

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Eleventh Legislature

Thursday, March 10, 1949

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

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. Mr. Fines:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair.

Mr. G. H. Danielson (Arm River): — In rising to take part in this debate today, I want to mention that I was complimented the other day by some member on the opposite side of the House having done so well during this session, and I hope he will have the same compliment to hand out after I get through.

I have been in this House for fourteen sessions, this is the fifteenth, and this is the sixteenth session I have attended. This is a new Assembly, of course, being the first one after the general election which was held on June 24. I was listening to a broadcast before the election — I think it was the 9th — and the Premier announced the date of the election. Being very clever with words and phrases, of course, he referred to the opposition, and then he said: "What opposition?" Well, it is my pleasure, today, Mr. Speaker, to introduce the hon. Premier the opposition of the Saskatchewan Legislature. I also want to say to him that in the rural part of Saskatchewan he lost over 500 votes from the last election and the opposition combined gained over 55,000 rural votes in the province of Saskatchewan. That is the sum and substance of the election results.

Many things have been said during the session, and so many things that have been said have been dealt with so very well by various speakers, not only on one side of the House, but on both sides of the House. The views, of course, differ very considerably in the line they have taken. I am sure you will find that many of the things I am going to say this afternoon will be a repetition of some of the things I have said in the years gone by, as this is the sixth session I have sat in the House during the C.C.F. regime, and listening to the Premier. I have listened to him now 11 times, twice every session and once this session, and I have had to endure or enjoy the same speech ever since the beginning, and that is a re-hash of the sins of the Liberals party and the wonderful benefits of socialism that have been brought to the province through the C.C.F. efforts.

There were only five of us in the opposition during the last four years, previous to this session. When you work together as we did during these years — Mr. Proctor has been referred to on the floor of this House and I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I appreciate my association with Mr. Proctor. He is now Justice Proctor, and it is very well-earned by him. I want to say in regard to that gentleman that he has a mind of his own, he speaks it freely, he has no hesitation to express his convictions. I also want to associate myself with the new member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) when he said that there is one characteristic that is outstanding with the gentleman, and that is that he always told the truth.

One of the first things the Premier did, when he got up to speak in this session, was to mention the deplorable conditions which were existing previous to his government taking office, regarding the health situation in the province. He said they were so deplorable, and no doubt that is how he expected to find them. That was his hope and ambition, to really get something to spread around among the people to justify the charges that were made precious to his coming into office in 1944. Then he sent outside of Canada, to the United States and hired a gentleman by the name of Dr. Sigerist — I think he got him from Johns Hopkins University in the United States. He brought him in here, and I am sure, in my mind at least, that his intention was to get from this gentleman a most condemnatory report in regard to the health situation in the province of Saskatchewan. That gentleman came here for the purpose of condemning, and he stayed here and expressed praise. Speaking to one of the service clubs in the city of Regina, after he had completed his report, he said: “Saskatchewan’s survey was one of the most pleasant he had ever undertaken in his career. He had had similar assignments, but this one in Saskatchewan was different from those in South Africa, a sit was one of them in which health services did not have to start from scratch. In Saskatchewan it was a case of bringing the existing facilities into more service for all the people.” And the Premier himself stood on the floor of this House, March 3, 1945, and he said, speaking about hospital grants: “We would find that the hospital grant was 50 cents per day per patient. This is one of the highest grants paid in Canada, and it speaks well for the previous administration of the province and the people in taking such interest in health matters.” That is what the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan said, leading the socialistic government at that time, and still is. That contradicts any ‘deplorable conditions’ mentioned before the election. The accusations on this condition in the province got so rough, bad and extreme that the medical association of the province, who has absolutely refused on any occasion to take part in political controversy, had to come out and state their mind on this subject. Here is what they said: “The C.C.F. statement that the death rate of babies in Saskatchewan is more than twice as high as it needs to be. The Rev. T.C. Douglas, May 20, 1944, in Regina said our death rate for infants is 65 for every 1,000 where, in truth, 1944 (this is the doctors, the medical association of Saskatchewan speaking) it was only 43 compared to the dominion rate average of 54. This is a reduction form a dominion rate of 63 in 1938 in spite of the fact 30 percent of the doctors are on active service.” That, Mr. Speaker, is worth more to the people of Saskatchewan, in my estimation, than a thousand accusations coming from a political party which has built up its fortunes on accusing somebody else, on statements of conditions which are absolutely untrue.

In 1943 the per capita expenditure rate for public health in the province was the highest in the Dominion of Canada. Those are truths, not C.C.F., socialistic propaganda. We will hear more about that before we get through today.

On June 18, 1938, the Premier was at a meeting at Wawota, and he said: “In the past few years the government has spent over \$1 million in the municipalities to build new hospitals and to extend existing institutions.” Well now, what have they paid out? The question was asked here in the House a few days ago, and every member has it in the Votes and Proceedings. In 1944-45 there was nothing paid on them; 1945-46 it was \$69,900; in 1946-47 it was \$202,500; 1947-48, the last year we are dealing with here, \$254,316 - \$526,716 paid out in all these years. Let me point out that for the last two years the

March 10, 1949

hospital grant which has been in operation in the province since 1912 was 50 cents a day to every bona fide hospital in the province, for every day a patient was in that hospital. For four or five years, during the hard thirties this former government paid to the hospitals in the province 75 cents per day extra grant, and our total receipt from the government in those days was \$1.25 per day.

But let us get back. That is why the hospitals gave a service to the people and nobody was turned away, in spite of the member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak). The total amount of over \$526,000 was in the last two years. The hospital grant, which I mentioned, of 50 cents per day amounted to close to \$500,000 and some years more than \$500,000, has been taken away. We paid out more in one year in hospital grants than they have handed out in grants in hospitals for building purposes in four years.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I am sure my hon. friend would not want to mislead the House. The hospital grant has not been taken away. It is now included in the payment to the hospital under the hospital services plan.

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is another of what we used to call weasel words but we can't say it any more, according to the rules of the House.

The hospital services plan is an entirely different thing. The people are taxed and assessed for what services they get, and the rest comes out of the public revenue of this province. The hospital grant was taken away by this government, and now they are handing out just about 50 percent in hospital grants to what it used to be, for building grants, in the province of Saskatchewan to certain prepared hospitals — not all of them. I am going to deal with some of those things now.

This government is notorious for discrimination. It does not make any difference where you go. It is the same with your school grants, and it certainly has been proved with the hospital grants. In my district there is a hospital at Imperial. They pleaded and pleaded with this government — it is a poor district with a lot of sandy land, hills come up immediately to the town on the west side — and they were able to get \$300 per bed of grant from this government. The hospital at Watrous, in a much wealthier district, got \$1,000 per bed. \$1,000 per bed. I want to draw to the attention of this House that Arm River has not got a C.C.F. member, but Watrous has. That is the situation and I say it is rank discrimination, absolutely.

There has been a good deal said on the floor of the house with regard to the operation of the hospital plan. In spite of what has been said by some of the gentlemen over there, there was no puss in boots from the opposition against this legislature or the hospital plan when it was put into effect. There is no man in this House can get up and say that it was so, and tell the truth. In spite of what has been said, what we criticized and criticize today is the tremendous overhead built up by a bureaucracy of officials that takes about \$600,000 a year out of the people's money, for their services. I think four-fifths of it can be done away with. I have had something to do with hospitals since 1926, was chairman for five years and I am still on that board. In the last two years we did not get enough, of course, to pay for the operation

of that hospital. The result was that we were in debt at the end of the year. Last year they said they were going to increase the per diem payment so there would be no deficit. You did that, Mr. Speaker, but what was handed out with the one hand, you reached out with the other hand and said: "We're going to cut your rate paid by the government from the Hospital Commission." One just offset the other. In our hospital, within a few dollars, one offset the other. What they gave us was taken away by cutting the infants rate in two, and at the end of the year we were \$6,500 in the hole. Here again is discrimination, Mr. Speaker. The city of Regina get their full hospital operating costs at the end of every month, and so do all the cities so far as I know. Why are the rural hospitals singled out, and should be struggling along for 12 months until they get their audit completed, sometimes into the new year, before they can get their money. It is not so easy for us to go into the bank and raise \$6,500 to keep that institution going. We can also tell the hon. gentlemen, within a few dollars, at the end of every month what it costs to operate that hospital for the preceding month. There again, Mr. Speaker, is rank discrimination, and I want to tell this government that it is time it was done away with.

They are now collecting \$10 per person, with a maximum of \$30 per family, and I can tell them if they would let us keep our money in our district, we could give free hospitalization with all the trimmings that go with it. We would allow our patients to go to Rochester, Winnipeg, Regina, Saskatoon, or any other place, and pay everything, and still have several thousand dollars left to build a nurses' home in the town of Davidson, if you will let us have that money. We have to come down here, and in the process at least 10 percent is taken out to pay high salaries and frills that the government put on. And they are still increasing these frills.

What happens if a person cannot pay his hospitalization? Well, it says here that many things happen. In regard to anyone who cannot pay his fee the municipality pays it, as they always did, and it is the old, old story that you cannot get away from, that somebody pays. If the individual does not pay, the municipality or the government pays. They are doing it now. I came down on the train the other day with a gentleman who advised me he was a councilor. He said that at the last meeting he had a peculiar case, he mentioned the name, where there was a \$186 hospital bill, and they had to pay that. "Then, he said, we had to buy the fellow a hospital card." That is the situation although the idea has been propagated in this House that such things are not going on any more. I would like to tell the member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) that he should know better what is going on. If he does not pay, and the investigators, these fellows who go out and check up on these delinquent taxpayers who can't pay, they prosecute them, and then they put them in jail. They have the right under the Act to put them in jail. I am going to read something to this House that was said the other day:

Reginald Smith, First World War pensioner, was assessed to the tune of \$61 in fines and costs, in the raising of Saskatchewan hospital taxes, or 40 days in Prince Albert Jail, by magistrate W.G. Elder, K.C., in city Police Court this morning. It was charged that Smith benefited from the hospitalization plan and is liable to hospitalization taxes, and failed to pay the taxes for 1947 and 1948. For failing to pay the 1947 tax, Smith was fined \$10 and costs, or ten days in jail, and ordered to pay \$15 tax and \$4 surtax or a further ten days in jail, and was given to November 13

March 10, 1949

to pay. For not paying the 1948 taxes he was fined \$10 and costs or ten days, and ordered to pay \$15 or a further ten days in jail. The sentences are to run concurrently. Mr. Spence told the court, in answer to the charges, that he must be guilty as he has not paid the tax. In his defence he said he did not think he had to pay as he was a pensioner and his hospitalization was covered by the Pension Department.

