

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Eleventh Legislature**

**Friday, March 11, 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. H. Gibbs (Swift Current):** — Mr. Speaker, when the adjournment took place last night, if there had been no interruption and the balloon had not gone up, I would have been through by 6 o'clock. However, you will remember I was criticizing the sabotage work the Leader of the Opposition was doing in Swift Current when he spoke at the nominating convention for the Liberal candidate there. I am glad to say that with all that sort of work and what went on, we have at least seen the light of day, and I am glad to say that through the efforts of this government, a government that does try to do things, we will have a bridge over the Saskatchewan Landing this year, or at least it will be started this year. I can say to the constituents of Swift Current that at long last we have got that long-wanted bridge which the Liberal government of the past has promised us for 35 years.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, that the members in the opposition, and especially the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) who spoke yesterday is always criticizing socialism and communism and the members on the government side of this House. That is all they can talk about, and that is all they can say. Possibly that is all they have in their minds at the present time, but it is rather a funny thing that through the ages we see changes, we see scientific development going on and yet these people stay in the dodo fashion in which they have been brought up. They criticize every socialist country in the world, and yet, I notice, over the air and in the foreign press, we get that the Labour Socialist party, the government of England, has once again retained a Labour seat in St. Pancras. They have not lost one seat since 1945. Socialists, Labour men. Not Liberals and Conservatives but socialists and labour men, doing something for that great country and empire. I just thought I would bring that to their attention.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to draw to the attention of the members of the opposition that a certain gentleman, some years ago, quoted — I hope the members on the Liberal side of the House will digest what is in this quotation for their own benefit as well as what follows them, and their children's sake: "I painfully regret that in almost every political controversy of the past 50 years, the leisure class and the titled classes have been in the wrong. The common people, the toilers, the men of uncommon sense, have been responsible for nearly all the social reform measures which the world accepts today." That was not a quotation of Karl Marx, that was not a quotation of Nicolai Lenin, or Joseph Stalin; that, my friends, was a quotation of the eminent British statesman, William Gladstone.

**An Hon. Member:** — A Liberal.

**Mr. Gibbs:** — So there you are, my friends. Accept it and work by it.

I shall support the motion.

**Mr. A. Lopton (Saltcoats):** — Mr. Speaker, first I want to do as the other hon. members of this House, express my congratulations to yourself, Sir, for having retained the confidence of this Legislature for the past four sessions and again being re-elected to that honoured position this session. I realize your position is a difficult one. This is not the first time I have been in this Legislature, and I don't think we have ever had quite as much controversy over rules and regulations as we have had for the short period I have been here.

Having said that, Sir, I think it would only be fair I should let the members know where I come from. As a matter of fact, I come from that area the hon. member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) has already designated as a rather out-moded area, and termed it as "God forsaken". I don't know what that really means, but I take great pleasure, at any time, just to describe what has happened in that particular part of this province.

I happen to have lived there practically all my life, and by the looks of my hair I guess you can realize it has been a good many years. When I came there as a youngster, the only mode of travel was the oxen. There were no roads or anything, and I have seen the influx of immigrants into that area to which my hon. friend referred, by the hundreds, in the most poverty-stricken state of any human being. That is a good many years ago.

These people went in there and they were not asking for any government aid or any help from anybody. They came there with one ambition, and that was to establish for themselves a home. Homesteads, of course were quite plentiful in those days, and I have seen these people being driven out onto the prairie, which was not the best of land as it is here on the Regina plains, with nothing but a hack-axe and a saw, a hammer and a hoe. These people went out on the homesteads and the first thing they did, Mr. Speaker, as you probably know, was to cut logs out of the bush and build themselves a shack. They plastered the walls with clay, and I used to be, as a matter of fact, a fairly good plasterer myself. They lived there with dirt floors and dirt roofs. The men-folk went out and got what work they could, and that was the first capital they had; and they bough a cow and a pig and an ox. This developed into one of the most prosperous areas in this province, through the work and ambition of those people who have been classified as more or less "God forsaken".

I take exception to it because I know these people. I have lived with them. I have lived with those people who are now old-timers. I have seen those then young people become old, and I have seen them educating their children, many of whom have become very prominent citizens of our society, in medical arts, legal art, teaching art; but there are always some who think they are a little better than anyone else, and we heard that expressed in this House. It is a good thing there aren't too many of them there.

**March 11, 1949**

Now, what is the situation there today? After that community was settled by these poverty-stricken people many years ago, you see it dotted with fine buildings and homes, and most of the farms are fixed up and equipped with motorized power. They have money in the bank, and they are driving good cars. Some of them have homes that would do credit to the city of Regina. The area is now checkerboarded by railroads; there is a town about every six or eight miles. There are highways and byways, although the highways have, of course, been badly neglected this past four years, I must admit. They have telephones and they have power lines, and they have schools wherever they are needed. Now, that is the area my hon. friend referred to as being "God forsaken". I want also to tell this House that that particular area of this province, according to statistics, produced more actual wealth, year in and year out, than any other similar area in this province. That is what these people have done who came in here, and they have done it under the capitalistic system which my hon. friends want to get away from. That is something to be said for the individual capitalists. So much for that.

I want to make a little observation of what I have seen since I have come here, Mr. Speaker. I have never seen, and I don't think anyone else has ever seen, a Premier of this House perform as our friend has performed since I came here. I feel rather badly about it because I look upon the Premier's position as one of honour and dignity; but when I see him stop out and challenge a member on this side, practically telling him in open language that he was not telling the truth, and then have you, Mr. Speaker, tell him he had to accept it, than a member came here on the next day and proved that he, himself, was the one not telling the truth, I want to say right here that that is not what we want in the leadership in our province, and I know my hon. friend does not want it either. He just wants to sit down himself a little bit and try to keep more closely to the truth when he is speaking in this House and outside the House.

I think it is fair for me to say that the present government or the C.C.F. party would not be on that side of the House had they told the truth during the last campaign. I don't think there was ever a campaign where there was more manipulation of figures of the government's activities than there was in this campaign, and had the meager information that we have today received from the government been known to the people of the country there wouldn't have been a corporal's guard on your side, Mr. Speaker, as there is today.

I have listened to statement after statement read on this side of the House where misrepresentation has been brought forward. Had the condition of the Crown Corporations been known to the people before the election last June, there would have been a different complexion at the polls too. I am not accusing some of my hon. friends of deliberately going out to deceive the people. I think possibly they may not have understood the facts themselves; but if their conscience wants to be clear, and they want to be fair to the people of this province, they know now the conditions are not as they were presented during the campaign, and the fair thing to do would be to resign and tell the people they had made a mistake. If you want this again, in spite of these conditions why then vote for it. I think that would have been the fair thing to do. I think most of the hon. members will agree that the people, as a whole, are pretty good judges at the polls if they get the proper facts laid before them.

Another thing we find is that this government has been rather extravagant in their administration. I do not think there is a government within the Commonwealth that fortifies itself so much by legal advice and economic advisers from other lands and provinces. I have never heard of a Premier of any province, or in the British Commonwealth of Nations, and especially in the province of Saskatchewan, who had to fortify himself with so many legal advisers. There is only one man in this province that I know who ever did that, and that was Harry Bronfman. Anybody who knows Harry Bronfman knows why had had to have legal advisers. He had them in order to keep him out of jail because his business of adulterating liquor came so close to the borderline and it would not pay him to be put in jail.

**Premier Douglas:** — I thought the Liberal party did that for him.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well, my hon. friend, the Premier, must have a private legal adviser for some purpose, and by the mis-statements he makes it is possible he might be afraid he would be caught up. However, that is as it may be, but I want to say . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I know my hon. friend is trying to be deliberately provocative, but I am sure he will not want to leave the record the way he just did, when he infers that the reason there is legal adviser to the Cabinet is because they are going to get in jail. If the debate is going to descent to that sort of level then, of course, my hon. friend will have to accept the responsibility for it; but I am sure my hon. friend will want to withdraw that statements.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, it is everyone's privilege to have their own opinion on that.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I must ask your Honour for a ruling. If it is quite in order for an hon. member to make a statement that the government has legal advisers because they were afraid they might get in jail.

**Mr. Loptson:** — I didn't say that.

**Premier Douglas:** — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I am asking you. All my hon. friend needs to say is that it was not his intention to give that impression.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think the hon. member should assure the House he was not making such a statement.

**Mr. Loptson:** — No, I was just merely making a comparison.

**Premier Douglas:** — Does this extend to hay contracts too?

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well, if my hon. friend wants to know something about hay, I will tell him all about it. I have never held any hay contracts in my life with any government,

**March 11, 1949**

but I do know a lot of people are interested in hay. I want to tell them all about it: the cows and the horses and the sheep, and there are a few asses around the country, that are still braying for something.

**Premier Douglas:** — Yes, there is one braying right now.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order.

**Mr. Loftson:** — I just want to read some of the things they tell the people around my part of the country, and some of the things that happened. First of all, I want to say, as you know, Mr. Speaker, there is quite a large percentage of our voting population who depend entirely upon verbal conversation in deciding how to vote in an election. I think you will all agree with me that that is the case. There are a lot of men and women who do not read political history. A lot of them do not even think about politics until it gets near an election. Until the C.C.F. came into being there never was very much politics talked around the country during election time, but since they came into being there is hardly anybody ever left in peace without somebody approaching them about the C.C.F. party. Well, you can incite people by false rumours and false statements when there is nobody to contradict them, and you can get a lot of support that way. You can get certain people in the community to take up the sword and go out as a crusader for certain things that are not altogether right. I think my hon. friends will agree to that.

