched by the coarse grain deal. It was probably the most costly provincial election in the history of Canada. The question on the night of June 24 was: "Why was the C.C.F. re-elected?" The answer is quite plain. In 1944 the people voted against something. In 1948 they voted for something.

I was amused by the historical sketch of the C.C.F. made by one of the members of the opposition. I just forgot who it was as it was before we got the seating plan, so I am quite at a loss to know which one it was. He said, among other things, that the C.C.F. was comprised of disgruntled Liberals and Conservatives. By 1948, Mr. Speaker, they and a great many other Liberals and Conservatives were not only disgruntled, they were completely disillusioned with the old parties, and so their political metamorphosis had become complete.

It appears that the hon. members of the opposition had never taken time to study the history of the C.C.F. and its constitution. If they did, I am sure their views and impressions would be radically different from what they are. The hon. member for Cannington (Mr. Patterson) — I am sorry he is not here — apparently does not like the way or our manner of holding caucus. Perhaps that is because of the fact that all our actions in the C.C.F. are so radically different from that of his party. I could find no clearer definition of that difference than that as expressed by Dr. Frank Scott, National Chairman of the C.C.F., and Professor of Law at McGill University, and I quote from his opening address at the National C.C.F. convention in Winnipeg last August, 1948:

The C.C.F. was formed just 16 years ago, and this is the tenth occasion on which we have assembled in national convention to discuss our policy and to choose our leader. This year the calling of national conventions by the two other major parties reminds us how normal this event is for us, and how exceptional it is for them. The purpose of their conventions is the choice of leaders. They have no tradition of democratic control over party policy and organization. They have never believed that a political

party should be directed and financed by its rank and file members. Yet these undemocratic parties have the effrontery to stand before the Canadian people and to pretend that they will save democracy from the totalitarian practices of the C.C.F. This attitude is similar to that of certain large corporations whose directors, when they have successfully combined the eliminate competition and to control a free market, then become the stoutest defenders of free enterprise. The undemocratic parties are the greatest opponents of democratic socialism, and the monopoly capitalist planners are the greatest opponents of democratic planning. It is time more attention was paid by our citizens to the inner construction and working of political parties. As the party behaves in its private meetings, so will it behave when it comes to power. Men and women educated through their party in the practice of free discussions, frequent elections and respect for individual opinions, will not be dictators when they take over the machinery of state. But people accustomed in their party to the dictatorship of political bosses, to all sorts of patronage and private deals, and to the control of policy by the big contributors to centre party funds, will inevitably abuse their state authority, and will continue in public office the corrupting influences in which they have been trained. Such has been Canadian experience in the past.

For the past few days, Mr. Speaker, I have listened to speeches from both sides of this House, as to by what numbers one side increased its ranks and as to the additional votes received by the other. Well, Mr. Speaker, I was beginning to wonder who won the election, but after looking over this side of the House, I was assured that we had the situation well in hand.

President Truman once said: "There are probably one million men in the United States who could fill any office as well as I, but the fact remains, gentlemen, I am the President." And so, Mr. Speaker, the fact remains the C.C.F. is the government of the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Tucker: — Unfortunately.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — It all depends on the point of view.

Mr. Erb: — The inference was made several days ago by one of the hon. members of the opposition that an unduly large amount of the highways per portion was being spent or was spent in the constituencies of the hon. Premier and the Minister of Highways — your clapping won't be so loud after I get done with this.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if there was a conspiracy, I was involved, because in my constituency when No. 6 is completed there will be approximately 35 miles of blacktop highway; and for further information I am going to refer to Public Accounts of 1947-48, and I find that in my constituency was spent some \$200,000 on road construction, bridges, etc.

Mr. Tucker: — That may be why you got elected.

Mr. Erb: — I believe that it was quite unkind to say that this large portion was spent solely in the constituencies of the hon. Premier and the Minister of Highways.

February 25, 1949

I am sure that the hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. McCormack) — and I see he is not here either — seems like every member I am speaking about isn't here — and I am going to spend many, many pleasant hours gliding over this excellent highway.