It goes on to give the returned man's record of service in France. This thing came up here yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and the Premier rose in his seat and said it was misrepresented. Let him stand up now and say it was misrepresented. We are not going to take that any more; we have had enough of it. I could speak for a long time on this, but I am not going to do so as there are other things I want to mention. I know you don't like it, but I can't help that.

Premier Douglas: — You overestimate.

Mr. Danielson: — I listened to the Minister of Education and he made a very good defence of his department, an excellent defence since he had such a poor case. Many things have been said by the other members, but I have a point or two here that I want to bring to his attention. Today in the province of Saskatchewan, at least I can speak for my district and I have also spoken to people outside my district, and we find schools that have been opened for a service to the people ever so far back, today are closed. I came down on the train with a gentleman who lives in the south-west corner of my district. I have a list of schools here. I am not going to give the name of the schools. There are ten schools and only three of them are open, and one of the three has a 'baby-sitter'. Let me read some of the things I have here to the hon. gentlemen: I strongly object to the government sending Normal School students to teach in schools out in the rural areas when they have not completed their training. This practice is a discrimination against the farm children who have inexperienced teachers sent to the country schools with no supervision. "Mr. Feeley (my hon. friend for Canora should listen to this) suggested to the government that inexperienced teachers should be sent to schools in cities and towns, and the trained teachers should be sent to teach in the country schools." Well, I am inclined to agree. If we have to have that type of teacher it might be all right. It might be a good plan. But today we find that the experienced teachers are not in the rural schools, they go into the cities and towns, and we have not teachers except in the odd school in the rural areas. Here is another thing which was said in the Legislature in April, 1943 by Mr. Phelps: "I am here to defend the rights of rural children who obtain the great measure of their education at the existing price-tag that has been attached to the present system, and it must go. Every boy and girl in this province, and in the whole dominion, is entitled to an education, both elementary and higher, regardless of their parent's ability to pay." Here is another one: "The aims of the C.C.F. is to provide equal educational opportunity for all, all over the province. Those on this side of the House (it was the opposition speaking) propose that the standard of education available to rural pupils be comparable to those in urban centres. Can we give adequate education to rural children under the present system, or shall we do away with the mistaken methods of local financing." That address was given by Tom Johnson and reported in the Phoenix, April 19, 1943.

Mr. Speaker, what has this government done? My friends smile over there. I can take them to the rural part of Saskatchewan and show them place after place where there are two or three children sitting at home that have no school to go to. I went into a farm just before the election last summer — I didn't go to electioneer because I didn't need to. It was about 2 o'clock and I drove in there and I said: "Can I get through that road by the Church?" there had been drifted soil there for years and that road had not been traveled for some time. On the porch was a lady and two children. I know her and I know her husband. Just before I left I said: "You folks won't forget to go over to the school on the 24th of June and cast your ballot?" She did not answer that, but she said: "What school?" "Well, I said, the school is half a mile north and a mile west." "Why, she said, that school has not been open for a year and a half." There was a boy and a girl there, and she pointed to the boy and said: "that boy should have been in school a year and a half ago, and he hasn't had a day's schooling yet. The superintendent had the nerve to come in and tell my husband that he should take me and the children into town and he should stay here and farm. We have milking cows, turkeys and chickens and regular mixed farming." Now, that is the situation out in the rural part of this province. You can smile and grin all you like, but that is a fact.

I went home last Saturday and I was walking down the street in the afternoon and I met a gentleman. This gentleman, in 1944, was one of the most ardent supporters of the C.C.F. He was out to do anything — they have those kind of people in the C.C.F. I spoke to him and he said: "I want to talk to you." He told me about a school that was ten miles away from the family I just spoke to. They opened the school next to the family, and they closed the school ten miles away and now he had two girls sitting at home this winter with no school. That was his tale. Both these people were paying taxes on their land. Now the boy and the girl in the first family is going to school, but the other school where the other fellow is is now closed. Out of ten schools there are three open, and one of the three has a 'baby-sitter. As I said, the inspector up there, at election time, his job was to play politics and run around the country and take part in the elections. You can take that down if you want to.

The people of Saskatchewan today are up against a problem, and that is — you are a practical man, Mr. Speaker, and you will see the point I am going to make — when these schools first commenced to close in the winter time, two or three years ago, the wealthy families, and I can mention three or four, moved into town, some to Craik, Girvin and Davidson. That takes the children out of the rural district, and reduces the children in these districts, and there you are, they have the excuse that they cannot keep the schools open because they haven't children enough. But the poor people, mostly renter, people who are trying to get a start on the farm, are told to take their children to town, but they cannot because they cannot afford to do it. They have to take care of their livestock and try to make a living there. I want to say to you today, and I say so without any fear of contradiction, there are two things that this government is responsible for, in removing the people from our farms more than anything else, and they are the Farm Security Act and the Larger School Units.

There are hundreds of young men of today who have to go out and rent a far, when they could have bought if they had a security in the sale of that land. They have reduced land sales in the province to a cash basis, and the Premier knows.

March 10, 1949

Premier Douglas: — I don't know anything of the kind.

Mr. Tucker: — You should know it if you don't.

Mr. Danielson: — I can tell you instances that I myself have been up against in this province. What happened? I had two returned men rent a section and a half of land that I looked after a year ago. They could have put up a fair amount of money on that land, but they could not do it because a man from the States came in and bought it all for cash. The two boys who had been renting three sections of land still have three sections of land, and a section and a half as well, The other fellow had to get out and find land some place else. They would have had the opportunity to buy that land if that land had been secured in the transaction, knowing that if they built on that he had his land and could get it back if they did not come through and live up to the contract. He did not want cash out of it because he had plenty of money. He would sooner have left his money in that land, but four or five percent interest had been taken down to the United States. Two percent was all he could get for it there.

That policy has not helped anybody except a few probably who had their loads with the Farm Loan Board, just a handful.

An Hon. Member: — They got votes out of it.

Mr. Danielson: — I am no so sure about that. Every road has an end sometime, you know. It takes people a little while to wake up and get the true impact of this thing into their minds, and then there is reaction about that sort of thing. They find out the whole thing was a fake and a fraud; but it serves at election time.

What about the teachers' salaries? We have heard a lot about that, not only here but out on the hustings. There was no candidate in that last election but what he talked about teachers' salaries. Well, I am not so sure that we need to be disappointed at the teachers' salaries in the old days. You know, Mr. Speaker, they were terribly small, but everything was down accordingly. But just as soon as things began to get better, the teachers' salaries came up, and come up rapidly, even more rapidly, I think, than under this government. In 1944 the average teachers' salary in this province was \$1,100. if the Minister of Education does not think so I will quote: "The income of Saskatchewan school teachers improved steadily during the past eight years from a low of \$407 in 1936 to a salary of \$1,100 in 1944, according to figures released Thursday by the Department of Education." This was January 12, 1945, and came right from the hon. gentleman's own department. What has happened to teachers' salaries? If I sat in those benches I would be reluctant to go out and take any particular credit for what has been accomplished insofar as teachers' salaries are concerned, because in four years, 1944 to 1947, there was an increase in the weekly teachers' salaries of \$7.35. Well, that certainly is not anything to be proud of, when everyone else's salary has been doubled and some more than doubled in that period. So I don't think we have anything to be ashamed of so far as the record of the old government is concerned.

When the Minister of Education gets up to speak, he has a certain way of speaking; he speaks at a strong clip and really drives it in. I know when

he was speaking in the House he had done his best to make a good showing in a poor case, but I say to him, in all seriousness — there is no politics in this — there is a problem in Saskatchewan . . . laugh all you like if that is all you can get out of this thing. You are not smiling so much anyway.

There is this problem in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. It has gone on for two or three years, and is coming to a head. The problem is, what are you going to do with these families out on the prairies that has no access to a school. That is what I want to know, and that is what the people in my district want to know. That is right on the doorstep of this government.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Will the hon. gentleman permit a question?

Mr. Danielson: — Yes.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Will he give us some suggestions? Would he then carry on and give us the answers?

Mr. Danielson: — I think I can do that. If you will hand the school administration over to the people who live in the district, who are interested in the school and the education of their own children, you will get that school opened. You bet you will. I can tell him, in the hard thirties there was school after school in my district that operated with five or six pupils — even four pupils — and they were kept open, my with ‘baby-sitters’ either.

An Hon. Member: — And they paid the bills.

Mr. Danielson: — We paid the bills. It is not in your philosophy to do this, to hand any authority to the man who is vitally interested in the affairs of his own district.

The Minister of Education was very emphatic and very critical of any suggestions from this side of the House, that there was anything except a purely business proposition as far as the schools were concerned. We were all trying to fool the people, if we suggested there was any ideological matter in the question so far as anything controversial in the textbooks in the schools were concerned. There is a chapter in the history of this government, and a chapter that is not very creditable, and that is the notorious adult education. They had one about Communist Watson Thompson and his associates, Red Parker and R.B. Henderson. For ten solid weeks they were feeding the people of this province of Saskatchewan — I suppose it even permeated outside the province — a line of communistic propaganda that was something the people of the province could not stand. The reaction was so strong the hon. Minister had to get rid of it.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. Action was taken with that particular incident before either the Liberals party of The Leader-Post said anything about it.

Mr. Tucker: — It is not a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

March 10, 1949

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — I am correcting a statement.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, they hired this man, he was not even from Saskatchewan. They hunted around outside to get the right type of man, and no doubt when they hired this man they knew what they wanted him to do. There is no question about that. He was the type of individual that suited this government. He proceeded to set up a certain type of department to educate the adults in the province of Saskatchewan to certain things. For ten long weeks that Radio College and Living Newspaper was carried on. There are many things that might be of interest to the people here this afternoon. Here is one of them: On November 17, the Front Page attacked Time magazine for the treatment of a story on the general behaviour of the Red army soldiers in occupied Europe. Here is what the Living Newspaper said: “The new world, full of fascinations and dangers, included bombed cities which were ugly with ghettos even before they were blitzed, country roads strewn with dead and dying, farm manors where peasants lived in hovels, small towns depleted of life, substance and laughter. What may have impressed the Red soldiers (this is Watson Thompson speaking) as beautiful in terms of buildings or city services could also have been found in the great cities of Leningrad, Kiev and Odessa. What may have impressed them as ugly, the disease, the unsanitary living conditions of the millions, the crematoriums and enforced slavery, their communist nurseries probably had accurately described beforehand. Many (using Times’ favourite word) were undoubtedly grateful that ‘Home was never like this.’” “Peasant for peasant (the story goes on) the standard of living on a co-operative farm in the Soviet Union is higher than that on a feudal farm in any of the countries into which Red army men streamed.” It goes on, reporting the dialogue in the Radio Caucus: “Harvey: Marshall Tito is a Yugoslav and a Communist, and he and his party had control of the country at election time. He appraised the needs of his people according to Marxist principles and then proclaimed an election in which the candidates could represent themselves as best fitted to satisfy those needs.” Then Harvey said this, rebutting the no-opposition argument: “Tito, like Stalin, counts on worker and farmer support for a dictatorship of the proletariat within which democratic procedure is in order. Without the will of the people in support of communism, of course, he would have no hope of succeeding with this programme of social change.” Now that is the type of thing they spread around among the people. That is what comes from this government. Today they are trying their best to show the people they never had any sympathy with this thing, and that they were sworn to their ideology, and they resented anything of that kind. This went on for 15½ months. Finally, as I said, this mountebank, Mr. Thompson, had to get out of here and they gave \$1,500 extra fee, and they paid to ship his furniture to Vancouver afterwards. That was appreciation for the good work he had done.