This new movement had done just that very thing. I know, up in our community, men and women — I have no pity for the men, but I do have pity for some of the women who have been misled to do things that were not to their honourable interest. Many of these women go out and canvass and spread propaganda, and they spread many false rumours. They think they are doing the right thing, and these women are absolutely sincere in their actions. I have had women go up there in my seat with an envelope from a cheque for the family allowance, and they told those people who could not read or write that this government was paying the family allowance. These women are in high positions in our society, and they are good women. They go to church too, and they work hard with the Red Cross, and all the other things that go along to make our ills well, but as far as they knowing politics, Mr. Speaker, they do not know any more about political psychology or factualities than the cats do about cooking, and that is the sorry thing about it. Now, if my hon. friends ever got to their objective, which I hope they never will, that kind of people are going to be the most difficult to deal with, far more so than those who are opposing it. There is nothing more unreasonable, and there is nothing more, I may say, abominable, than to go out and induce people to do things that do not come out as they are promised, when they are sincere about it. I don't think some of my hon. friends on that side are sincere about the results that may come out of the C.C.F. party if they got into power at Ottawa. I think a lot of them do know. There is another hand than what is leading it today, that is behind this thing, as far as this movement is concerned.

How did this party come about in the first place? It was well said by the Minister of Agriculture that the party was created as a result of the activities of the U.F.C., but he did not tell how the U.F.C. came about. The U.F.C. is the parent of the C.C.F. party, but he didn't tell us who was the parent of the U.F.C.

I wonder if my hon. friends have ever gone back to see what influence organized the U.F.C. in the first place, way back in 1921 — some of you gentlemen were too young to know just what was going on — when they were meeting behind locked doors, when their members were pledged to secrecy. I know a lot of farmers who joined the U.F.C. They joined it because they wanted to find out what was going on. It was purely and simply a communist organization. It was engineered by the International Soviet Union organization. They did very well for a while, but they lost all their best members, and as a result of that, they went broke, and had it not been for this government here passing legislation whereby the municipalities could pay them \$200 apiece in order to keep them going, they would not be in existence today.

There isn't anybody going to tell me that that was not so because members of that organization, not only the leaders but the supporters, told me personally they believed in the communist system. I have no quarrel with communists; I have no quarrel with the communist party or the Labour-Progressive party because they are at least in the open and they are telling just what they are going to do. They are going to socialize everything and take capitalism out of existence; but I have a quarrel with a party that goes out and purports to be something they are not. It was said in the House not long ago, by the Premier of this province, who goes out and condemns the Communist party, and says: "We are not Communists." You don't have to be a member of the communist party to promote the communist principles. You don't have to be a member of the Liberal party to promote Liberal principles, and you don't have to be a member of the Conservative party to promote Conservative principles. If, as they reported here, and I presume it was right, that when the hon. Premier was challenged to define the difference between the policy of the C.C.F. party and that of the Communist party, what did he say? Just in case he has forgotten, I will read it to him: "When challenged in the Legislature in the 1947 session to state the difference between socialism and communism, Premier Douglas replied 'Socialism is different from communism in four ways. First the C.C.F. socialists do not believe in resorting to violence to overcome a government and its capitalistic, economic system'." Well, I can tell you that it is only the radical 'reds' in the Communist party that believe in that system. I can tell you hundreds of communists who are supporting you, through our part of the country, who do really believe in the communist system, and they are supporters of this party. They don't believe in violence, but they do believe in the communist system. "The second is the C.C.F. socialists believe in God." I can show you hundreds in our part of the country that go to church regularly, and still they confess their belief in the communist system. "Thirdly, the socialists do not believe in the one-party government." Well, even Stalin says that they have elections, and there are lots of them out there say there is absolutely no reason why any man should want to have an opposition to the government. They should have the different parties voting and supporting the government and have free elections. "The fourth is the C.C.F. socialists believe in freedom of speech and freedom of the press." Well, that is a very small thing. That is the only thing I say that isn't the same. Stalin says you can have all the freedom you want in Russia both in press and speech, as long as you don't offend the government. Well, that seems to be a very small compromise.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that leaves everything in the C.C.F. platform the same as the Communist party — exactly the same, and I am going to compliment the Premier on being the one C.C.F.'er that came out and told the truth.

**March 11, 1949**

**Premier Douglas:** — You wouldn't know the truth if you met it in broad daylight.

**Mr. Loptson:** — There are many other leaders who have been bold enough to tell you that everything you have got, as far as capitalistic ownership is concerned, will have to be abolished before you can get true socialistic states. They are right; there isn't any question about it. You can't go half one way and half the other, and when he made this statement, that is one time at least that he told the truth, and I am going to congratulate him on it; but I wish he would tell it to the people out in the country. If he would only tell that to the people in the country and say: "Here, this is what we stand for. If you want us to carry out this, vote for it." What would have happened? Well, he might have got elected, but I am sure they would not have been another one on that side of the House.

I might say, while we are on this subject of economic conditions, why don't you say something about what the Liberals have done? First of all, I am going to give you a little resume of what happened when this party was formed. I have already stated that the U.F.C. was the parent of this party. In the first place, the communists came into this question in 1919, and were responsible for organizing the big strike that was held in Winnipeg, that they called the "One Big Union" strike. Out of that was born the Labour party in Manitoba. Stalin, or Lenin, at that time told them that they had got weak-hearted or they would have won that strike. They should not have allowed the milk to be delivered to the hospitals, because they had everybody on the run. After that they found they had to organize politically and as a Labour party alone they couldn't get far so the next thing was to try to get the poor farmer; he was the next goat. So they organized the U.F.C. and of course they wrecked the Grain Growers Association which was too slow for them. When hard times came — as a matter of fact I may tell you something too that many of you will say is not true: who was it that influenced the Pool organization to hold the wheat from the market? Some of you would say it was the U.F.C. did that. And what happened as a result of holding the wheat to Great Britain, but as a result of their action the British government allowed wheat to come into the British market to replace the Canadian wheat. Millions of bushels came into Britain at that time. What was the result then? Farmers went broke. I got 64 cents a bushel for wheat. As a matter of fact I got 80 cents as an initial payment, 16 cents a little afterwards for over-payment when a man that rented my land took \$1.44 from another farm organization, the United Grain Growers. He got \$1.44 the same day I got 80 cents, and that was charged back with 14 or 16 cents over-payment.

Now, I am sure not many of the Pool directors were in favour of that policy but it only takes one, Mr. Speaker, one loud-spoken fellow to influence a body of men, especially when they think it is done in earnest to do something for those they represent. I think, as far as the directors were concerned, they did think they were doing something for the farmer when they held the wheat off the market. But, as a result of this thing, the farmers were then in debt and the hard times come in 1921, and the time was prime to organize a left-wing of the Communist party to get the farmers into it. Nobody was more likely to work in that direction than the U.F.C., and as a result of that, in 1933, this is the bible that was then written. In that book is laid

down the policies and plans on which the C.C.F. party is going to operate when it gets into office. True, Mr. Speaker, lots contained in this book could not be administered by a provincial government as long as our constitution holds good in Ottawa, but all of it can be put into effect if they get into power at Ottawa.

What did they do? During those days we were all in the dog-house, as we might say. That was the hungry thirties. Did you ever hear one suggestion from this organization, the U.F.C. — the Farmer-Labour party, and later the Co-operative Commonwealth — or did you ever see in print, or spoken, a word of advice as to what should be done to alleviate the hardship that was then prevailing throughout the province? The only advice that was ever given was to say to the farmer: “Give us your title and we will look after you.”

In 1934 we had an election, and the main argument then when 75 percent of the farmers were right on the rocks, owed arrears on their mortgages, owed arrears on their interest, owed taxes, owed everything, it was very easy then for them to talk to these people about something different to what they had had. The only relief was: “Vote for us, we’ll take your land and we will give you a use-lease back. See how easy it would be for you to live, and you wouldn’t have any worries about your debts.”

Well now, what happened? Fortunately for the province the C.C.F. didn’t get into office; fortunately for the farmers. I had a neighbour living right across the road from me; he was in debt and so was I, and I asked him how he would likely to be a tenant on his land for the rest of his life. “Well, he said, I am likely going to be a tenant anyway.” So he went and voted and worked hard for the C.C.F., but today, what had happened? That man owns his land with a clear title; he has tractors and cars, and money in the bank. What happened: Let me tell you what happened. A Liberal government was elected. And what did they do? If my hon. friends don’t know, at least they might be reasonable about it. We know that previous to 1935, Mr. Bennett set up the Farmers-Creditors’ Arrangement Board, and we also know that it did not work properly as he did not have the proper men at the head of it. It was not because Mr. Bennett did not mean right, but he didn’t put the right men at the head of it.

Then in 1935 the Liberal government and Mr. King were elected. What he did is a matter of record. I will tell you this — you can read about it if you want to: they continued the board but they changed the personnel. I think many of you gentlemen know who was at the head of the board. I know Mr. Wilson, anyway, who was the Land Adjuster. He was the man who set the value of the land, and as a result of the local administration of debt adjustment in this province, and the assessment under the Farmers-Creditors’ Arrangement Act, no less than \$243 million was written off the indebtedness of the farmers of this province. \$243 million. Well, would you say that that is doing nothing? As a result of that, and of course, the better prices, I don’t think there is two percent of the farmers in my area who haven’t got their titles clear. And my hon. friends say that the Liberal party has never done anything for the farmers.

**Mr. Gibson:** — That was the war.

**Mr. Loptson:** — That was done before the war, Mr. Speaker.



**March 11, 1949**

Now, let us see what this party is going to do for the farmers. It is just too bad that the farmer is in pretty good shape right now, and the only way now you can get his land is to tax him out. You'll never take it by confiscation I know that. There isn't any chance if you ever try. And who are you going to look to to assist you in making that policy possible? Likely those you are paying \$14,000, through the municipality, to keep in existence — the friendly U.F.C., Saskatchewan Section. They are supposed to represent the farmers of this province, and they had a convention here not very long ago. We know, of course, that the government is facing a considerable amount of expenses. They have budget for \$56 million this year; they have allowed a meager 2.5 million for Agriculture. They have assumed that the education tax was going to be \$6 million, or \$1 million more than last year. They have assumed that the liquor profits are going to be high. These things might not come in just as they expect, especially when many of those who sit on your right, Mr. Speaker, have predicted that times are not going to be good in the future. They must then be facing the prospect of finding revenue somewhere else. So, or course, they have gone to the parent to see what can be done about it, and they have very conveniently passed a resolution at their convention, an organization of farmers, representing the farmers of Saskatchewan, and let me read it to you, Mr. Speaker:

Therefore be it resolved that we ask the provincial government to consider the possibility of eliminating the present head tax and replacing it with an increase in the public revenue tax, large enough, eventually, to insure complete health service for the people of the province.