Mr. Speaker, this is only a portion of the tremendous highway construction that has gone on in this province. The hon. member for Cannington (Mr. Patterson) was most unfair in his criticism of Saskatchewan roads. This unfair criticism is detrimental to the operators of tourist camps and tourist resorts, who derive a considerable portion of their annual income from tourist trade. Certainly the least the hon. member could do toward encouraging tourist trade is to paint a true picture of our roads. I am sure that the tourist resorts would concur with me in this.

We have also heard criticism, by various members of the opposition, of our rural electrification programme. I need not bring to the attention of this House the splendid job that has been done by this government in the past four years. The Premier in his address made that quite clear, as well as the Minister of Public Works in his address yesterday; but I want to point out that almost one-half of all the towns, villages and hamlets in my constituency and scores and scores of farmers are connected to the power lines. Even I have power on my farm, and I was not one of the poor farmers in 1941 who received it. I am not quite that fortunate. I have often wondered who those poor men were; they ought to go down in the Hall of Fame.

Mr. Speaker, I might take in each department of the government and enumerate in detail the contributions each has made to the social and economic welfare of the people of the Milestone constituency, but time would not permit this indulgence. It is sufficient to say that in electing a C.C.F. candidate the Milestone constituency has put its stamp of approval on this government.

I should now like to give a brief resume of the election campaign in my constituency. That probably is something that all of us are interested in. Needless to say, of course, that I won the election there. The Returning Office gave me a little pink slip on which he wrote down what the figures were, and I have broken it down into percentages. I thought probably if the hon. member for Cannington were here he would do that for me, but, in any case, it was a three-cornered affair. There was the Liberal-Progressive Conservative candidate, and I could not decide that for a long, long time. Some people said that he was a Conservative in Liberal clothing, and others said that he was a Liberal in Conservative clothing, but I have come to the conclusion that he must have been a Liberal because in all these Liberal-Progressive Conservative arrangements the Liberals always wear the pants. In all fairness to my Liberal-Progressive Conservative opponent, I must say he conducted himself in a gentlemanly manner throughout the campaign, but the brass hats of the Liberal-Progressive Conservative machine sent out seasoned speakers to assist him and they, experts in the art of fear and propaganda, masters of insinuation, distorters of truth and fact, resorted to every trick in their political bag to swing the election in their favour.

Mr. Tucker: — We did not hear whom you were talking about. Were you talking about the C.C.F. speakers?

Mr. Erb: — They harped on the high taxes and they trumpeted about what they would do when elected. They fiddled their way trying to drum up the bogey of communism, but with the preponderance of the brass of this political symphony, the effect produced was only a discord of wind.

I should now like to make a few remarks about what the hon. members of the opposition cannot seem to comprehend, and that is democratic socialism. The hon. member for Cannington seems to labour under the illusion that just because we call ourselves C.C.F. in Saskatchewan, and because the government in Australia calls itself a Labour government, and likewise New Zealand and in Great Britain, and everywhere else by different names — and even Mr. Alexander calls himself a Co-operator — therefore it cannot be that we are democratic socialists, or belong to the philosophy or are disciples of democratic socialism. Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's party calls itself the Liberal party and Mr. Drew's party calls itself the Progressive Conservative party, Mr. Solon Low's party calls itself the Social Credit party, and Mr. Duplessis of Quebec calls his party the Union Nationale party, yet they all ascribe to one political philosophy, and that is capitalism. Therefore, while New Zealand, Australia, Great Britain, Pakistan and all the other countries call their governments by different names, does it not also follow that they might be disciples of one philosophy, that is democratic socialism. But there are none so blind as those who do not wish to see.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Erb: — Actually, we have much in common with the capitalist parties. We believe in private ownership and so do they. We believe in co-operative ownership, and so do they; and I am quite sure that the Leader of the Opposition does as well. We believe in public ownership and so do they. Really, Mr. Speaker, we should get along quite well together if it were not for the fact where each of us believes the emphasis should be and to the extent of such ownership. This difference makes for capitalism on one hand and democratic socialism on the other.

Mr. A.W. Loehr (Humboldt): — Coming over here, eh.