These are the things, Mr. Speaker, that should not be forgotten at this time. I am sure that the people will long remember, when they turned on their radios and heard the Radio College and Living Newspaper.

I would like to say a few words now about agriculture. One of the first things this government did after coming into office was to lay down the two great pillars of the foundation for the socialistic edifice they were going to build. One of these two pillars was The Natural Products Marketing Act, and the other one was The Crown Corporations Act. There is no doubt in my mind that these two Acts in action should serve as a pillar for the socialized economy

which they were going to build in this province. Something happened, however, I recall that a few months after this was done, the Premier went down to Manitoba and he said that he had now laid the foundation for this great socialistic state in Saskatchewan. Next year he was going to proceed and put another storey up. Well, after this election, I think something has filled up the basement. I don't think there is any more sign of them, so I am sure the biggest job they have now is to take care of some of their problem children. I think perhaps we can say that if this government had its own way and could act according to good commonsense of the Provincial Treasurer — I am sure he has plenty of good commonsense — there would not be anything to this any more. Something else I have. It says here: "This is the proving ground in Canada for socialism." This is the place there were going to put into effect and prove it to the rest of Canada. It was a practical application of economic theory. That is what they were going to do, and they were going to win every province in Canada by having proven here that it was going to make this a better place to live in, with happier people, without service and without price, and all that sort of thing. And somebody else was going to pay the shot. Today they face a very disappointing situation.

We have heard many things of what the Department of Agriculture was going to do. I know they have plenty of men to do things with. They have a staff that should be able to do something, but, like everybody who is employed by the government, first things come first and first things with them are politics. That is the first concern of the C.C.F. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he paid for all the telephone calls during the elections, or if he paid for them himself. He can answer that question when he speaks. That is their job and, of course, it is much more important that the job the people of Saskatchewan are paying them for doing.

In regard to the budget, so far as agriculture is concerned, there is absolutely nothing for agriculture in that budget. The millions of dollars the provincial twisted around in his fingers is accounted for by more staff, more salaries being paid out, and by shifting the control of Crown lands in this province from the Department of Natural Resources to the Department of Agriculture. If they had wanted to do things for agriculture, there are two practical things they should have done. They should have removed the education tax from all farm fuels. Then they could have gone further and removed the tax from small hardware. It might have been quite difficult to do that, I recognize that, but it would not have been difficult to remove the education tax on anything, bought for the operation of a farm — gas, oil, grease and such as that. That would have been a practical thing. The money would be going to the man on the farm who is struggling for a living. We don't all live on the Regina plains, Mr. Speaker. In my district we haven't had a crop for three years, and things are not so rosy. One other thing you should have done, and that is more important, perhaps, than the first one: you should remove the education tax from all building materials, in the province of Saskatchewan. These fellows are hollering for houses. The dominion government removed the sales tax on May 14, 1945. Mr. Coldwell, a year and a half afterwards, got up in the House of Commons and told them it was still on. Well, he should certainly know. He is not the only one who does tricks like that.

I was down in the City Hall on Thursday night, and the hon. Minister for Municipal Affairs addressed a convention. He made a very good speech. If he had had a good subject, he would have made a wonderful speech. He went up

March 10, 1949

before the 450 people in that hall, people probably with more brains than any of us fellows in this House. I think they are outstanding in the province of Saskatchewan, and I was one of them myself at one time. He goes up there, and he drew a parallel in taxation, and he said: "You go and buy a tractor or a little pump engine, and there was a duty of 17½ percent" — I think he said. "then there is an eight percent sales tax on that tractor, about \$550. You pay that on that tractor, and you get that, and you are glad to get the tractor, and you feel good about it. But you come home and have to pay \$500 on a section of land, and you squawk about it." I want to tell him Mr. Speaker, that responsible men in the province of Saskatchewan, before they go and make a statement of fact in any place, should at least have the information, and not misrepresent the situation.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — I am sure the hon. member for Arm River would not want to misquote me. May I remind him that I said "truck", not "tractor".

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, he said no such thing. I asked 15 delegates who were up there.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member must take the word of another hon. member.

Mr. Danielson: — Will the hon. gentleman repeat the statement he made?

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — I thought we were only dense on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Danielson: — That is all right, I will accept your statement.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — I said "truck" not "tractor".

Mr. Tucker: — It is a funny thing so many people thought you said tractor.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — I will accept his explanation.

Mr. Speaker: — You must withdraw that.

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, but I don't know what kind of an implement that is that means trucks on a tractor, and I farmed for 45 years. I never heard that application to any implement that ever entered a farm any place, trucks on a tractor. With the rules of the House we will have to accept it, and I will withdraw the statement, so there is not trouble about that. I want to tell him, though, when he speaks the next time, in case he gets a tractor mixed up with a truck, that there is not duty on farm tractors of any kind, and there is no sales tax on tractors of any kind, or farm implements.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Pardon me, Mr. Speaker. Again, I said ‘truck’ at the meeting. Would you like me to quote from the speech that I delivered, if it is necessary to convince the hon. member.

Mr. Danielson: — It is all right. I was in that meeting too, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member is rising on a point of privilege to correct a statement by the hon. member for Arm River.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, he may have withdrawn it . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Some Hon. Members: — Order! Order!

An Hon. Member: — Throw them out.

An Hon. Member: — Throw them out.

An Hon. Member: — Dictator.

Premier Douglas: — You are the dictators, you won’t even let me speak to a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Tucker: — He said “throw them out”. He should withdraw that.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the statement.

Mr. Speaker: — The Premier is on his feet . . .

Mr. Danielson: — So am I.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, you sit down.

Mr. Danielson: — No.

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. member for Arm River please take his seat.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: — Will the member for Arm River please take his seat.

Mr. Danielson: — That is all right, Mr. Speaker.

Premier Douglas: — It is true that the hon. member has withdrawn his statement, but after having withdrawn it he proceeded to impute again that the Minister has misrepresented

March 10, 1949

the situation. I say now, on a question of privilege, the Minister has a right to quote exactly what he said at the convention. Since two members over there have inferred that what he says now is not in accordance with what he said then, I think he has the right, under the rules of the House, to read to the House what he actually did say.

Mr. Speaker: — My ruling is that when the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) made a statement, and the accuracy was denied by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, in regard to a speech he is reported to have made at the City Hall, that the hon. Minister has the right to quote what he did actually say.

An Hon. Member: — You wouldn't let us do that.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. Minister may quote what he said:

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. "That the taxes on the average section of land in Saskatchewan in 1947 was \$212.60. That is, on the average section of land. Probably the very farmer whose taxes were \$212.60 bought a truck just the day before he received his notice."

An Hon. Member: — He said a lot more than that.

Mr. Danielson: — I suppose you will allow me to say a word too, after you have allowed two of the members on the other side of the House to speak after I had accepted the denial and had withdrawn the statement.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member for Arm, River did go on to reiterate the statement.

Premier Douglas: — Absolutely.

Mr. Danielson: — No. The thing I want to draw your attention to is that when he got up the first time he got up he said "a truck on a tractor".

Premier Douglas: — He did not say a 'truck on a tractor'. He said "truck not a tractor".

Mr. Danielson: — I am very sorry the Minister of Agriculture is not in here because he has been very active in the last summer, and I have no comment to make on that. He was trying to get votes for the C.C.F. He made some remarkable statements while he was out getting votes for the C.C.F. He was at the town of Allan and someone said something about insurance, and they asked him if it was true that the school boards, or all boards who received grants from the government of Saskatchewan would not have to take out insurance with the government or else forfeit the grant. He said he had never heard of it. That is a remarkable statement to come from a Minister. He was chairman of the Committee of the Whole before he was a Minister. The statement was made.

May I again point out that the time is here when the public of Saskatchewan should have a right to expect that the Ministers of the government, when they go out and make statements, are telling the facts.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. The Minister is not in his seat at the moment. He has twice already drawn to attention of this House that that statement is not an accurate statement of what he said. He denied it publicly and my hon. friend ought to accept it.

Mr. Danielson: — If that is the case, I did not hear it. I don't know whether you have any right to deny it for him or not.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. members, when making speeches in this debate, I think it would be just as well if they refrain from making statements as to what someone else said outside. There has been altogether too much of it, and, in some cases, it has been denied from one side, and again from the other, but when statements are ascribed to people who are no in the House, I don't think it is very good taste.

Mr. Patterson: — Under the rule are members of this Legislature restrained in this regard.

Mr. Speaker: — I am not quoting any rule. I am simply asking the members of the House to refrain from doing it. I think it is bad taste. We have had accusations from both sides of the House. A member gets up and yells he did make the statement. I think it would add to the decorum of the House if they refrained, as much as possible, from making these accusations.

Mr. Patterson: — Then your are not ruling?

Mr. Speaker: — No. I am simply asking the members of the House.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, we are taking up the radio time, Mr. Speaker. That might be one purpose.

I am not going to stop here. We find that in the insurance business that there are threatening letters going out from the department to the people out in the country with regard to certain matters in regard to insurance. I have a letter here, written by Mr. Collier, to a certain insurance agent out in the province of Saskatchewan. Another point. This gentleman, as I understand it, was writing insurance for some private concern as well. After mentioning other things, he writes this enlightening paragraph:

There is one other point we should like to clean up. We do not issue licences for selling insurance from this office. That is handled from the office of the Superintendent of Insurance. It would appear possible to cut down the number of licences issued in two ways, first by having

March 10, 1949

the Superintendent of Insurance refuse to grant them, in which case the various companies recommending the appointment would have something to say in the matter. The other way appears to be the promotion of the sales of Saskatchewan Government Insurance to the point where the other 200-odd companies do not feel it worth while to have agencies representing them in the towns of Saskatchewan. As long as there are this number of companies operating, we are almost bound to have too many agents. We are interested in having your opinion as to the solution of this problem of the number of agents.