To increase the public revenue tax, Mr. Speaker. They propose to take the levies off, and let the property pay for it.

Now, what does it mean? I have tried to be very conservative in the estimate of what full hospitalization and medical services would mean in this province. And I don't want to exaggerate any, but you can very easily see \$100 per quarter section added to the present taxes on farm land. Well, then, almost any time except prosperous times, in a very few years, the municipality would have the land for taxes. That would coincide very nicely with the lend-lease that is now given to our returned men and others who are getting government lands. It would just fit in nicely. It would be pretty hard to assume that the hon. gentlemen did not have this figured out long before this. And with what we are facing at the present time, I think our hon. friends know they might find themselves in difficulties at the end of this year in balancing their budget, and the day is certainly not very far off when you are not going to raise the revenue you are doing today. Where are you going to get it? When the federal revenue is going to go down considerable from where it is now, and when it runs out in four years from now — I think that is as long as it will run — it is just a question of whether the people of Canada are going to take another chance on giving you the same deal as you have now.

So I can see where the confiscation is coming. I have always expected it. It is nothing new to me. I knew that our hon. friends weren't going to take the land away from the farmers. Of course they wouldn't. They would very conveniently tax them off the land, and they are using the farm organization as an excuse. They say: "Oh well, that is better than the Liberals have done. The Liberals have never done anything." Oh sure, that doesn't mean anything to them.

Let me just tell you something about what the Liberals have done. After all, Mr. Speaker, when it comes down to the finalities, most men come down and sit at the table and see what can be done about the things that are before them, especially when we are in difficulties. When we are through with all this fanfare, we've got to get down to real sobriety and meet the situation not matter what we call ourselves, and when it come to reality, people who are reasonable know what principles and policy is the best for the people, especially people who are used to that kind of living we have been brought up to. I don't think anybody will deny that most of us want to preserve our individual liberty and freedom.

The hon. Premier was reported as saying in New York, and I think he was right that there were only two principles involved: either serfdom or freedom, and the only policy you can have freedom in is the individual, capitalistic system. You can't have it under state socialism.

Now, just let us see what Liberalism has done. I don't have to go away back to England to tell you what Liberalism has done for the underdog. My hon. friend for Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs) just mentioned the first, real exponent of Liberal policies and principles was Gladstone, whose name is borne in high regard all over the world. It was the Liberals in Canada who were the first ones to come to the relief of labour, in spite of their being supposed to be a capitalistic organization. They were the ones to first establish the Department of Labour. They made the trade union legal. That was Liberal policy. They adopted the eight-hour day in the civil service. The fair wage clause — that was Liberal, and the eight-hour day in government contracts. Terrible wasn't it. They established the P.F.R.A., everybody knows they expanded it. They brought in the old age pensions, the blind pensions, unemployment insurance, family allowance. They brought in the Agricultural Price Support Board; they established the Farm Home Improvement Act; and they established the Farmers Creditors' Arrangement Act in that they made it workable. The central bank, and we have a socialized bank; the Department of National Health and Welfare; the Veterans' Land Act. What did they do for Saskatchewan. This Liberal government hasn't done anything for Saskatchewan, of course. But you haven't got a thing in Saskatchewan that the Liberal government wasn't responsible for bringing in — not a school or anything else; hospitals, sanitoriums, roads, electric lights and telephones. And you go out in the country and try to tell the people that don't know any better that the Liberals didn't do anything. What do you think they think of you? Well, they just simply think that you . . . well, I'm not going to say what has been told to me.

Who was it brought in the co-operatives? It was the Liberal brought the Co-operative Act into this province. Who was it brought in the Farm Loan Board when interest was eight and ten percent? I suppose it was the capitalist loan companies that asked them to bring that in. The Liberals brought in the Loan Board and forced the interest down to six percent. Who was it loaded the money to start the co-operative elevator system in the province — I suppose it was the line elevators asked for them — and reduced the big spread of five or six cents a bushel? Yes, sure, I guess it must have been the capitalists asked the government to create the elevator system.

Then, I think, in this province, the past government has a pretty good record as far as debt adjustment is concerned. I am sure this government hasn't.

**March 11, 1949**

Then, I think, in this province the past government has a pretty good record as far as the adjustment is concerned. I am sure this government hasn't improved it any. No, Mr. Speaker, they have a lot of policies they use out in the hustings. I remember in 1934, in addition to the new use-lease they used — and the farmers didn't like it — they used to tell the people what a wonderful Utopia there was in Sweden. That is the kind of a government they were going to create here in Saskatchewan. After they had shot the fifty big shots, which they had so much to say about — I haven't heard anything about the fifty big shots for a long time — but they were right on the top of all their literature, and they were going to get rid of the 50 shots who were handling all the capital in the country. After they had done that they were going to create a government patterned after the Swedish government.

When the 1934 campaign came about, the Swedish government had withered away. The people got to know something about it and they found out that wasn't the thing, and the use-lease had been forgotten, and the big shots had been forgotten. So who did they adopt then? New Zealand. What was the kind of government they were going to have here; they were going to have a New Zealand government. Then, of course, that went pretty good. Nobody knew much about New Zealand so that, of course, they thought must be all right as it was a British country. Well, in 1938 it didn't go over very good because they had been caught on this Swedish stuff; but we had an occasion to find out just what New Zealand was doing for the farmers, and they didn't use it much in 1944. In New Zealand they weren't very good. The government, apparently, socialized the farm products there and the price comparison was not good.

I am going to give you the comparison of the activities in New Zealand as far as it applies to the farmer. We know, of course, that New Zealand has a Labour government, and I think my hon. friends here might just as well call themselves a labour government as they have nothing for the farmer. We had occasion to have a representative in New Zealand in 1945, Mr. Ross and Dr. Donald, and I know their statement is beyond question. Let us compare the price of farm products here in Saskatchewan with those of New Zealand. Products from both countries were sold on the same market — the British market was taking their bacon as they were from here, also the butter. Australia and New Zealand, as quoted here, were very much on a par, and here is the existing price as it was on that date: Australia, the price of butter was 34 cents. Butter fat, top grade; 43½ cents here in Saskatchewan; that's socialistic government. Cheese was 18 cents there and 24 cents here. Hogs were 14 cents a pound there, and 18½ cents here. That's a socialist government where they had the power to handle the farm products. The price of beef 3 and 5¾ cents for top beef steers; 11 to 11½ cents in Canada. Four and one-half cents top heavy weight beef, and 11½ cents here. Forty-six dollars an 800-pound top baby beef, and \$88 here in Canada under a free enterprise system. Sixty-seven dollars and fifty cents for 1,500-pound top heavy steer when it was \$165 to \$175 here in Canada. Honey, for instance, at that same time was 90 cents a pound here and 13 cents there, and wheat, at that time, was 72 cents there and \$1.25 here.

Now, let us have a look at what it cost the farmer to buy his equipment, which is also a cost of production; in Australia, \$525.60 for an eight-foot binder with a four-horse hitch, as compared with \$347.50 here in Canada. Australia, \$341.46 for a five-foot mower, and that is a pretty high price; only \$120.50 here; \$195.75 for a five foot mower; \$120.50 here — the other item

was a double disc. Two hundred and two dollars and ninety-five cents for a six-foot mower, and only \$122.75 here. Let us take rubber-tire tractors: we are all interested in them. We got rubber-tired tractors here, \$2,187 for a 28-36 No. 102, Massey Harris Senior — everybody knows the Massey Harris tractor is the same there as it is here — and \$1,486 here, and I can trace them right down here and the comparison is the same.

How do the hon. members ever expect to get farmers to accept the system they have in New Zealand or Australia on this basis?

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — The question is: what provisions have been made for taking care of the difference in monetary exchange between the two countries in the figures you have quoted?

**Mr. Loptson:** — I can answer that, Mr. Speaker. These are given on the Canadian value, in each case, so that the money is the same.

I think it is fairly clear, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members have misrepresented themselves in the country in the last campaign. I don't think there is any question about that. They told them the economic system of the C.C.F. party was the same as the Communist party. The hon. Minister has not . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is not going to put words in my mouth. I at no time made such a statement. I would ask my non friend not to make such a statement and attribute it to me. He can make silly remarks if he likes, but he is not going to attribute them to me. One can expect nothing else but silly remarks from him.

**Mr. Loptson:** — My hon. friend, Mr. Speaker, I have read the statement of facts, here in this House, where he stated that the C.C.F. party and the Communist party were the same, and you cannot do anything but admit the economic policy of both are the same.

**Premier Douglas:** — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. It is true that I outlined four points in a speech in this House two years ago as the difference between the Communist philosophy and that of the C.C.F. The four points are there, and if my hon. friend wants to refer to the, fine. But his conclusion that I said they are one and the same thing, he cannot attribute to me, because I said they were not the same thing, there were four distinct and fundamental differences.

**Mr. Loptson:** — I did not say you said so. I said it was my conclusion, and the conclusion of everybody else, that the economic policies are the same. That's the fact. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think insofar as my hon. friends are concerned, they haven't anything to crow about in getting themselves on the right side of this session.