Mr. Erb: — Democratic socialism is not a revolution, but rather an evolution. It is the banding together of the common people against the tyranny and oppression of the few. A democratic socialist government comes to power not by coup d'état, but by the will of the majority of the people, and by democratic procedure. Wherever in the world today we have a democratic socialist government, it is yet to be and can be changed by the will of the people. Incidentally, it is significant that in the past week or so in the two by-elections held in Great Britain both seats were retained by the Labour government. It is even more significant that in all the by-elections in Great Britain since the Labour government took office they have not lost one single seat.

An Hon. Member: — What about Saskatchewan?

Mr. Erb: — The hon. member for Turtleford (Mr. Trippe) berated the Labour government in Mr. Churchill's words "that the Labour government was liquidating the British Empire". I do not believe that the Labour government in England was as much interested in liquidating the British Empire as it was interested in liquidating British capitalist imperialism. That is the type of capitalism that held millions of people throughout the world, the Empire especially, in economic slavery. The bond that holds the British Commonwealth of Nations together today is incalculably stronger than at any time in Britain's colonial history, and that bond is democratic socialism. The destiny of man is not economic bondage, but economic freedom; not war and its attendant and subsequent misery, but peace and well-being. Democratic socialism, I submit, Sir, points the way to the full realization of man's destiny for its fundamental characteristic is its ability to meet the ever-changing pattern of economic demand. It marks the change in the old order. As Tennyson says in his *Morte d'Arthur*: "The old order changes, yielding place to new, for God fulfills himself in many ways lest one good custom should corrupt the world."

One of the hon. members made an effort to give a definition of capitalism. Now, as he is on the other side of the House, I am at a loss to understand why he did not give us a better one. When I want a definition, I go to the best authority, a good dictionary, and I am fortunate in having Volumes I and II. It is not a socialist dictionary either because it is published by a capitalistic press, the Appleton Central copy. Now the definition of capitalism in that dictionary is as follows: "the concentration of capital in the hands of a few, or the resulting power or influence; also, a system favouring such concentration of wealth." Mr. Speaker, I submit that in this definition there is nothing to justify capitalism any long.

An Hon. Member: — What is its definition for socialism?

Mr. Erb: — I had a teacher one time who told me that if I wanted to get to know a word thoroughly, and remember it ever after, to look it up myself; and for the member's benefit, the same dictionary but of which I took the definition of capitalism may be found in the Library.

I want to be fair in saying that capitalism in its day had made its contribution, and probably one that was worthwhile, but it has long since outlived its usefulness to society as a whole, due to its fundamental characteristics of snow-balling, uninhibited by any moral restraint. The hon. member for Cannington (Mr. Patterson) in his speech tried to justify the principle of capitalism by saying that he believes in allowing the maximum freedom of initiative to anyone in working out his economic welfare with the least amount of government restriction. Well, what the hon. member believes is his prerogative, but what he is suggesting, if carried out to its ultimate conclusion, would create the law of the jungle in our economics where the race is to the swift and the battle to the strong. I don't know whether the hon. member feels that he can thrive in this economic jungle — perhaps he can — but it is certain that thousands would perish economically, victims of the unscrupulous. Unbridled free enterprise exists because it has successfully subsidized political parties to power. It follows, therefore, that capitalist governments legislate in favour of capitalism. We have only to look at Ottawa and the legislation