In other words, here is a letter that tells this man that if you don't discard private insurance companies and take on this, there is the possibility you will not have any licence at all, because with 200 companies in Saskatchewan there are too many agents now. He is very careful to point out: "We don't issue the licences." It is an intimidating letter Mr. Speaker. That comes from a government office. These are things that should not come from any government department. This man was in a lawful business. He had the chance to take on the government insurance, or reject it as he saw fit. That is his position; but he is plainly told here he had better do so and so, or else. There is the possibility that the next time he applies for his licence it may be denied him. That is what that means.

The Minister of Natural Resources — I don't know whether he is the man who handles the road grants any more or not. It used to belong to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. He had taken on himself to try to show that the grants which have been given to our municipalities during the past two years are so and so and so. In order to accomplish what he tried to do here is a statement that is grossly inaccurate. He has 13 municipalities of Saskatchewan inside the boundaries of Arm River, but there is really only ten, and I think maybe less than that. R.M. 221 is all in there, according to this, when less than half of 221 is in there. R.M. 222 is only half in there. R.M. 224, with one corner the community pasture, has nothing in there but that one little corner, about one section and a half. It is entirely outside my municipality. There is nothing there in my constituency. That is what we get from the Minister of the Crown. Then we have R.M. 251, that is all in there; R.M. 252 and R.M. 253 are all in there. There is just one square township in that constituency of Arm River. R.M. 281 is just about half in my district; R.M. 283 and R.M. 284 are about half in my district. So we have 11. He comes out with the statement last year — it is in the Votes and Proceedings brought in here yesterday — which takes in 13 full municipalities. He is doing that to try to demonstrate . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Danielson: — I'm not going to answer any question.

Mr. Speaker: — This is on a question of privilege.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I thought I made it clear. I am sorry the hon. member misunderstood me that these municipalities in regard to which I quoted the amounts of grants were municipalities that laid wholly, or in part, within the constituency of Arm River. I don't like the hon. member inferring that I sated, or wanted to give the

impression on that these municipalities were all within the constituency of Arm River. The constituency is not that big.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, this thing was up last year, and I am just repeating it here. You can read the question asked by the member in this House, and the reply that came down yesterday. There is no argument on that point at all.

Many times in this session we have heard about road grants. Again I say, Mr. Speaker, this government shows rank discrimination in the distribution of road grants because the money belonging to the municipalities, withheld by this government, they are handing out in grants. R.M. 253 paid in \$18,000 into that fund — public revenues — \$18,000. It is one of the hardest hit areas in the drought area in the province of Saskatchewan. More than half of the people in that municipality left and went into the north country. In 1947 they got \$500. That was the grant that every municipality was entitled to. R.M. 254 got paid \$8,000 into that fund. \$8,000. This is equalization, Mr. Speaker, by a C.C.F. government. R.M. 283 got the magnificent sum of \$50 out of that fund in 1947. Fifty bucks. That is equalization by the C.C.F. socialist government. These municipalities suffered as much as anyone in the drought period. In R.M. 253 we cancelled \$8,000 of hospital account for that municipality. That is the treatment they get from these gentlemen here. Last year they came back, and some of them got as much as \$600, after a protest had been lodged with this government; but that is not the shadow of an adjustment, comparatively. In other places in the province we find that municipalities had been under-assessed for years and years before this adjustment took place, got big grants from this government, and they hadn't paid in nearly enough of public revenue tax they should have done, on account of being under-assessed. That is the justice that is meted out by this socialistic C.C.F. government in the province of Saskatchewan. I would say to the hon. Minister, when he brings out these figures, he should not try to make the people believe something that is not so. His explanation is the same. As a matter of fact, the figures I have used now, in my file, are the last years figures he gave, not this year's figures at all. He did not make that explanation last year.

Another matter, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with, and it is a peculiar thing that nothing has been said about it in this House this session, except a slight reference by one of the members on that side of the House, and that is the coarse grain settlement. You know that was a great standby for the C.C.F. socialistic agitators, all over the province, for the last year and a half. It is dying down now; but, nevertheless, I have an idea they will resurrect it when the election comes off. Let us take a look at this question for a while. The hon. Premier, speaking in this House last year, said, on February 11, 1948:

As part of the process of removing price controls, both the ceiling and subsidies were taken off coarse grains. When it came to the end of July last year, my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, along with producers' organizations of this province and other provinces, bombarded the federal Minister of Agriculture to get some statement on policy before the end of the crop year, but none was forthcoming. We went on into the new crop year. Farmers were urged to sell their coarse grains. Some

March 10, 1949

85 percent of the coarse grains were sold, and then, on October 1, ceilings and subsidies were removed.

There is one statement in there that I take issue with. I am not going to use my statement on this; I am going to use the statement of the Minister of Agriculture, when he spoke on the very same thing on February 24, before the Premier spoke in this House. In 1948, on the hog resolution, he said:

And that equalization payment that was formerly paid to the producer was incorporated in the new price of oats and barley, but the thing to bear in mind is that the fed drawback is still available to the feeder of livestock, but only to the feeder who did not raise his own feed.

Then he said:

The announcement was made in Ottawa that there was an indication that the ceiling price would be removed entirely from coarse grains after August 1.

So the statement the Premier made, when he spoke, shows he had not consulted with the Minister of Agriculture. The ceilings were removed, Mr. Speaker, on October 21, and the reason they were not removed before was on account of the packing house strike which was supported by this government. Certain dislocations were bound to occur, of course, with a move of that kind, but it had to come. What has been said all over this country is the fact the producers of coarse grains had to take a terrific loss by the removal of price ceilings. As a matter of fact, they have claimed it was millions and millions.

There has never been any research made as to what actually did happen at that time but I can say that there was no loss to the farmers who sold their feed grains between August and October 21.

An Hon. Member: — That's too loud.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — The Premier made a statement on the radio during the election time that he was going to present any farmer with a Cabinet Minister's head, stuffed full of celery. Well, he does not need to stuff them because they are full of boloney now. He was going to present a head stuffed with celery to any farmer who received a payment for coarse grains sold between August and October 21. When he was caught up by someone he immediately wrote a letter to the press and he said he did not mean the grain companies, he meant the government. You see, there was always a way out.

An Hon. Member: — Weasel words.

Mr. Danielson: — Other weasel word, but we can't use that.

Premier Douglas: — They did not pay until we made them pay.

An Hon. Member: — The farmers did.

Premier Douglas: — Then they only paid 50 cents on the dollar.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I wouldn't talk about it.

Mr. Danielson: — The Dominion, and he said dozens of times that on the farms 85 percent of the coarse grains had been marketed at that date — on October 21. Now, I want you to bear in mind this 85 percent, to say whether it is a half-truth, 60 percent truth, 40 or maybe 15½ percent. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics gave the production of coarse grains in the three western provinces for the 1947 crop: barley, 131 million bushels; oats, 194 million. There was marketed from August 1 until October 31: barley, 32.6 million; oats, 28 million; but the ceilings were removed October 21. There were 17 of the 27 marketing days in that period closed under the ceiling, and the rest of the ten days were open. If we divide on a basis of the 17 days, we find the deliveries for these 17 days, while the market was under control, was 32.6 million, or 24.8 percent for barley; oats 28 million, or about 14 percent was delivered in that time. Removal of the price ceilings resulted in substantial increase in prices to the farmers in barley and oats. The average price of barley at a Saskatchewan delivery point — the price is delivery point net to the farmers, September until October 21, was 76 cents for barley and after the removal of the ceiling, \$1.05 per bushel, an increase of 29 cents. The corresponding figure for oats, under the ceiling, 52 cents, and after the removal of the ceiling 72 cents per bushel, or an increase of 20 cents per bushel for oats. The 1947 crop in the prairie provinces was about 98 million bushels of barley and 166 million bushels of oats; at 29 cents per bushel for barley and 20 cents for oats, increased amounts paid for the undelivered crop, from October 21 to the end of the crop year, May 31 1948, \$28,420,000 net to the farmer for barley and \$33,200,000 net to the farmer who sold the oats; a total benefit, since the ceilings were taken off till July 31 on oats and barley to the western provinces, \$61,620,000. That is what the farmers gained by the removal of the ceiling. These figures are correct, and I take the responsibility for every one of them.

I know what is in the mind of some of my friends. I notice the Minister of Agriculture and Premier have gone out. I expect they went out to get that Cabinet Minister's head to bring in. I beg the Minister of Agriculture's pardon, as he is right in his seat, Mr. Speaker. I did not see him.

The average back payment from the grain companies from August 1 to October 21, on this grain that was delivered under the ceiling, is 11.9 cents per bushel for oats, 26.6 cents per bushel for barley. That is the average paid by the grain companies and the Pool. Then the government comes along and pays them 5 cents per bushel on oats and 11 cents a bushel on barley. That makes a total payment on oats of 17 cents a bushel, and on barley 25.5 cents a bushel.

Mr. Tucker: — That is the payment the Premier said would never be made.

Mr. Danielson: — That is the payment the hon. Premier said would never be made, and I hope he does not, in desperation, go out and get some Cabinet Minister's head and bring it in.

March 10, 1949

Mr. Tucker: — I would be nice to get rid of some of these Cabinet Ministers.

Mr. Danielson: — That is a fact, Mr. Speaker. The socialistic agitators can take no comfort out of this because, even in election time, they went out in my district and one farmer asked the C.C.F. what was wrong that they should take out the man they had in now. Well, the candidate started to talk about the coarse grains. Well, the farmer said that that was the only thing they had done for him. He said he had two granaries full of oats in the yard, and he said he had made lots of money. These are the facts. You can take the grain companies payments — I have them all here, the Wheat Pool, the grain companies and the government payment have now been made. Just a day or two ago we found we are going to get another payment, an equalization payment of over \$8 million in Saskatchewan alone. The total amount we are going to get on that basis will be: barley, at the farm, 97.5 per bushel, and when the equalization comes on, it will bring it up to \$1.04½ cents per bushel, right at the farmer's granary.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Would the hon. member answer a question?

Mr. Danielson: — Yes.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Would the hon. member tell the House what particular crop years these equalization payments have reference to?

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, the equalization payments cover the exact 12 months beginning August 1, 1947 and ends July 31, 1948.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Nonsense.

Mr. Danielson: — They do, and you know it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Still nonsense.

Mr. Danielson: — There we are. \$1.04, the very barley that before the ceiling was removed, the farmer got 76 cents for at the farm. That is the history, and there are the figures for you. Ask any of my wise friends over there to contradict these figures. I have them and you can have them. That is what the situation is, \$1.04 cents in place of 76 cents.