I want to say something about what has been said in this House. My hon. friends come out and rear and rave about what the old government had done and what this government has done. Well now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to tell you

**March 11, 1949**

that is no honour to any intelligent member who tries to tell people that this government, with \$56 million revenue, should not do any more than the old government with about \$30 million. I think they are rather belittling themselves when they crow about how much they have done with their revenues since they went into power, compared with the old government when they were in power and taking half the revenue in that time. Surely any government can do more when they have a bigger income. I am not criticizing what they have got for the money, but I am saying this: if they were honourable and sincere men they shouldn't attempt to put that before people who don't understand. To me it doesn't make any difference because I know it is a lot of rot, and stable-minded men out in the country don't listen to that sort of thing. If you want to make a comparison then be reasonable about it; make the comparison with your neighbour who is receiving similar revenue. That is what you should do, and that is the honourable thing. When the hon. Ministers go to Ottawa, Toronto, New York, to talk to these men who have millions at their disposal to come out here and develop things, and then see what they do here, and with the business sense they have, just imagine what they think of them after listening to them make such foolish comparisons. The government in 1929 didn't have the revenue; they only had about one-third of the revenue this government is getting. Maybe they didn't get any more for their money; I am not saying they did, but the comparison is foolish. It is just bunk.

My hon. friends go out in the country and they take a corporation — Oh my goodness me, terrible profits — and then, all of a sudden, they find out it belongs to the United States, Great Britain, or maybe they are in all parts of the world, and they make it look as though they make it here in Canada. In any event, I would like to ask my hon. friends where would they get the revenue if you didn't have corporations that make profits? Where would you get it: the Fish Board? the Shoe Factory? the Woolen Mill?

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — Who pays it now?

**Mr. Lopton:** — It comes out of the profit of industry in this country. Now, let me tell you this: where in the world does the government run all the industry? There is only one country in the world and that is Russia. What would this government have done if they had a monopoly with their shoe factory? They wouldn't have gone broke. They would have done exactly the same as the Russians do. They run shoe factories there, but see how much it costs the consumer. I will give you exactly what it costs. Look at this one item: it takes 107 hours of hard work to earn one pair of women's shoes in Russia. It might have cost 50 hours here, and you could have made it pay, but that is just exactly what we get if the government has monopoly. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friends are on the wrong track.

Now, let me have a little say about the budget. My hon. friend made one elegant speech. He almost convinced me that he was entitle to it, but after I listened to the former Provincial Treasurer, Mr. W.J. Patterson, the picture was different altogether. I almost got exhausted to think anything could be wrong with it, but now I can see all kinds of things wrong with it. That is the difference between experience and inexperience. What a difference, Mr. Speaker. My hon. friends should know by this time there are some of us with experience. I heard him tell the people here in this House, and he repeated it

before the people at the Municipal Convention yesterday, that if they want more grants and more services they have got to pay more taxes — most logical thing for a Provincial Treasurer to say. As a result of listening to the ex-Provincial Treasurer, I think there are lots of places he could find more money to give more grants and social services. Let us just assume you cut down the civil service by about 2,000 and send them back into the C.C.F. organization. Let them pay for them for a while. Surely, Mr. Speaker, there isn't that much extra business in this province that you have to have 2,400 more civil servants to run this province than there was under the previous government.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — May I ask a question? Is that official Liberal policy, to cut the number of civil servants down to the position it was when the C.C.F. government took office.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Mr. Speaker, we certainly are not going to have any political organizers in the civil service. If my hon. friend wants to say it takes 6,400 civil servants to run the business of this province, and only 2,800 to run it in Manitoba, then there is something wrong with the administration. There is something wrong.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Did you ever look at the Ottawa figure?

**Mr. Loptson:** — I haven't the Ottawa figures; maybe I'd have the same criticism of them too. I know there is criticism of the Ottawa civil service. At least we can do something about it here. There is absolutely no justification why this province should have to employ 6,400 civil servants to do the business of this province when they only have about 2,800 in Manitoba. I can tell you, you can save about \$6 million right there, including their salaries and cars and all their expenses.

What about our brain trust here? It is costing about \$90,000 a year with their expenses. For heaven's sake, Mr. Speaker, there is more brains those two seats right in front of me than in all the brain-trusters you are paying \$90,000 a year for. I venture to say that these two men, the hon. Premier and the Provincial Treasurer of this province, will make a darn-sight better job of running this province if they fired the whole darned bunch of brain-trusters.

They talk about increase expenditure for social services. Well, just check up where that increase goes to. I think if you check it up closely, there is only about half of the increase in the social service charges goes to the recipient. The rest goes to inspectors and inspectors of inspectors. There was a meeting in Saltcoats about two years ago when the new regulations on trapping came in, and they were going to have instructions to teach them how to observe the law. Well, Sire, there were about eight instructors and six attendants. Just about the same comparison as there was in the Cannington constituency where there were 22 instructors and 21 attendants. I am not blaming these men for being there, and I presume that is where the humanity first policy comes in. These C.C.F.'ers have been good organizers in the past and they have to make them some compensation, and the only thing they could do for them was to send them out on the road as inspectors. I don't think there is a day in Yorkton when there isn't one or two inspectors, checking up on who? Stenographers, waiters in the restaurants, and the men in wholesale houses, to see the hours they work, and if they happen to put in five minutes overtime, it must go down. If they

**March 11, 1949**

are going to give them a day or a half day to do a little shopping, that doesn't mean anything, but he or she mustn't work five minutes overtime unless he puts it down in the book. That very necessary, isn't it? Pestering these people who take five minutes over and give in some place else, but they must not work five minutes overtime without putting it in the book. These men are being paid by you and me, Mr. Speaker.

So far I have told the hon. Minister how he could save \$6 million, and if I went down the list of the ex-Provincial Treasurer, we could tell him he could get rid of a lot of those extra departments costing us millions of dollars. There is where you can cut expense, and it would be a whole lot better if you retrenched there than to put an additional tax on the poor farmers in the way of public revenue tax.

8 o'clock p.m.

At six o'clock I didn't have very much left to say, but there were a few observations I wanted to add to what I had already said. We had established that the policy of the C.C.F. was the same as that of the Communist party, and I had also suggested that the government had more brains in those two front seats than in all the brain-trusters they had. I didn't mean that they had any brains to spare, but, in any event, that is as far as we had gone.

I would like to just observe the effect of some of the legislature since the government has been in power. After all, I am just one of the common herd my hon. friends are trying to protect, that is, the common man. We have to work for a living, and I don't possess any titles that come from a learned institution, and I presume that is the class they want these planning boards to look after. First of all, I would like to tell my hon. friends the effect of the Security Act. They talk a lot about securing the farmers. I think it has been mentioned in this House before, that the effect of that Security Act may support or at least protect, some of those who more or less try to get out of their obligations, but certainly it has a very detrimental effect on our young people who want to start out farming. I do not know of any case in my area where a young man could go out and buy a piece of land by a payment down, as they used to in former years, and start out in that way. Every section I know of has been sold for cash outright, and the land available for sale was merely for those who had the cash to pay for it. I say that Act, or at least what has been said about it, has done more damage than what it has done good. I wish the hon. members on the other side to take note of that and correct it so our young people will have a chance to get started.

Another Act they have passed, which I would say hasn't done what they intended it to do, and that is the labour legislature they passed. That labour legislature, Mr. Speaker, has been very detrimental to labour rather than an improvement to labour. I will cite cases right in my home town where labour is suffering as a result of the regulations. The eight-hour day limitation has been very detrimental to the seasonal workers. I can tell you of many workers right in Yorkton, and the hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Swallow) is sitting there, who have lost a great deal of earning as a result of not being able to work more than the eight hours during the summertime in occupations that did not provide any work for them in the winter. And the contractors and those who employed them will not pay them the time and one-half necessary in order to give them the two extra hours of work a day. Now those are concrete facts.

Another thing I can draw to the attention of this House is this fracas they had in Yorkton, or Saskatoon, where the Labour Board interfered with some employees working for some wholesale hardware there — I guess the hon. members remember it — the result was they were the cause of Yorkton losing two wholesale distributing houses. These are facts, and I know because I had something to do with arranging for these warehouses where these wholesalers were going to move into Yorkton in order to distribute their wares from there. Yorkton, as you know, is quite a distributing centre. Now, we have lost, as a result of that labour legislation, the employment of maybe 15 or 20 families, and these firms have already established themselves in other centres, one just a little outside of Saskatchewan in Manitoba. I submit, too, Mr. Speaker, that labour in itself has been very much abused. They have been exploited by leaders and they are in the same position, in many cases, as the farmer. Misrepresentation and the glorified promises held out to them bring them under control of a few men, and I submit that it is time now, if we are going to hold up our democratic system and freedom of work and action, something should be done in order to curb the racketeering leadership of organized labour. I would like to draw your attention to one particular case, not here in Saskatchewan but in Quebec, where the union of 650 paid-up memberships called a meeting of the members — the leaders — and there were only 62 attended that meeting. They took a strike vote and 27 of those presented voted to strike, and 24 voted against it. The strike is on- I think is still on. The town, or city, is Paris, Quebec, and it is just disrupting the whole community. Twenty-seven men out of 650 did that, and I would suggest, with all seriousness, that the consumer and that population which depends so much on labour and its product should get busy and do something to clarify the present situation, and the pending situation. We know it is as necessary for our economy that labour should get just reward for its work, and I know from talking to many labourers that they certainly are not in favour of a lot of these labour troubles that are brought about. We also know that communism and the C.C.F. are just competing with one another in bringing that destruction about. I realize, of course, that their intention is to bring about a condition where by the goods of labour will be so high that the ordinary man cannot buy, and by doing that we will throw them out of work. That is, of course, meat for our hon. friends on the other side, or at least their party, and it certainly is in the communist activities favour. So I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this government will do something to help the helpless 95 percent of the men and women who are honest-to-goodness workmen, and all they are looking for is a job and are willing to give a decent day's work for it. I am going to suggest that this government here, in an agriculture province like Saskatchewan, see what is happening and what is going to be the end of it. It cannot be anything but disaster as far as labour is concerned, that they take relief by setting up a labour board and take it out of politics entirely, and I would suggest they would set up a labour relations board composed of proper representation of labour, management and consumers, with a judge as the chairman. It is just a suggestion.