passed there in the past few years to see the veracity of this statement. I should like to quote a figure in that regard. I am happy to hear — at least it is just a rumour — that in bringing down their budget, they are mending their ways. It seems like there is a federal election on the way. On May 27, 1947, the government turned down a C.C.F. proposal to exempt single persons up to \$1,000 and married men to \$2,000, but on December 31, 1947, the federal government completely removed the excess profits tax from corporations. On June 1, the government subsidy of two cents per quart on milk, and on October 1 a government subsidy of 55 cents per hundredweight on milk was removed; but on February 14 a subsidy of \$7.2 million was granted to the Dominion Steel Company and a \$1.6 million subsidy to Algoma Steel. On August 17, 1946, the federal government increased salaries to judges up to \$20,000 per year. On July 17, 1947, diplomats pensions were set at \$7,000 a year for life. But on June 26, 1947, the government refused a C.C.F. proposal for a \$50 a month pension to old age pensioners. On July 17, 1947, the government refused a cost-of-living bonus to the superannuated civil servants who were getting less than the old age pensioner. I merely state those facts to bear out what I have said before; that unbridled free enterprise exists because it has successfully subsidized political parties to power, and as a result that is the type of legislation that we have been getting. It is only in conditions of expediency when the common people are allowed the crumbs that fall from the table.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier in the closing remarks of his speech portrayed a stirring picture of the situation in the world and particularly in Europe today. Time did not permit him to deal fully with all the phases of human misery and suffering and destitution in that unhappy land, but I want to emphasize one point, and that is capitalism will not be revived in Europe and particularly in Germany, and that the people there are slowly but surely building a new order of economic security, justice and freedom. The hon. Premier also stressed that democratic socialism in Europe is the only bulwark towards the westward spread of communism. We have heard inferences ever since this debate opened, by almost every one of the members of the opposition, that democratic socialism and communism are synonymous or that democratic socialism leads to communism. These inferences suggest not only a complete disregard for truth and fact but they also suggest spiritual and mental bankruptcy. Germany, once the home of the greatest and the most powerful cartels the world has ever known, lies in ruins. A great portion of her country and population are behind the iron curtain, and thousands more are languishing in concentration and slave camps — what a price to pay for the common people of Germany for the unbridled greed, insatiable lust for power of the few. That, Mr. Speaker, is capitalism. That is the system that the hon. members of the opposition extol and that they so desperately try to defend and justify. That is a system which, by their slavish obedience, perpetuates not only economic inequality but, in its sinister phases, depression or war. By whatever circumstances, whether by compassion for the poor and the sick and the downtrodden, or by the grace of Providence, I am proud I am a democratic socialist. I am still more proud that as such I was elected in the Legislature, for when I speak of economic freedom and all the other freedoms that we want to enjoy, I know that there are billions upon billions of people throughout the world, of every race, creed and colour, who are of kindred spirit. The brotherhood of man, long envisioned by prophets and poets, is at last taking form in democratic socialism. Markham once said:

“We have committed the golden rule to memory; let us now commit it to life.” We need now to find a material basis for brotherhood. Government must be made the organ of fraternity, a working form of comrade love.

This government, Mr. Speaker, can be proud that it is the vanguard of a new and better day. Only to the extent that we become selfless and lose ourselves in filling the needs of others can we bring out the brotherhood and a federated world.

Poetry probably speaks more truth than prophecy, but there are certain poems that seem to make a particular emphasis on prophecy, and Tennyson’s Locksley Hall is one in which, I am sure, all of you are interested and have learned in your school days. So much of the prophetic poem has materialized since it was written that it well may point the shape of things to come, and, in closing, I should like to quote from Tennyson’s Locksley Hall.

For I dipt into the future, far as human eye could see,
Saw the Vision of the world, and all the wonder that would be;

Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales;

Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rain’d a ghastly dew
From the nations’ airy navies grappling in the central blue;

Far along the world-wide whisper of the south-wind rushing warm,
With the standards of the people plunging thro’ the thunder-storm;

Till the war-drum throb’d no longer, and the battle-flags were furl’d
In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the motion.

The question being put, it was agreed on the following division:

Yeas — 39

Messieurs

Douglas (Weyburn)
Wellbelove
Benson
McIntosh
Brockelbank
Fines
Corman
Lloyd
Brown
Gibson

Murray
Thair
Darling
Nollet
Howe
Douglas (Rosetown)
Sturdy
Williams
Gibbs
Heming

Dewhurst
Stone
Erb
Kuziak
Denike
Swallow
Willis
Buchanan
Walker
Larsen

Nays — 19

Messieurs

Tucker	Woods	Loehr
Marion	Trippe	Banks
Prince	Egnatoff	Horsman
Culliton	Korchinski	McDonald
Patterson	Cameron	McCormack
Danielson		Blanchard
Dundas		Lofts

The Assembly adjourned at 6:00 o'clock p.m.