Now, what about the oats. Well, the oats will bring us 74½ cents at the granary door, when it brought us 51½ to 52 cents before. That is the truth. There is no election on. It is not figment of the imagination. The farmer knows it, and anything that this government and their agitators throughout the farming community can take out of it, they are welcome to it. The farmers today know, and who knows better than the farmers. I stood on the floor of this House last year, time and time again, and said that the farmer had never got a fair price for coarse grains, and I say so today. This was a bit of credit to them, and they got the money, \$61 million more, and you can add the coming \$8 million to that, in the three western provinces.

This 85 percent of deliveries before October 21, 1947 is way, way out of line. As a matter of fact, if we go into percentages, the 85 percent figure is about 350 percent in error, but it is still being repeated to the farmers of the province by socialistic agitators, going from house to house, selling membership cards and some other member gets the money. I know some people never got their cards but they paid the money. I saw a man the other day who showed me he had given \$10 two years ago, and he had not got his card yet. So there we are.

Mr. Tucker: — He did not lose very much by that.

Mr. Danielson: — No, he did not lose much, but he wanted to show somebody how he had thrown his money away.

That is the history of the coarse grains. There is absolutely nothing there. They go further, Mr. Speaker. I know what he thinks — the Minister of Agriculture — he thinks about the man with the hogs. It is not the man who raises the hogs, it is the man who raises the grain; but there are people today who feed hogs, and at that time as well, a year or two ago, who bought grain to feed the hogs. Well, I have it on good authority that there is more money in hogs since the ceiling was removed, because of the more than corresponding increase in the price of hogs.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear! He said it would not happen.

Mr. Danielson: — I proved that conclusion on the floor of the House last year. The Premier is only about 350 percent in error when he says that 85 percent of the coarse grains was going to the grain companies.

Let me tell you this: he made a broadcast about three or four weeks ago. It was the next broadcast after he had been cleaning up on The Leader-Post about guessing what took place in the C.C.F. caucus. He said: "Of course you all delivered your grain to the Pool but there was millions of dollars that the farmer never got back." Let me point this out to him, the other grain companies have done equally as well as the Pool, and there is only a difference of a cent or two in any of them. He said it was millions of dollars that the farmers did not get back. He applies that to our friend, the Pool, as well. He said there was a "skin game" going on, and according to the Premier, they must be equally guilty with the rest of them.

Mr. Tucker: — It made a good story.

Mr. Danielson: — Oh, that is pretty dead by this time.

The government has been praying for a depression for the past four years. I think the Premier, before he goes to bed every night, has a little stanza that he repeats every night. I know Coldwell is doing it, Joliffe is going it, and I am sure the Minister of Agriculture is doing it, because that is the only solution for socialism in this country. If a depression comes in here it will raise their hopes and give them a little more ammunition. Mr. Coldwell has given up hope. In 1944 he said that by April 1 there would be 100,000 unemployed. Joliffe, at the time, said that within a few weeks there would be

March 10, 1949

500,000 unemployed in Ontario. The other day we had Mr. Coldwell speaking to the Co-operative Commonwealth University Federation and he said — this is a confession that he has absolutely no hope of going into power for a long, long time to come: “If employment is maintained for a number of years in Canada. Through the effect of large expenditures on defence, and European recovery, this effort or movement cannot catapult us into power overnight, but during such a period that lies ahead, we must build our movement solidly to include Canadians in all walks of life to our cause, educating and organizing, while reviewing our policies in the light of domestic and . . . ” He says that without a depression they have not a hope of going into power. Not a hope for them. I think that is a pretty awkward position to be in because I am sure that by this time that depression will come on. I hope it does not come on, but if the C.C.F. can bring it on, it will come on. The people of Canada will have had their eyes on the province of Saskatchewan and have seen how this old, moth-eaten creed of socialism has not worked out. It has been a curse to the province, and is just now beginning to show up the evil effect it is going to have on our economic life in years to come. Millions of dollars have been squandered by this government, and now they are on the spotlight. They are under the searchlight of all of Canada. The C.C.F. socialists in Ontario and every other province of Canada has been pointing to this province as the proving-ground of their theories, and that by making a success here they were demonstrating to the rest of Canada that they were the ones they should put into Ottawa to regulate the economy of this dominion. But it has not worked out that way, Mr. Speaker. This grand creed of something for nothing, humanity first, Christianity applied, has proven a miserable failure. The only place they can continue to operate is where the cost of services does not count because they have a monopoly. Where they have a monopoly they have been able to keep in favour, but not any place else, in spite of the fact they are relieved of taxes, municipalities, the Dominion government, and that they have not had, like any other concern would have, to pay for the cost of the capital they use to operate the enterprise of business with. If they had to do that with the bus lines — I understand there is \$2 million in that enterprise — not a dollar has been paid to carry the capitalization of that company. And still they are in the hole. They even add in the lunch counter profits in order to be not too much in the hole. I know I appreciate the theories of the hon. Provincial Treasurer. I think he is a confirmed, orthodox capitalist, and he is out of his place there entirely, but he is in there. I think if they did not have him, well, then the whole ship would spring a leak any time. I think he is doing his best, but I would not want to have his job, to have all these socialists jumping on him all the time, and everybody wanting money. This depression they have been praying for is not here, and is not going to come. Until that comes to relieve the agony of these socialists, we find they are not going to be able to get back into power, or even gain anything because, in every country of the world where they have had a little start, it just took a little while and they were driven into the urban centres, and they have become nothing else but a socialist, left-wing Labour party. The same process is taking place in the province of Saskatchewan. This election clearly indicates it, and in other elections they will all be in the cities, if they can hold them. The rural part of the province has waken up to the fact that they have been on the paying end and somebody else has been on the receiving end, and they do not like it. This argument that the farmer and labour can work together is all a bunch of bunk. It is all boloney, because if had been proved over and over again that it is all right as far as labour is concerned, as long as the farmer will come their way and follow them any place

but it is not all right so far as the farmer standing up for his share of the national income. There are conflicting opinions there, and they cannot be reconciled, and particularly in Canada. I do not care what anybody says. The agricultural economy of Canada depends entirely for its survival on foreign markets. We are not like the —us and some of the highly industrialized countries of the world, where the home market practically absorbs it all. I don't care if the working man in the city gets \$100 a day, they are not going to be able to consume any more than they are right now of our home production. We have to go to Great Britain, which is our best market — I hope we will be able to retain it — but we have to go to every other nation in the world to find a market for our products, and there is where the farmers' salvation lies for the future.

The Premier made a kind of hurried trip to New York. Last fall I think it was, and he came back from the old country a few days before . . .

Hon. C.M. Fines: — More fuel.

Mr. Danielson: — Pretty near as strong as you sell.

An Hon. Member: — You be careful.

Mr. Danielson: — Just as thick as the C.C.F.

Mr. Tucker: — They make a profit on it too.

Mr. Danielson: — The Premier saw fit to go to New York. Of course, it is nice to be always traveling, particularly when you don't have to pay the shot. I wouldn't mind going myself. I would like to see my friend, Dr. Laidlaw, too. You know, he gave us a recommendation. The Premier went down there, as we all know, to get some capital for Saskatchewan. I cannot understand it, because if his argument is correct, this province does not want any capital. I don't see why he has to go to New York and Great Britain, and he says he thought there was some money coming from Sweden too. I don't think they have any more money than they need over there, but he might have hopes. Anyhow he went down there and addressed the "Town Hall" which is something like the Forum in Regina, and he made a very interesting speech, as he is a good speaker, and he certainly did a nice job of it. Oh yes, I will give credit where credit is due.

He said something, Mr. Speaker, that I fully agree with, and I wish he would say the same thing in this House. He said there were only two great ideologies in the world, one was communism and the other one capitalism. He said capitalism gave political freedom, but not security; and he said communism offers security but not political freedom. If he had the choice he said he would take the one with political freedom. I think he was honest about that — more honest than some of his colleagues. I want to include the whole cabinet too. That is what he said. I appreciate the admission of the Premier when he said that. It opens up a large topic of discussion but I won't do that now.

March 10, 1949

The next day he addressed another meeting, and I myself think that was the real purpose the Premier went to New York for, to return the friendly visit of his friend, Dr. Laidlaw, who was at the C.C.F. convention here in 1947. He is a director in the League for Industrial Democracy, and you know that that league was very well investigated by the Senate Committee on Un-American Activities. Mrs. Roosevelt was made and honorary president as well. He went down there and addressed that gathering. I am not criticizing it, but I think that was his real purpose when he went to New York. Dr. Laidlaw, for some incomprehensible reason, when he was here, on a Sunday morning when some other co-operative men from the United States were passing through, and accidentally — I suppose it was accidentally — just happened to coincide with the national convention of the C.C.F. here in 1944. Pure accident, of course; but, on Sunday morning, a few strays went into this caucus, and one was a Mrs. Sanderson from Toronto. The C.C.F. announced her as a co-operator and we, as good co-operators and good citizens, prepared a splendid banquet for this group. I am sure there are some very fine people in there; but these two strays, one Dr. Laidlaw and the other Mrs. Sanderson, after the festivities were over, had the honour of listening to quite a few speeches. Mr. Carpenter, a minister from the United States, was a leader of this group, and he went through his duties, of course, as the leader of the party, and finally we had Dr. Laidlaw up to make a speech. No one from Saskatchewan had asked him but these fellows who had come from foreign parts asked him to say a few words. He delivered one of the nicest and most beautiful communist, socialist addresses I ever heard in my life. So the manager of the Co-ops from Iowa said to me: "I hope you don't think that man represents our views." He said: "What are you going to do?" I said: "If you are not going to reply to that gentleman, I will." I had no place in the programme at all. I said: "It is up to you." Well, Mr. Wilson replied to him and he made one of the finest replies I ever heard in my life, and one of the most practical also. I cannot understand why that man in the first place, when he came to a C.C.F. convention and then slipped into the wrong car, when he started out on Sunday morning. There is something mysterious about this thing. He was there, and I know by press reports, New York Times and several American papers, and we get more information there than we do from the Canadian papers, there was very brief mention in the local papers about this thing. So I think it is very honourable of the Premier to take upon himself to go to New York to return a friendly visit from a gentleman like Dr. Laidlaw who heads the League of Industrial Democracy, which is commonly recognized as a communist organization in the United States. I just wanted to mention that.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we had an election last summer, and the fellow who used to be here is not here any more. I came into the city of Regina one night. I had been out in the country and tired to get all the votes for the Liberal candidate I possibly could, and I might say that I don't think I did too badly, because the man is in the House here. In spite of me, or whatever it was, he is here. I picked up the paper and there was an ad, June 18, 1948: Public Meeting, A.A. McLeod. Tonight, 8.15, Ukrainian Labour Temple, 1809 Toronto Street. Vote C.C.F. Well, Tim Buck says: "the Labour-Progressive Party is heart and soul in the fight to re-elect a C.C.F. majority in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Tucker: — They did their best, too.