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — I would like him to explain what he means by a proper labour board. Does he suggest the present board is improper as to politics?

**Mr. Lopton:** — Mr. Speaker, I would say that it is very improper because it is established entirely in favour of labour and antagonistic to the employer and consumer as well. So it is entirely one-sided. For that reason, I am suggesting that the consumer should be represented on this board.



**March 11, 1949**

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — They have two representatives there now.

**Mr. Loptson:** — I would suggest that it be a permanent board. The qualifications of the members should be there fairness and impartiality and their experience in the matters to be dealt with. This Board should be permanent and should have the sole right to deal with the setting of wages and satisfactory working conditions in all classes of work and deal with disputes which may arise. Having done that, I suggest that activity of unions and their authority should be limited to the individual occupation, plant or industry in which the members work and that affiliation with other unions should be illegalized. Now, this is merely a suggestion from neither an employee or an employer, just merely a consumer. I am representing the consumer in this case. I think it is high time that the fair-minded and ninety-five percent of labour which has nothing to do with strike and all that kind of thing, but pay in their dues and have the instructions of their leaders, should be taken into consideration. Well, that is so much for labour, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I wanted to say something about the hospitalization. Much has been said about hospitalization; in fact it is about all we hear about. I have never been in a hospital in my life, and I am very thankful for it; but having heard so much about hospitalization I am just wondering if I shouldn't go there sometime and see what it is like. In any event, my hon. friends say much about what they have done about hospitalization. The hospitalization would have been here no matter what government was in office. The plan was all set up and it was just a matter, after the war, of getting it into operation. I can tell my hon. friends, and they will probably wake up to the fact, that unless they reduce the overhead expenses of the operation and running of the hospital system, it is going to bog down on the. I am in favour of hospitalization and I would like to see total health services in effect here if it was possible to bring it about, but I certainly can't see any possibility of it being brought about under the present overhead plan.

I want to say something about highways. This would never be complete unless I said a little about highways, but I'm not going to say very much about them. I am going to say to the hon. Minister of Highways that his comparison in this House, in my opinion, is a bunch of bunk. He says he has gravelled so many thousand miles more to highways than the other government did. Well, of course, he should have done it for he has far more revenue, in any event. But there is not just comparison in mileage gravelled unless he gives the yardage put on. I think my hon. friend will agree with me. I know in many cases during the past two or three years gravelling has just been what we call 'gunned' on the highways, three or four hundred years put on to the mile. Now you can gravel a good many more miles to 300 years to the mile than you would with a thousand yards to the mile. I am not saying he hasn't gravelled that many miles, but I would say, until he gives us the yardage, we won't know whether he is getting value for his money or not.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, he said he had a lot of government gangs working much cheaper than the contractors. Well, I am not opposed to government gangs to a certain extent because there is a certain class of work on the highways which can't be done very economically by letting contracts, but when he tells me he is moving dirt for 11 cents a yard, then I want to know

what class of work it is. I know contractors having taken contracts to move dirt for as low as 7 cents a yard, and made money on it. So comparisons of that kind don't mean anything in the minds of those who know something about the work. It might be all right out in the hustings where the people don't know anything about it, but they can't come and tell me that he has done work at 11 cents a yard unless he tells me what kind of a job it was. That is about all I am going to say about highways, except for the deplorable conditions down our way. I am grateful for the work done there last year in my constituency and I will do everything I can to help it to be completed. I have no complaints. The work was done, and done reasonably too. And the other work around Yorkton that was done, I appreciate that too, on No. 10. I would like to see it go west to Willowbrook, and the sooner that piece of work is completed and blacktopped, the sooner we will have what we really need in Yorkton, as far as that heavy traffic road is concerned. It is in pretty good shape right now, and they have done a good job.

Now I want to say something about the natural resources, and the mining and oil. I am very interested in the development of our natural resources. I have no interest in mining, but I do know, Mr. Speaker, that as long as this government sits here, with the policies they have now, and are at the beck and call of convention of the rank and file of their party, which is probably composed of 50 percent of men and women who want to wreck everything, they are not going to get capital into this province. The never will. I know enough about those who are doing mining work down east, not so much in Chicago, but I can tell you something about the mining interests in Toronto and through there. These men will come in here and take a block up in the north country and explore it. They'll send out prospectors but they are not going to put one drill down there until the policy of this government is changed, and I have seen too many letters from these men already, prospectors, and they have all been along the same tone. Until the situation in Saskatchewan is changed, they are not disposed to put any money into development in Saskatchewan. As a result of what has been going on this past four years, you still only have one mine operating when you came in here. I have heard a great deal about what this government did about raising the royalties. Maybe it was justified, but the royalty that you did put on the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company just scared all the rest of them out, and you have lost maybe millions of revenue as a result of the \$500,000 extra you got out of the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting.

About oil development. I know something about the oil development in this province too. Why was it that the Imperial Oil pulled up their drill and went to Alberta right after this government came into power. They were in the very same position as the mining interests, and if this government is not going to develop those resources then they should at least change their policy and they cannot change it unless they change the constitution of their party because no promise of this government is good only for the term between one convention and another. Out in the country they say that they are the only democratic party in Canada because the people control everything by annual convention.

**Some Hon. Member:** — Hear, Hear!

**Mr. Loptson:** — The hon. members say 'hear! hear!'. They don't know any better, and we take it from where it comes. I am telling this because I know something about these particular things, and I am advancing them to the hon. gentleman, the actual facts, for what they are worth to them.

**March 11, 1949**

Of social services, I want to say a little about that. I am all for social services, in reason, but on checking over the increase in the cost of social services we find that almost half of the increase, as was said before, goes to overhead and administration.

Now, that is all I have to say, Mr. Speaker. I didn't have very much left when we adjourned at six o'clock, when I tried to explain that another ten or 15 minutes would have been enough, but possible it was misunderstood. As a result of these things I have said, and the lack of confidence I have in the government, I am not going to support the motion.

**Hon. L. F. McIntosh:** — Mr. Speaker, I have listened in silence to the opposition members in their efforts to justify the confidence placed in them by the electorate in the constituencies which they represent. I am going to say that, in a number of instances, I am somewhat reminded of the Englishman whom someone described as a self-made man who worshipped his creator. If that is unparliamentary, I will apologize. I am also reminded of the fellow who is very much like a blotter; he soaks it all in but gets everything backwards.

I would feel I would be amiss in my duties if I did not congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on his elevation to the leadership of the Liberal party in the province of Saskatchewan. I believe it was in the early spring of 1946 when he was chosen for that position. I believe also that he is fully cognizant of the fact that along with the leadership of the Liberal party must, of necessity, go the feeling that the machine he has inherited is old, obsolete, and non-modern, cast in the 19th century. Here we find a group of men attempting to adjust that machine to 20th century socialism and political economy. I think it was only on one occasion that the hon. members moved from thinking in the past to casting their thought into the future, and that was when the Leader of the Opposition predicted the outcome of the June provincial election.

The Leader of the Liberal party, up to the middle of 1947 at least, exercised remote control over the party in the province, and about that time he returned to the province of Saskatchewan as the 'Prince of the West' to lead this party from the chaotic conditions into which they had fallen. One of the first things necessary, of course, was to get the propaganda machine working and the ads that appeared in the papers from day to day 'Tucker or Tyranny' would put the insurance agents, Testrails and Gladstone Murrays to shame. Following the building up of the propaganda machine, then came the organization and the work of that organization. In watching the daily papers during the month of May and the early part of June, one could not help but be impressed by the stories of those great parades; those parades that ranged from 2½ to 3 miles in length. I believe there was one such a parade in my home constituency of Prince Albert, and of course, prior to this parade, there was considerable effort locally, if not provincially, to put a coalition candidate in the field. It is quite true there was no Conservative candidate running in the Prince Albert constituency. They rallied all the support they could get within their own ranks, and then they set up what was known as an 'anti-socialist' group. That was the disgruntled Liberals and those Conservatives who would not go over into the camp, and so they set up a separate organization to assist the Liberal candidate. There was a Social candidate in the field during the campaign. The first Social Credit

candidate, Mr. Kurtenbach, resigned and made a passionate radio address, appealing to all people to support the Liberal candidate.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — How much did he get for that?

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — Following his resignation, the Leader of that party had this to say, according to the press: “Up to the election of 1944 at least, it was well-known in this province that Liberal money was being used to put Social Credit candidates as dark horses into the field.”

**Mr. Tucker:** — Who said that?

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — I am quoting from a press report, stated by Dr. Halderman.

Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said about the World of Today. That book was used in the political campaign in the Prince Albert constituency. It was not used in radio addresses, nor was it used very extensively in public addresses, but it was used from house to house in a canvass campaign. I was not so much concerned about the quotations made from that book in the house to house campaign, but I was very interested in the use and the interpretation placed by the canvassers in that constituency of The Natural Products Marketing Act, passed by this government and assented to on March 30, 1945.

**Mr. Tucker:** — By what canvassers.

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — By this government.

You know, Mr. Speaker, along about the last eight days of the campaign they felt up there they would have to make some change in their approach to the electorate, so they decided on bringing in some of the most high-powered speakers available, and then following that up by a house to house canvass.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That is new. You haven't used it before.

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — In the house to house canvass, in those areas particularly where the English language is not spoken as freely as in some other sections of the province, they started with The Natural Products Marketing Act, something like this: they would drive into the yard and start an interview with the farmer. They would say: It is quite true that this government does not intend to take your farm. You see, after all, there is a big problem in administration and management, and they know that it is best that you do that. I don't think they are going to take your farm; but here is an Act that was passed by that government which, incidentally, was piloted through the Legislature by the present member for Prince Albert. Over here, in Section 5, it gives the government the power to take control of the products, to take control of the fruits of your labour.” And from house to house they went, singing this one. What amused me most immensely, however, was that the Hon. James G. Gardiner, in campaigning for the Liberal candidate in the Rosthern federal by-election, quoted, according to the newspaper reports on more than one occasion, that the provinces have the legislature necessary to bring into existence the coarse grains under the Wheat Board. And Mr.

**March 11, 1949**

Gardiner went up and down citing the Saskatchewan Natural Products Marketing Act as the vehicle in which this government could bring coarse grains under centralized control, and arrangements could be made to market it through the Wheat Board.

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Culliton) had something to say about an invitation he had received from I believe he state, his former Sergeant-Major, to address a meeting at Meadow Lake. No doubt he was a good Sergeant-Major in His Majesty's Service, as well as a good Sergeant-Major for the Liberal party. In listening to some of his addressed, I gathered the people were leaving the Meadow Lake district by the thousand, and that you could even shoot a cannon up and down the street of Meadow Lake without endangering anyone's life, yet the Sergeant-Major, speaking as a member of the Board of Trade, mentioned how things were booming in the town of Meadow Lake, pointing out the new buildings going up, the new businesses coming in. The town of Meadow Lake was booming. So the Sergeant-Major as the representative of a political party spoke much differently than what he did as a member of the Board of Trade.

I sincerely trust that the Leader of the Opposition does not become too discouraged in his efforts to build a Utopia for the citizens of this province. I sincerely hope that he will keep in mind that it took somewhat over 80 years to complete confederation. For the information of the Leader of the Opposition this carpet, red as it is, was on the floor before this government took office.

**An Hon. Member:** — It isn't the carpet we worried about.

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — We heard a great deal about the people who were leaving the northern part of the province by the thousands because of the policies of the present administration. I was naturally very interested in picking up a copy of the Prince Albert Herald, issued late last fall, and reading: "The new wealth produced in the Prince Albert trading area is reported to be \$78 million." Seventy-eight million dollars of new wealth produced in the Prince Albert trading area. That is rather interesting in view of the fact we have been told that the people are leaving that section of the province by the thousands.

**Mr. Tucker:** — It is a good area. You cannot even keep them down.

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — At least the people recognize right from wrong up there.

A great deal has been said about dictatorship, communism, socialism and so on. No doubt the hon. members opposite picked up a copy of New Liberty that was published in May or June of last year, and no doubt they read this article: "Ottawa Dictators" by Harold Dingman. And no doubt they read in here where in 1947 alone the Cabinet at Ottawa passed 108 laws by Order of Council, and if they read this article closely they would have noticed this, and I quote:

Then came World War II. From august, 1939 to September, 1945, the government passed more than 92,000 Orders in Council. The permanent civil servants who carry out these orders say that only four or five percent were

of a legislature character, which means laws which should normally have gone to Parliament for consideration; if you accept the lowest figure of the civil servants, four percent, you will find that the Ministers passed 3,600 laws in the 'back room'.

The hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Culliton) quoted from a tax notice covering S.W. 1/4, 10, 29, 32, in his rather excellent address on the speech from the throne. He quoted the tax levy of 1944 and the tax levy of 1948. I believe he omitted stating that this particular quarter section of land has an assessed value of \$4,200. Now, the average assessed value of a section of land in the province of Saskatchewan is \$212.60, and I believe that the hon. member for Gravelbourg omitted mentioning that the municipal mill rate in this particular municipality has increased 5 mills since 1944. He also omitted mentioning that since 1944 they have a Union Hospital which adds another 2 mills onto their taxation.

For the information of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, getting a little closer to his own home, municipalities that have not suffered under the existence of Larger School Units or any of the so-called detrimental policies of the government and municipality 404; in 1944 the school and the general mill rate combined was 19.6, and in 1946 the mill rate was 27 mills in that same municipality. Again coming a little closer to his own home, in R.M. 403 the combined mill rate for municipal and school purposes in 1944 was 17.7, and in 1946, 24 mills. Now, we want to go into the year 1947 and remember there is no Larger School Unit administration in that area: 1947, R.M. 404 carried a mill rate of 28.37 and R.M. 403 a mill rate of 28 mills.

**Mr. Tucker:** — They aren't getting their fair share from the department.

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — An area, Mr. Speaker, that has no Larger Administration School Unit.

There has been a great deal said about the contributions of this government to the municipalities, and then inference has been left that this government has increased the tax levy in the municipalities, and also increased the amount of taxes. Let us take that period 1920 to 1929, a fairly prosperous period: the average tax levy during that period of nine years, by the rural municipalities, \$18,467,000; a total amount of taxes collected during that period, \$18,664,000 per annum. Now, if we wish to compare the contributions made from provincial funds to the assistance of the municipalities, let us use these figures: the total expenditures by local municipal authorities for all of local government, in Alberta it was \$37.11 per capita; in Manitoba, \$34.35 per capita; in Saskatchewan, 33.59 per capita. There was uniformity in the three provinces, based on per capita, of the expenditures of local municipal authorities for local municipal government.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Does that include education?

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — Yes.

The we come to the question of direct expenditures of provincial funds per capita for municipal purpose: in the province of Alberta, \$18.23; in the

**March 11, 1949**

province of Manitoba, \$15.86 per capita; in the province of Saskatchewan, \$33.35. I think this can be taken as authentic by the member on the opposite side of the House because it comes from the Free Press editorial page, February 15, 1948 and I quote:

What Mr. Morton is advising is that local government should spend with thrift and selection is warning against the swing of the pendulum which has taken the amount of municipal taxes imposed from \$7 million in 1935 to more than \$11.5 million in 1947, which has enabled local government to collect, not the \$6 million in 1935, but \$11.8 million in 1947.

Even in Manitoba, where they have a coalition government, and in which the members of the opposite side of the House are very proud to quote, they find that the taxes imposed have gone from \$7 million in 1935 to more than \$11.5 million in 1947.

The hon. member for Arm River yesterday made some mention of my address before the rural municipal convention the other evening. What I was endeavouring to do there was point out that the municipal authorities are faced with difficulty in the collection of their taxes. The provincial government is faced with difficulty in its tax levy. The federal government, having indirect means of taxation, are not faced with the same problems as the provincial or municipal governments. Having in mind that the average taxation on a section of land in the province is \$212.60, and we hear much more about that than we do about the duty and sales tax on a truck, and if it was a \$2,000 truck, those two taxes amounted to \$538.

**Mr. Tucker:** — You don't lose your home if you don't pay the tax.

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — I think it might be as well here to mention, also, that according to recent figures the Canadian citizens pay \$2,465 million in taxes, divided between the three governments. The dominion government gets over 76 percent of that; the provinces, 12.5; the municipalities 10.8 percent.

There have been two committees set up to study provincial-municipal relations. One committee is headed by that eminent authority, Dr. George Brintnall, ably assisted by Dean Cronkite, and the technical staff are studying the financial relations between the provinces and municipalities. The other committee is chaired by Professor Van Vliet of the Farm Management Department of the university, another well-known, eminent student. We did not import any of this personnel. It is our understanding that these reports will be ready in the early summer.

**An Hon. Member:** — Before the federal election.

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — I would like to make it quite clear here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, as I attempted to do at the municipal convention the other evening, that when these reports are received by the government and studied, they will call the executive of the Rural Municipal Association together. We will go over these reports with them; then, if necessary, we will go back to the district municipal meetings and discuss

these reports in municipal district meetings with the representatives of the municipalities. Then, if necessary, this government is prepared to call together a representative from each of the 303 municipalities and go over the report with them. We have no desire, and do not wish, to usurp any of the powers of the municipal government. What we would prefer to do, and we will move in that direction, is to give to the municipal governments, that power that rightly belongs to them in the field of municipal administration. I served on a municipal council for a short period of time, and it is a good many years ago now. I am familiar with the ways in which the provincial government's grants to municipalities were handled. As a municipal councilor and I might frankly say, as a citizen who had some interest in the future of the government of that day, I am familiar with the ways in which provincial government grants to municipalities were handled. I deem it very unfortunate to have those who are well-wishers of the present opposition going around the 44th annual convention of the Rural Municipal Association, trying to create a fear in the minds of the delegates that this government is bent upon usurping some of the powers that the municipal councils now have.

I am not going to go into the details of the various problems and the hardships suffered by the thousands of Canadian citizens when the government of the day moved citizens into the northern part of this province. It is a black page in the history of the progress of the province of Saskatchewan. In order to exercise the necessary control, there was a centralization of the administration of the L.I.D.'s, a centralization here in Regina. We are now, and have been for the past few months, moving towards a general decentralization of control of the administration of the affairs of the Local Improvement Districts, placing them back amongst the various inspectors in the different L.I.D. units, going back there where the taxpayer, who is a citizen of the province of Saskatchewan will be able to get the information he requires relative to his business affected by the administration of the L.I.D.'s.

I was rather interested in what the hon. member for Athabaska (Dr. Marion) had to say about fish. He is not in his seat, so I am not going to deal with that, but I would like to say that there is a vast difference between centralized control over the products of labour and capital of thousands individual farms than the control over the wealth produced by nature on the land belonging to all of the people of the province of Saskatchewan. The arguments used by the hon. member for Athabaska, and some of the hon. members who sit with him, reminds me of the arguments used by the Winnipeg Grain Exchange representative in the early history of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. It reminds me, also, of the arguments used by those people in their opposition to the United Kingdom Wheat Agreement, in their opposition to the continuation of the Canadian Wheat Board. There are members opposite, according to Hansard, who sometimes vote against the principle in order to support the party. I would like to say there this afternoon, when The Natural Products Marketing Act of 1934 was brought into the House of Commons, to the everlasting credit of the late Hon. W.R. Motherwell, he was among the few, if not the only one, from the Liberal benches who got up in support of a principle which he believed in against the wishes of his party.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) sometimes gets very eloquent on interference of the government with the co-operatives. Probably before the session is over he will mention that, but just



**March 11, 1949**

in case he does, might I just remind him of a paper that was given at the morning session of a co-operative held in the United Kingdom, July 29, 1924, by Mr. Charles Dunning who was then Premier of the province of Saskatchewan. If the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) would like to read this, he will see here where Mr. Dunning made reference to the assistance that his government was giving by way of state management. That is 25 years ago.