Mr. Danielson: — There are several men in this House who sit here by the Labour-Progressive help. The votes tipped them over, and they were able to get here. I don't see anything wrong, and I never could see anything wrong why a communist socialist should not vote for C.C.F. socialist. I cannot see it because they were both socialists. It is clear that the election proves on thing, and that is, as the old saying says, "Time is the essence of all things", and if this election had been held off one more month that group over there would be sitting over here. There is nothing surer than that. If it was held today, even more decisive would be the result of that election. I think we can truthfully and confidently predict that this government is on the way out in the province of Saskatchewan. There is no question about that.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Running out of gas.

Mr. Danielson: — I can give you more; probably more than you want.

In the last few weeks, Mr. Speaker, we had the experience of seeing the Leader of this government and some of his supporters over there standing on their feet and making certain definite statements: the only way, the only salvation or hope for the province of Saskatchewan to keep the communists out of here is to elect the C.C.F. That is a new line. As a matter of fact, the biggest job this government has on their hands right now is to convince the people, and try to make the people of Saskatchewan forget they are socialists, because you never heard that two or three months before the election.

Premier Douglas: — You will have to convince the people you are not a . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Did you ever hear Mr. Coldwell, ever since August last, mention the programme he laid down at the Winnipeg convention? Oh no. Never one word, and never one word from these gentlemen here either. You won't hear them either; they are going to hide their programme under a cloak of agitation about social services, hospitalization and things of that kind. They never spoke about their socialistic designs in this province, but we know what they are. It is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, to look back to the statement the Premier made that socialism is the only thing that will save this country from the Communists. It is an absolute myth. There is not one historical or current fact to back up that statement. Everything is to the contrary.

What is socialism? We had a gentleman from the other side of the House who looked up in the dictionary what socialism meant the other day. I think I am perfectly in order, Mr. Speaker, if I try to quote to this House what socialism is. I am going to quote from the 14th edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica, and it says this:

The Communist Manifesto, drafted by Karl Marx and Engels for the communist League and issued in the year of the revolution of 1848, is generally regarded as the starting point of modern socialism. The distinction between socialism, as represented by the various socialistic parties of Europe and the New World, and communism, as represented by the Russians and the minority groups in other countries, is one of tactics and strategy rather than objective. Communism is indeed only socialism pursued by revolutionary means. Communists, like all other socialists (get that)

March 10, 1949

believe in all the collective control and ownership of the vital means of production, and seeks to achieve, through state action, the coordinated control of the economic forces of society.

That is the explanation of socialism. All leading socialists, Laski, Cole and Shaw, all agree that democratic socialism cannot succeed under the present condition of society.

We have here another thing, and I say it is very interesting, when we consider that the gentleman who writes this article and makes this statement, is one I think Mr. Coldwell considers higher than practically anyone in the socialistic parties. He says — Mr. Cole, who was going to head the Planning Board in this province if Coldwell had won the 1944 election:

The characteristic of centralized planning and control which are common to Nazi Germany and to the Soviet Union, are not accidents. They are the direct outcome of certain technical conditions, and are indispensable, in some measure, to any 20th century society that does not rest on a solid foundation, and are inevitably to be accepted as part of an order of our universe. From them we have to build as best we can. Being the possessors of great scientific powers, which we have not yet learned the art of controlling and subordinating to the nobler human society, leaves these forces as they are, and it is inevitable that any society capable of standing the test of the struggle for existence under 20th century conditions shall have built into its very foundations this common element of centralized planning and control that exists in Germany and the Soviet Union. We have to assume a larger-scale, planned social order; we have to assume that the control of the major powers of production will be in the hands of central authorities; we will have to assume that the greater majority of men will have to work within the limits set by this great machine, and we have to admit that any attempt to build a society that does not accept these basic conditions is doomed to failure. If we try in the name of liberty, in the name of individuality, in the name of anything else we hold dear, to stand in the way of the development of these great technological forces we shall do nothing to build a democratic order that would have an element of victory and stability.

That is what Mr. Laski said. What is more clear or concise, and what is more forcibly or appropriately put than these things are. They are exactly what the Encyclopedia Britannica says about socialism.

Mr. Stafford Cripps said in the House in 1944 that there could be no socialistic economy put into effect without force. That is what he said.

Mr. Gibbs: — He said so such thing.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, I will quote to my friend.

An Hon. Member: — What about the time?

Mr. Danielson: — That is no object to me now. I can go on tomorrow if I don't get through today.

Premier Douglas: — You won't go on tomorrow, you'll go on until 11 o'clock tonight. You have read it to us the last three years in a row, you don't need to bother.

Mr. Danielson: — Just for the benefit of the member for Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs). I certainly don't want to disappoint him.

In February, 1946, he said he was a Minister in Mr. Churchill's War Cabinet: "No country in the world, so far as I know, has yet succeeded in carrying through a planned economy without compulsion of labour. Our objective is to carry through a planned economy without compulsion of labour." Well, Mr. Speaker, this very gentleman two years ago put through the British Parliament a law which conscripts — if they want to use it, and they are using it to some extent — 750,000 British subjects in the British Isles for the conscription of labour. That is the Act which Mr. Cripps put through. It has been used in the coal mines and they have gone so far that absenteeism from the coal mines is frowned on. I am going to read you that too. "In England . . . it has taken sufficiently for the National Coal Board to issue a most drastic and arbitrary ruling in the Derbyshire mines where absenteeism was no small problem in this particular pit. They listed several men by name who had been dismissed for absenteeism. What is more, the order went on, these men would not be allowed to work in any coal mine in Great Britain." That can only happen, Mr. Speaker, in a socialist economy. Under capitalism that could not take place. They can kick them out, and they can go some place else and get work, but not so in Great Britain under socialism. That is the answer to my friend.

Mr. Gibbs: — Did you ever see a coal mine?

Mr. Danielson: — The Premier asked a gentleman the other day in this House if he had ever read the Russian Constitution. If he had asked me I could have truthfully told the hon. gentleman that I have read it. It is a very long document. In that document the word communism only appeared twice, but the word socialism is in there 49 times. Socialists never say whether it is in Saskatchewan or Moscow. The name of the party is Communist. I am going to quote my authority from Mr. Carlyle King. He said in "The Science Corner", published in The Saskatchewan News, 1944, on November 1: "When the Russian groups seized power in Russia in 1917, Lenin suggested calling the party Communists as a party name. His suggestion was adopted. History points to the chief difference between the Communist party and the Democratic Socialist party in Europe. It is a matter of best methods to be used to achieve socialism. The objectives of the communist is the same as that of the socialists." That is Carlyle King.

An Hon. Member: — Who is he?

Mr. Danielson: — I think he is connected with the C.C.F. party some place.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — He is with the Saskatchewan University.

Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 1949, I made a budget address to this House. What I would like to know is: when is the hon. gentleman going to discuss it?

Mr. Danielson: — I think, Mr. Speaker, I am the only man in this House that has given him some really good meat to think on. I told him that he should do something for the

March 10, 1949

poor farmers that they are crying over, and the poor children who are chasing the cows out of the willow bushes at four o'clock in the morning, and the poor farmers that are milking them. If he wants to do something for them, cut off the education tax on all farm fuels. He remembers that. And I told him he should take the education tax, as the dominion government took off the sales tax in 1945, off all building material.

An Hon. Member: — What about income tax?

Mr. Danielson: — This is the party that has played politics with housing shortage in the Dominion of Canada. Have they done anything to eliminate that particular problem? Here is a concrete suggestion, and these are two practical things to ease the ability of financing. He has the ability to juggle figures, he can mean anything he likes, and he can do that. He might have to stop hiring more planners and big-salaried C.C.F., and all that sort of thing. He might even have to stop feeding these problem children all year which are losing hundreds of thousands of dollars a year; but he can do these things if he wants to. That is a practical thing, and if he does that I am going to hold up both hands for the Provincial Treasurer. I am going to go out in the country and tell them he is the best man they could have under the circumstances. That may not mean very much; but that is my suggestion.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — The hon. gentleman is not trying to get me fired is he?

Mr. Danielson: — No, I think you are the saviour of that group in the Legislature. If you got out of there, there would be nothing left of them.

An Hon. Member: — They probably can't do without him.

Mr. Danielson: — No, they can't. I am satisfied of that.

Premier Douglas: — We agree with that.

Mr. Danielson: — I can say that in all sincerity. I don't think even he or the Premier are socialists, but they have six or eight around them who belong to the very left-wing.

Premier Douglas: — We are a bad lot.

Mr. Danielson: — You bet. I can name them and probably more than you think.

Premier Douglas: — You had better not try.

Mr. Danielson: — He asked a while ago if I had ever read the Russian Constitution. I have read it, and it is a very long document; you cannot read it in an hour. I read it three times. Here is part of it, Mr. Speaker. Let me read: "The Union of the Socialist Republic is a socialist state of peasant and worker. The economic foundation of the U.S.S.R. is the socialist system of economy and socialist ownership of the instruments of means and production."

Mr. Tucker: — Sounds like the Premier's speech.

Mr. Danielson: — “The land, its mineral wealth, forests, mills, factories, mines, rail, water, and air transport, and communications, large organized agricultural enterprises as well as municipal enterprises, and the build of the dwelling houses in the cities and industrial localities are state property.” Well, you know, I could not help but draw an analogy in this when I read what happened in Winnipeg last fall. I shall read you the first four-year programme of this socialistic national party in Canada. I know they don't like that. I don't mind if they call me a nation Liberal. I would feel rather proud of it. I don't see why they should object if I call them national socialists. If that is out of order in this House, I am not going to do it. When I read this part of the Russian Constitution, which is the kernel of the whole document, and I think of the press report which I have here: “the first-year programme is the immediate public ownership of banking, insurance, transport, communication and electric power. The second step is the socialization of mining, the pulp and paper plants, farm implement factories, fertilizer manufacturers.” Mr. Speaker, what is that? It is just as complete as the U.S.S.R. Constitution. I'll bet any thing you like that if this group in this House, and all the agitators from coast to coast, will never talk about that programme during the election. They never mention it. They cannot mention it, and they don't dare to mention it, for the simple reason, first of all, there are over five million people in Canada today with savings deposits in the banks; millions and millions of policy holders in the line insurance companies. What a Roman holiday these fellows would have if they got hold of the banks. What would the farmers do then? There would be more things like the letter the insurance agent received from the C.C.F. government in regard to getting a licence to operate in this province. What business man could start up without having to go to the government on his hands and knees? Oh, no Mr. Speaker, the people of this province will never put their neck in a noose like that, and they won't do it in the Dominion of Canada either. I am satisfied you can take this thing right through, and let me quote the Premier. “There are only two ideologies in this world and that is capitalism and communism.” There is no choice. He tells the truth when he goes to New York.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think I need to tell you that I am going to oppose this motion. I would like to talk another hour but I am getting rather tired. I have said a great many things, but I have not said anything that I am not willing to back up, and I have not said a thing that I am going to apologize for.