I had intended this afternoon to deal with the International Wheat Agreement which has a very direct bearing on the finances of this province, but owing to the limited time I will step to what I consider is a very important issue. You see, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members opposite make no mention whatever of the \$79 million cancelled debt, which is equivalent to the total of four year's levy on every municipality in the province of Saskatchewan.

It is rather interesting to note that when the ranch people and the farmers in the south-west part of this province were endeavouring to find a solution to the surplus horse problem, I am told — and I take the responsibility for this statement — that high officials of the government of that day suggested that the best solution to the surplus horse problem was to take them over the hill and shoot them. Those men came down to interview this government in the fall of 1944. As a result of that, they through self-help created an additional \$13 million of new purchasing power, through the horses that it had been suggested to them that the best solution was to take them over the hill and shoot them.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Bu whom?

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — I will give you the name if you wish. I take responsibility for the statement, as I said, and I will give you the name in private if you wish.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Give us the name.

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — I think one of the greatest freedoms of free enterprise is to be found in the free associations of people who come together in a common cause for a common purpose. Freedom of enterprise is to be found in the co-operative movement. It is extremely interesting to note that for the year ending 1947, these people through their own free institution transacted over \$28 million of their own business.

**Mr. Patterson:** — Will the hon. gentleman answer a question? Will he tell us who was going to take the horses over the hill and shoot them?

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, I take full responsibility for that statement.

**Mr. Patterson:** — He said somebody said it, but he says now he takes responsibility. Was he the one who said that?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! As I understood it, the hon. member was speaking said he would give the name in private.

**An Hon. Member:** — But he is giving it in public.

**Mr. Speaker:** — He is not naming anyone; maybe it is just as well.

**Mr. Tucker:** — It is unfair to these officials.

**Mr. Patterson:** — Tell us who said that.

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — The opposition in this province made mention of not accepting at its face value all of the statements made on this side of the House . . .

**Mr. Patterson:** — You cannot take him at face value.

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — May I quote a statement that was made some 35 years ago: “We have pushed forward as far as colonization can go. I have great confidence that before many years are past we shall see towns and villages on the shores of Hudson Bay like those we see on the shore of Norway, where people will be prosperously engaged in the lumbering business, the pulp industry, the mining industry, and others. That is what I hope Canadians will see ere long.” That statement is credited to Sir Wilfred Laurier, speaking in the House of Commons 35 years ago. In 1946 was the first indication that the Port of Churchill would become a prominent route for the traffic between the new and the old worlds, and I am happy to be able to report here this afternoon that indications are that the Port of Churchill this coming season will enjoy the best year in its history, outgoing and incoming cargoes breaking all records.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest demonstrations of co-operation is to be found in the carrying out of the battle in the increase in freight rates. Seven provinces working as one team for a common objective. I am happy to say that insofar as the personnel that represents the province as being Saskatchewan is concerned they are accepted by the other provinces as being among the top-ranking economists, accountants and legal men that there are in the battle against the railway companies and their application for increased freight rates.

I have probably said nothing, Mr. Speaker, that would indicate that I intend to support the budget nevertheless that is my intention.

**Hon. C.C. Williams:** — Mr. Speaker, just before starting to speak on the budget, I would like to take a moment to congratulate you, Sir on being re-appointed as Speaker of this House, the office which you have held with considerable distinction during the past four years. I would also like to congratulate some of my friends opposite, particularly the members for Gravelbourg and Melville (Mr. Culliton and Mr. Deshaye) who, I understand, have the same background as myself, having been brought up in a small country town railway station. The member for Athabaska (Mr. Marion) too might take a bow if he happened to be in his seat. I understand that he indirectly has been connected with the same profession.

**March 11, 1949**

I have just one more special reference, Mr. Speaker. I noticed in 'Corridor and Chamber' for Tuesday, that this appears: "Shades of Abraham Lincoln were stirred in the House Tuesday. F.A. Dewhurst, C.C.F. (Wadena) may not look very much like the great emancipator, but he did a fair job of quoting Mr. Lincoln 'government of the people, by the people, for the people' rolled out with a Yorkshire accent. And then Mr. Dewhurst said: 'The Liberals believe in government of 94 percent of the people by two percent for the benefit of the other four percent.'" I thought I had heard everything, but that was something new and very well put. I might just add for the benefit of the House, that the hon. member is perhaps, in the true sense of the word, the only native son we have on either side. He was born in a house over in the 22 block Robinson Street, I think about 1912. He arrived about the same time as the cyclone.

I don't know what caused the flurry of a few moments ago about somebody threatening to take a horse over a hill and shoot it. I have heard that thought expressed out at the race track a good many times by certain people, especially if it finished last.

The budget speech which was delivered last Tuesday by the Provincial Treasurer in a very able manner is actually only a report to the people of this province as to what was done with \$52.5 million of their money, plus \$2.5 million supplementary, during the past fiscal year, and what it is proposed to do with \$56.5 million in the coming fiscal year. That is all there is, really, to the budget. It is the largest budget in the history of the province, which fact is continually being viewed with alarm by the opposition. During the last eight or nine years, Mr. Speaker, everything has gone up except, perhaps, the Cabinet Ministers' salaries which were reduced to \$6,500 when this government took office.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Especially C.C.F. taxes.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — I was merely leading up to the fact that \$56.5 million in the budget will only have the purchasing power of approximately \$37.5 million ten years ago. In spite of the increased budget, the people of the province returned the government last year, and this indicates a willingness to provide additional revenue knowing they would receive it back in other beneficial ways.

During the past year, as you know, I have given up the Department of Telephones, of which I had the privilege of being Minister for four years, and have taken over the duties of the Provincial Secretary. Telephone has turned into a Crown company, and along with the Power Commission, is now under the jurisdiction of the hon. Minister of Public Works.

I will attempt in the time at my disposal to give you a brief resume of the Department of Labour and, in addition, my new duties. Last year the then Leader of the Opposition made a remark while speaking to the budget to the effect that farmers cannot have the 40-hour work week, the one day's rest in seven, time and one-half, and so forth.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — The farming population, of course, does not now, due to modern science in machinery, put in the long hours they did years ago, to which I think farmer members on both sides of this House would agree. Thousands of young men and women from the farms now working in urban centres are receiving benefits out of the legislation we have brought in — shorter working hours, one day's rest, etc — and I doubt very much if they would be particularly desirous of employment in urban centres without these benefits. The suggestion was thrown out — and I wish the hon. members opposite would listen to this; I have forgotten whether it was last year or two years ago — by the then Leader of the Opposition that due to the labour legislation this government has brought in, they would not elect a single member from a rural constituency in the 1948 election. As I look around me here, in this 1949 session, I seem to find farmers to the right and to the left, in front and behind me. That prediction did not right true. There are more rural members certainly, which is only proper in view of the fact that Saskatchewan is largely an agricultural province.

The budget speech did not mention the Department of Labour, but on page 22 of *The Leader-Post* of March 2, 1949, the amount of \$296,940 appears. This is the requirement for the department and the various branches, for the coming fiscal year. While not a particularly spectacular department, we who are connected with it believe it to be one of the most important in the government, concerned as it is with the welfare of thousands of our citizens many of whom live in the urban centres. This department, with the approval of the government, of course, has done a great deal toward creating a better standard of living for many people during the past four years. I might say that six or the perhaps seven of the members of this side of the House are here because of the fact of that legislation, and I include myself and the Provincial Treasurer among those six or seven. Every wage-earner in the province, with the exception of farm help, has been benefited to some extent, particularly by *The Holidays with Pay Act* which reaches into every town, village and hamlet, no matter how small it is, in this province. It guarantees everyone two weeks' vacation with pay or a proportionate amount for the year. Practically all employees in the cities come under this 44-hour week, and most employees in towns of over 500 also do come under the 44-hour week.

Having advanced to quite an extent in the past four years, and having the most progressive labour legislation in the dominion, we feel that we should consolidate and perhaps wait for other provinces to catch up. We find that others are gradually following our lead and even in the Maritimes, which has been backward for many years, we find they are bringing in legislation much the same as ours. For that reason we do not propose to bring in very much new during the present session. We do find, from time to time, we need to make improvements to the various Acts, and in this session to the Legislature will be asked to improve *The Workmen's Compensation Act*, especially to benefit those who were injured back in the thirties when wages were very low and, as a result, compensation was very low. Approximately 150 of those people will have their amounts of compensation brought up, but not to exceed \$1,200 a year. This is going to bring about the investment of approximately \$115,000, which the Board now has, and it will not raise the charge to industry. It will also do away with an anomaly. We found out in the past two or three years that if a workman had become totally incapacitated — that is, he might be blinded, he might have lost both hands, but he is still living — he would receive 75 percent of his wages in order to keep himself and his family. As a matter of fact, had he

**March 11, 1949**

been killed, his widow, if there were enough children concerned, would have received up to 100 percent of his wages; so there was the anomaly that we are going to do away with. Janitors and caretakers, too, have been neglected for many years and we have now brought them under The Hours of Work Act for towns of 500 and over, and under The One Days' Rest in Seven Act. For some reasons they had always been denied a day off although I think most firms gave it to them anyway, but at the same time they were not legally entitled to it. We are going to bring them under that Act now, and feel that it has been long overdue. There may be some difficulties in making adjustments, and for that reason we have left the Act as it is; it will become effective on the first of July.