Mr. H. Gibbs (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I notice that the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) has not given me very much time as I want to get through before six o'clock. However, after listening to two hours and ten minutes of clap-trap from over on the other side, during half of which time I do not think even the hon. members of opposition were paying attention to him. They got sick and tired of that humbug and clap-trap which we have heard for almost the past two and one-half hours.

March 10, 1949

Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the rest of the hon. members in congratulating the Provincial Treasurer for his presentation of such a fine budget. It is true it is one of the biggest budgets, financially, we have had in the existence of this province. But that has always been the Liberal cry. When any government is apt to spend money for the benefit and the comfort and happiness of the people of our province, they do not like it. I think their past records have proved that. I cannot conceive how hon. members can expect to get anything unless we do spend money. They know that since the war, the Second Great World War, we are living in the highest inflationary period that the Dominion of Canada has ever known, and yet they will insist that we should not spend money; we should retrench here and retrench there. That is all they think about and this is all they can talk about. Condemnation of a government that in less than five years time has given the people of this province the finest government they have ever had since it was inaugurated.

I can see the hon. members smiling and tittering; that is all they can ever do because I am positive that after this present government has finished its present term, we will probably see a smaller opposition of Liberals over there than what we did in 1944.

An Hon. Member: — That is what you said in 1944.

Mr. Gibbs: — In 1944 we knocked out one of your so-called smarter Liberals in the Dominion of Canada, and you know who I refer to — the past Liberal Minister of Agriculture of this province. You thought you were going to do it again in 1949 when you sent up this great Liberal leader of the province, the hon. Leader of the Opposition. We also gave him a good set-back, but I will come to him later.

Mr. Lopton: — Oh, you had better keep your voice down a little bit because it may be up a little bit before we get through with you.

Mr. Gibbs: — I am not going to go into details because that has already been done by lots of the hon. members in the House with regards to the budget. We have heard a lot of talk about socialism and communism this afternoon from the hon. member for Arm River, especially, and we also get it from the Leader of the Opposition. A day never goes by but what he has to throw something high and dry over here in regard to that. I do not know whether they know anything about socialism or not. I do not know whether they have ever read any socialist books or whether they ever intend to read any. They probably want to remain in that old dodo fashion which the Liberals have been in now for years and years in this country, because you only have to look all over the dominion and see how many provinces we have in Canada today governed by a Liberal government. They are in the dodo section and they cannot get out of it. They have to throw this sort of stuff at us because we have done more, as I said, for the people of Saskatchewan than they had in all their regime as a Liberal government in the province of Saskatchewan.

Speaking of socialism, Mr. Speaker, I am a socialist and I want you to fully understand that. I am a fundamental socialist, and that is because I was raised in the Old Country, in the textile industrial section of Lancashire. The reason why I am socialist today is because of the days that we had to exist under the Old Country. I left the Old Country when I was quite a boy.

An Hon. Member: — You're quite a boy now.

Mr. Gibbs: — My dad was a socialist because they had to change the system under which they lived under the Liberal ruling classes in the old country. Have my friends ever come through the bitter school of experience when children were sent to work at 10, 11, 12 years of age in the Old Country, when women and girls worked in the mines, when the governments of that country exploited child labour to the very depths, when they starved and put millions of people in degradation in the Old Country? Now they do not seem to know anything about that. They do not seem to realize that hundreds of thousands of British people had to emigrate to the Dominion of Canada and other Commonwealths of Great Britain in order to eke out a decent standard of living. I thought I had finished with that exploitation when I came to this great big wonderful Canada, under a Liberal government at that time, but lo and behold, it was exploitation again to its very depths. These fellows smile. Probably if they had had some of the experiences that millions of British and European people and children had had, the smile would be off their faces today. But you cannot expect anything else because they believe in self-glorification and self-preservation. They do not think about the masses; they think about themselves as individuals. I want to say, too, that although they threw communism and socialism at us over here, millions of people in Europe and hundreds of thousands of people in Great Britain had to emigrate, not under the red flag, but under condition that were there under the Union Jack. I do not want you to forget that.

As I said before, I was practically born a socialist. I have done everything it is possible for a human being to do in order to maintain the ideal of democracy. I have fought for my country, and I thought in the 1914-1918 was that we were fighting a war to end wars, and I found that it was a fallacy. Hundreds of thousands of socialists died in the First Great War. We thought we had finished with warfare, but we shall never finish with warfare as long as we have capitalism and the Liberals like we have over there today . . .

Mr. Tucker: — What about the Soviet Union?

Mr. Gibbs: — . . . because, my hon. friends, they know that it is capitalism that thrives under warfare.

Mr. Tucker: — Why is the Soviet Union so aggressive then?

Mr. Gibbs: — But they can take millions of lives of the common people of the nation and then what do they try to give us when we come back? They try to discourage us and throw all the despicable things they can because we went out there to fight for something that is worth fighting for, the right of a decent standard of living and that we could educate and train our families and treat them decently in this world — a thing that the Liberal government in their patronizing never did when they offered the farmers and the working people of this province three cents a meal to live on, and they called themselves men. They are not even human beings when they could get down to that sort of thing. They preach fear all of the time. As far as the Atlantic Charter is concerned to those people over there, they do not know what it means. They fear this and they fear the other thing; they haven't got the guts to go after something and build something for the people of this country of ours.

March 10, 1949

After the first great war was over, these socialists that they condemned so much, their children had to go and fight another war. Who for? It was for the parasites, the Liberal and Conservative parasites, and the capitalists which they believe in and which they would try to protect. Our children died for the likes of this. My friend, the Leader of the Opposition, knows of the veterans who returned from the first great war when he sat as chairman of the Soldiers' Settlement Board down in Ottawa. He knows the deal that the veterans got there. They condemned the deal. The fairest and finest deal that ever a veteran got as far as farming is concerned, but yet they condemned it. Why doesn't he talk about the Soldiers' Settlement board after the first great war and say what the Liberal government did for our returned veterans of that day? It is a disgrace to Canadian nationality.

Our hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) — with his grin, and I do not think he knows anything about socialism at all although he yaps about it plenty. I would just like to read you an excerpt from a man that has gone through the mill. Not a man of 23 years old or 40 years old or even 50 years, but a man of 82 years old — one of the finest men in the socialist movement of the Old Country, Mr. Fred Anderson. He is a pioneer British socialist writer, and this is what he has to say — I am not going to read all the article like my friend from Arm River would to waste time, because that is all he tries to do just to amuse himself:

A government likes to make fundamental and idealist changes in social structure, in effect to begin building up a new order, another foundation under the old. As always imitation to the special task to face up to the immediate and incessantly urgent problem of keeping ordinary day to day life of the nation going with as little discomfort as possible while the process of change is taking place, and that, even in the most favourable circumstances, is a task of great difficulty, for fundamental changes are, in their very nature, long time projects. A new society does not come into existence fully matured and complete as a result of five sessions of the life of a parliament.

Be frank in passing Acts fro bringing it into existence. Its basic principles may be definitely asserted by a single general election as they were in 1945, but their transgression into institution and the new settled order of things find an acceptance in the minds of men, have to grow and mature in time and a generation or two may be required for it. This period of the growth of the new order of things into maturity and final acceptance presents many difficulties. There will be a feeling of displacement for many people whose whole habits have rooted in the old ways, and a certain inconvenience and confusion; often, indeed a degree of discomfort must be expected for all of us while the new way and the new relationship are developing into final shape, often through process of trial and error, and to an accompaniment of frequent disappointment, characteristic of such products. These difficulties we could have faced with confidence for the idealism of our movement during all the period when we were preparing for power, always contemplating having to face them by taking over in good going order the equipment of life and setting them to work for the common good instead of private gain.

Now if my friends across the way would read and digest something that old fellow of 82 has written, an old fellow of British stock and who believes in the British Empire, that possibly has done everything in his body and soul to keep the Union Jack flying, just like thousands of others of us. Then all we get for it when we come back is ridicule from the likes of the Liberal party over there that escaped in something that they will never get away from, as far as I can see.

My hon. friend for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) spoke about truths; he mentioned Mr. Procter and truths. Well, I always liked Mr. Procter. We used to get along pretty good and we had a lot of fun together in one thing and another, but I wonder if he really believes that.

An Hon. Member: — They're telling the truth all of the time.

Mr. Gibbs: — Just in passing, I would like to give you a quotation from Mr. Anderson, and it says: "The finest and loveliest ground on which people live is truth; the real with the real, on which nothing is assumed." I wish my friends in the opposition would digest that, study it and practice it.

I want to tell this House, and especially the members of the opposition, of something that occurred with regard to the bridge project at the Saskatchewan Landing. I, as the member for Swift Current, have had quite a little bit to do and say about getting the bridge. I wish, in the first place, to congratulate our government and the Minister of Highways on their good work in getting behind the project. Possibly some of you hon. friends do not know, but out in that south-west part of the province, the Liberal party, and as a matter of fact, the Conservative party when they were in power, always used this as a political football to get a bridge over the Saskatchewan Landing, and for the past 35 years it has always been the eleventh hour football to kick around and play with when the Liberals were elected. In 1944 they did the same thing, and lo and behold, after all the members they have had representing the city of Swift Current in this House, they have claimed to have worked in order to get that project over there. They had lots of time to do it because they have been talking for 35 years about getting a bridge over the Saskatchewan Landing. This is what I want to tell my Liberal friends again: now they talk about doing the things and their actions prove entirely different. Mr. Taggart found out, when it was too late, that he could not put it over, he could not pull the wool over the eyes of the people of Swift Current constituency like had had done for years previous, and he lost out and I was returned as the member for Swift Current.

There were all kinds of people who came to see me, all denomination, Conservatives, Independents, Liberals and C.C.F., and asked me to try and do something in order to get this bridge over the South Saskatchewan River. Well, I had to laugh and I had to swear sometimes, but I got here. We have done something about it, and it did not take 35 years to do it. We did it in less than five years.

Mr. Tucker: — You haven't got much done, and you have been in office four years.

March 10, 1949

Mr. Gibbs: — In speaking about this bridge, I am going to tell you now the bridge committee was set up, and then I am coming around to this great big Leader, or Liberal mis-Leader of yours or whatever you would like to call him.

Mr. Tucker: — You are just a little fellow yourself.

Mr. Gibbs: — When we set up this committee it was a non-political committee. Farmers and workers and all political stripes were on that committee in order to get this thing going. We had gone into all details; I had submitted resolutions to our government and had them passed with the full consent of the opposition and the Liberal party on that side — unanimous consent of the Liberal party on that side.

Mr. Tucker: — Didn't you want the consent of the people on this side? Did you object to that?

Mr. Gibbs: — Sure, I was glad of it. You didn't give it to us though. I am coming to that in a minute. The full unanimous consent of the opposition was fine and I thanked them for it. Now then, the great man from Ottawa came there after all this had been organized and ready to go, and he spoke at a meeting at Swift Current in support of my Liberal opposition, who was the candidate in the last general election. I do not know whether he had ever been in the west before or not. I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition had ever been in Swift Current before.

Mr. Tucker: — I was just born in the west. This is more than you were.

Mr. Gibbs: — Well, that is what you may think, but I do not think he knew anything about the country.

Mr. Tucker: — You even doubt that I was born here?

Mr. Gibbs: — I do not think he knew anything about it, but he stood on the platform and he raved about the communists and the socialists and everything else. The he started on about the bridge. Mind you, my opponent, the Liberal candidate, was on the platform with him. He says: "Look, my good people, you would not support a project of this kind. You wouldn't put in your good money in a project of this kind, would you?" He said: "Why you would be foolish to do it. The federal Minister of Agriculture said we are going to build a dam near Elbow, and when that dam is put in the backwater from it will come back to Swift current and your bridge will be under water. It would be foolish for you good people to put your good money in such a project." There was one little chap, knee-high to a grasshopper, sitting in the front row, and he says: "Look here, Mr. Tucker, we have been wanting that bridge for a long time and a bridge under water is better than not bridge at all, and we are going to get it."

An Hon. Member: — Was that the Premier?

Mr. Gibbs: — And we are going to get it, I can tell the Leader of the Opposition, despite all your sabotage.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. The hon. gentleman, of course, is quite entertaining in his report of that meeting, but there was no attempt at sabotage at all. What I pointed out — now I am just correcting the hon. member's words as you permitted others to do — was that there was no use building a bridge that would be under water, and that the best thing to do would be to build a high-level bridge or take steps that they would not build a bridge that would be useless. What is being done is to make the piers strong enough to raise the bridge to meet the very objection I was point out.

Premier Douglas: — That is going to cost the government a lot of money. How about the dominion government giving some money.

Mr. Gibbs: — I would say in answer to that, that the Leader of the Opposition was fully aware that this committee that had been set up had bone into all details. We had arranged for a heavier built fence, we had arranged for heavier piers in case we should have to build a high-level bridge. He already knew that.

Mr. Tucker: — That was announced afterwards.

Premier Douglas: — You should have known it.

Mr. Gibbs: — Furthermore, he was told from the floor of the meeting but he did not want to listen to it.

Coming back to the House again, Mr. Speaker, with regard to this bridge at Swift Current which the Liberal have promised for 35 years, we could prove that in this province under Liberal administration that five bridges had been built across the Saskatchewan River, and I think three of them were built by the federal government either putting up 80 or 90 percent of the cost, and the Liberal government either putting up 10 or 20 percent of the cost. On the other two bridges, the federal government put up about the same percent of the cost. But when the C.C.F. government asked the federal government to give us a little action and to do something about the construction of this bridge, they never gave us one cent, and they haven't given us a cent today.

It seems to me that the only thing that the Leader of the Opposition had in mind when speaking at Swift Current and trying to throw water on that bridge was that he possibly thought that the Liberals would come into power and then they could do something about it with the federal government, and get a bridge in order to tell the people of the world that a Liberal government had built it.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege again. The hon. member has made the charge that I was trying to get them to reject the idea of building the bridge. I said we would build the bridge, but we would build a high-level bridge that would not be under water.

March 10, 1949

Mr. Gibbs: — Anyway, we know that the Leader of the Opposition is pretty good at going behind and bringing it out in some way in order to make political expediencies. He is pretty good at that. Anyway, I want to say, as I said at the outset . . .

Mr. Patterson: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. You made the hon. Leader of the Opposition withdraw a statement the other day which involved political intentions. I think if the rule is to apply on this side of the House, it should also apply to the hon. member who is now speaking.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! We have used the whole afternoon up by the hon. member on that side of the house.

Mr. Patterson: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order again. You ruled the other day that the member had accused political motivation and had to withdraw. I am asking that you insist that this member comply with that ruling.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member who was speaking as to the events that happened during the election campaign was doing exactly the same as the hon. member who previously took his seat. A point of order is not warranted.

Mr. Wellbelove: —Mr. Speaker, you are on a point of order.

Mr. Culliton: — Can we not debate this point of order?

Mr. Tucker: — We cannot argue with the Speaker all day.

Mr. Patterson: —But on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — If the hon. member wants to debate the point of order, I am perfectly willing.

Mr. Patterson: — Well, I want to debate the point of order.

Mr. Speaker: — Go ahead.

Mr. Patterson: — Is something in connection with an election campaign when a charge is made that it is actuated by political motives different where something happens and the same charge that it is actuated by political motives? That is the question I ask you, Sir.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That is not the point, Mr. Speaker. The point that was brought to Your Honour's attention occurred in committee where it was deliberately stated that a previous Legislature had passed Acts and placed those Acts on the Statutes of the province definitely for political purposes.

Mr. Culliton: — Mr. Speaker, with all due deference to the hon. member who just spoke, that is not actually what transpired in committee. The hon. Leader of the Opposition said “in my opinion”, and expressed an opinion that certain things were done as a result of political motivation, and when he made that statement he was only making a statement which you, Mr. Speaker, had ruled to be proper in previous remarks in this House when time after time objection had been taken to remarks made by members on the other side, and you ruled that the member was expressing the same principle that arose in committee. The hon. Leader of the Opposition said quite distinctly and quite definitely, and on more than one occasion “in my opinion”.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I did not raise the point of order because, of course, I had observed that the hon. member was very heated up and ready to go to almost any length, but after all when a point is raised, then it comes before you for decision. The hon. member said I was very good a squirming around. I would refer you to *Beauchesne*, 2nd edition, and I quote: “No member shall speak disrespectfully of different people not use offensive words against either House or against any member thereof.” Then it goes on to say it is just a matter of how we are going to carry on the debates of this House. On page 97 it says: “the imputation of bad motives, or motives different from those acknowledged, misrepresenting the language of another, or charging him with falsehood or deceit . . .” If you say a person is pretty good when something is said that he makes an explanation, and then the hon. member says he is pretty good at squirming around at thing, you are practically accusing him of deceit. You are making out that he is not straightforward and honest, and that is certainly contemptuous or insulting language. All these are unparliamentary and call for prompt interference, Mr. Speaker.

I insist that since I have come into this Legislature, as far as I am concerned, if we are going to have the level of this debate and accusing people of ‘squirming’, making out that they are not straightforward and honest — if that is to be the level of the debate, well, Your Honour will see the level of the debate. What the opposition says, and if you will rule that is parliamentary, then of course we reserve the right to say, and the level of this House and this particular Legislature is going to be set very early in this stage of the Legislature. As I pointed out to Your Honour, if you want the tone of this Legislature to be characterized by language as just used by the hon. member for Swift Current, accusing me of squirming around something when I got up and made a plain statement of fact, if that is satisfactory to the hon. members opposite, if that is the way they want the debate carried on, with Your Honour’s permission, well, the, we will govern ourselves accordingly.

Mr. Speaker: — Speaking to the point of order, I know very well the ruling in *Beauchesne* and if I had adhered to it strictly I would have been up on my feet and there would have been a lot less discussion in the House than there has been, on both sides and particularly on the side of the Leader of the Opposition. I have repeatedly appealed to you not to use this kind of thing. If I had followed out to a letter the ruling in *Beauchesne*, I could have called the hon. member who was just speaking to order a hundred times. I have refrained from doing that. I have tried to be as fair as possible and when it comes to the interpretation of that

March 10, 1949

particular clause of Beauchesne, I am going to take my opinion seriously, and I rule that the hon. member was not out of order. If the hon. member wishes to challenge my ruling, he is perfectly in order.

Mr. Patterson: — I want to challenge your ruling on this basis, Mr. Speaker: you have no justification for accusing any group in this House of violating the rules of the House. When any member of this House, whether he is on this side or that side, violates the rules, then if, in your opinion, he has so violated the rules, it is perfectly proper for you to call him to order and point out his error. But to stand up in your place and to say that the people who sit in this House, on this side of the House, virtually have consistently violated the rules, that is beyond your prerogative.

Mr. Speaker: — What I said was that if I had followed out that particular clause literally in Beauchesne, both sides of the House would have been called to order and there would have been very little debate.

Mr. Tucker: — You said particularly the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, and I protest against that. I say that you have no right to direct those attacks upon myself. As far as I am concerned, we appeal against your ruling that the violent and uncalled for and improper language of the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs) was unparliamentary, and we do not propose to abide by that ruling without protesting against it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The point of order I want to rise on is not connected with the previous question at all, but this: when the Speaker's ruling is challenged there is no debate on it, and I do not think the member has any right to get up and debate it, nor the member for Cannington (Mr. Patterson) nor the Leader of the Opposition. They were out of order completely.

Mr. Patterson: — Is a point of order debatable, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — A point of order is but not in a challenge of the Speaker's ruling.

Mr. Patterson: — It was only a moment ago that we challenged the Speaker's ruling and you are the first one that has got up to speak on it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I did not speak on it at all.

An Hon. Member: — You tried but you do not know where you are at.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member for Cannington has challenged the ruling of the Speaker. Those in favour of upholding we say 'Aye'; those opposed will say "No".

Mr. Tucker: — A recorded vote, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — All right.

YEAS — 26

Wellbelove
Benson
McIntosh
Brockelbank
Fines
Lloyd
Brown
Gibson
Murray

Thair
Darling
Nollet
Howe
Sturdy
Williams
Gibbs
Heming

Dewhurst
Stone
Erb
Denike
Swallow
Willis
Buchanan
Walker
Larsen

NAYS — 18

Tucker
Loptson
Prince
Culliton
Patterson
Danielson

Dundas
Woods
Trippe
Egnatoff
Korchinski
Cameron

Loehr
Banks
Horsman
McDonald
Deshaye
McCormack

The Assembly adjourned at 6:05 o'clock p.m.