We read in the paper not very long ago that the British Columbia budget was being brought in by the Provincial Treasurer of the province for the amount of \$92 million, approximately \$36 million higher than ours. It does not seem to bother them out there a bit. Of course, many persons from Saskatchewan and other prairie provinces go out there to retire, where they spend their money and when the time eventually comes that they pass on, the British Columbia government takes full succession duty.

I was especially annoyed a short time ago to come across a news release got out by the federal government — the Information Department, Department of Labour. It is headed "Canadians Warned Against Moving to Pacific Coast in View of Fewer Job Opportunities There". I will just take a moment and read it:

Canadians contemplating moving to the Pacific Coast should think it over carefully before they do so in view of the number of job applications in that region, far exceeding the number of job opportunities, Arthur MacNamara, Deputy Minister of Labour, stated today. The Deputy Minister stated that his warning was especially directed to the residents of the prairie provinces since the greater proportion of those moving from other parts of Canada to the pacific region, during the war and since, have come from the prairie provinces.

That is the paragraph that more or less rubbed me the wrong way. It is no doubt quite in order to warn people of the conditions out there, but the part I did not like was the special reference to residents of the prairie provinces. It has been my information there is a definite anti-prairie feeling at the Pacific Coast, and a resentful feeling against those who go out from here, especially if they make good, and many of them do. The only explanation I have ever heard was that our citizens are ambitious and energetic, many of them forging ahead and thereby creating plain, petty jealousy among certain groups. Thousands of the best citizens they have at the Pacific Coast came from the prairies as adults or with their parents. We are quite welcome out there if we have lots of money, and there is no record of anyone from the prairies buying real estate at a reduced price. Full prices are paid, and we are referred to as 'prairie chickens', and they themselves say how they love to 'pluck' us. No one likes the saying that was quite common 35 or 40 years ago, and advertisements appearing in papers ending up with the words "No Englishman need apply". We do not like that. Neither do we like the suggestion that prairie people 'keep out'. Apparently this feeling has got into government circles and the British Columbia Unemployment Commission has been able to persuade the federal government to assist them by putting out the release referred to.

California has been referred to as the Golden State, to which the cynic has replied: "Yes, bring your own gold." British Columbia is something the same, and instigating as much through officials circles. We have freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and we should have freedom of travel. We do not wish to become a Balkan state.

I am just going to say something further on the British Columbia matter, Mr. Speaker, and then I will say something about the high cost of living. As I mentioned a few moments ago, many of our citizens go out to British Columbia. Most of them are comfortably well off, but every dollar that they take with them was made right here on the prairies. When the time eventually comes, they pass away, as I said before, and the government takes full succession duties; but it seems to me the province from which they came and where they made their money should be entitled to have some claim to part of that money, perhaps for a period of ten years. I realize there would be certain difficulties in connection with it, and many obstacles to overcome, but I pass it on for consideration. I do know that the prairie provinces, including Saskatchewan, could use the money.

I would like to spend a moment or two on the high cost of living which is still with us. Prices keep right on mounting in spite of assurances and predictions of those in authority that the peak has been reached. In January, 1944, the index was 119. Two years later it had only advanced 7/10ths of a point — it was 119.7, and then climbed to 125.5 by September. Here is what happened a little over two years ago. During the early part of 1947 decontrols were started which had the effect of raising the cost of living sharply, and a year ago it stood at 146. Since that time it has risen a little over ten points and it is now approximately 160. It is no explanation to say that wages paid to labour is the reason for that is simply not the case. Labour must keep its wages up to a high level in order to keep up with high living costs, and usually wages lag behind. We cannot have federal control. The only answer is voluntary controls on the part of the manufacturer, wholesaler, jobber or retailer. I refer to the large concerns, of course, for it is quite obvious that the small business man has little or no say as far as costs are concerned. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the solution to our high cost of living can be solved by the large commercial firms of this country getting together and agreeing to take less profit and pass that saving on to the consumer by reducing prices. Just as an example, one of the large oil companies, a few weeks ago, reduced fuel oil one cent a gallon. Many people were greatly delighted over that fact, even those who did not burn oil, because it seemed to indicate that finally something is coming down and perhaps other things will follow. Little or nothing has been the result, and if prices continue to rise, or stay where they are, there is bound to be another demand for wage increases, another round of wage increases as it is called, and who can say they are not necessary. The large business interests have complete control and if they refuse to act the government should again hold them to a reasonable profit as was done during the price control period. I know many of these concerns can paint a picture showing that they are barely breaking even, or even perhaps in the red. Too much attention should not be paid to these figures however, for almost anything can be proven by them. As a matter of fact, since I prepared this part of my speech, Mr. Speaker, I read an article appearing in the paper last Wednesday from a C.C.L. official in Ottawa, to the effect that it would soon be necessary to start another round of wages. Unless prices start to go down almost immediately those demands will be necessary, and no doubt will be proceeded with.

**March 11, 1949**

I am going to spend a moment or two on patronage. That has been thrown back and forth across this House from time to time, and someone has criticized the government even for the fact that the show factory was closed down about the first of December, as being to close to Christmas. Yet how does that compare to the 132 employees of the Liquor Board who were given their notices on New Year's Eve, 1934? Again, 232 employees in a comparatively small relief department were all given their notices about the same time. They were all experienced capable people and yet, out they went to make room for 232 inexperienced Liberal appointees. These are only two small examples which could be repeated many times. Our predecessors in office showed no mercy where patronage was concerned, and, in my opinion, that was one of the main reasons they were snowed under in 1944.

Let us compare what we have done, and I will use a small example of which I have personal knowledge. In 1942 or 1943 — I have forgotten which — while I was in the City Hall, a daughter of a friend of ours applied for work out here during the summer months and in her innocence she showed me as a reference. There was consternation when her application came in. They were quite willing to take her on, but not with the name of any C.C.F.er smearing up the application form, apparently. So it finally resulted in the form being destroyed and another made out, with my name left off, and she was taken on and everybody seemed to be happy. I do not think anything could have been more petty. This same individual was still in charge when we came in, in 1944. We let him stay right there. In fact, he was there for some time until the Civil Service Commission was re-organized under Mr. Edy. The person I referred to has since retired. We did not play politics there a bit.

Strikes are something, more or less, that are considered as the Department of Labour being connected with. We have been remarkable free from them in the last year, but something has been said about government Crown companies or departments. Actually we did have one, as you will remember, last winter, not over a wage dispute, but rather a dispute on negotiation procedure — quite a different thing. It was unfortunate that the employees lost several weeks work, put it in many miles on the picket line — they must have used a good deal of shoe leather — because they could have received actually the same results with out taking the extreme action of going to strike.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Which strike was that?

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — The hon. member knows very well what one it was . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Why shouldn't you tell the Legislature?

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — . . . the strike of the Insurance Company down town. I do not believe that the employer, in this case the government, or the employees should be criticized as far as that is concerned.

At item appeared in Wednesday's paper headed "Sanitaria threat seen in union domination", and then it goes on — there is quite an article there. It is given very good publicity by The Leader Post, and there is a statement there by Mr. Hingley. I am not critical of Mr. Hingley. I hear him very well spoken of. But it is to be regretted that negotiations have gone on between the

employees and the employers for the best part of a year. I would not want the impression to get around that the government is behind it in any way, shape or form. But to my way of thinking, and I am sure we will all agree in this House, it would be unthinkable to have a strike in a sanatorium, and I hasten to assure the people of this province, especially the relatives of the patients, that such a possibility is so remote as to be practically non-existent. We do not need to worry along that score at all. At the same time it was the parties negotiating for the hospitals who asked for the Conciliation Board last spring or early in the summer and the representatives of the employees reluctantly agreed. The, when the Board met and submitted its findings, it turned out the employers refused to change their attitude the least bit. They refused to budge from their original position, and it was only when our conciliation officers came in that they got them to come up part way at least. Actually the two parties are not very far apart, and my department, which has already devoted a great deal of time to the dispute, will continue to do so until settlement has been reached.

With one exception, this province was remarkably free from strikes in 1948. There were only eight altogether, and there was a loss of 12,333 man-days. Up until September, there were 100 days lost by accident compared to one lost by a strike. That is something that, perhaps, we do not always realize. The man-days lost by strikes are comparatively very small. The exception, of course, that I refer to is the one in the Estevan-Bienfait coal fields which lasted from November 3 to January 12, in all mines excepting one, which was seven days and which produces 60 percent of the coal in that field. I might say here that on November 12 a delegation came in to see me. Arrangements had been made a few days before, and I was going to see six or eight members of the Committee. You can imagine my surprise when three bus loads of miners rolled into town: 110 men altogether. They came into my office and demanded to meet the Minister of Labour; that is, they demanded through their spokesman to meet us. This was obviously impossible. We could not all crowd into my office, so I met the Committee as was originally arranged for. We talked for, I suppose 1½ hours. It had the conciliation officer there, the Deputy Minister, and a representative from the Attorney General's Department, and after that time I went out and spoke to the men in the hallway. They were quite orderly, in the best of humour, and even the next morning there was only one 'Mickey' found in the washroom. I think that was quite a record.

No laws have been broken down at Bienfait. I think they have been picketing for one day and the excuse for picketing is quite legal; and although we pressed the representatives who were there in my office for suggestions, all we could get out of them was a veiled suggestion for police. That was positively refused. Nothing could have been more dangerous than to have sent 100 or 150 uniformed police into Estevan during a situation of that kind. It is just full of dynamite, and anything can happen. Nothing will inflame a situation any quicker than for the police to come in. sometimes they are needed, but in this particular case they were not. I think we all remember they had been sent in there on at least two previous occasions and during one there was a great deal of trouble, bloodshed and loss of life. That was back in 1931. This mass demonstration or publicity stunt, as I call it, finally frizzled out. I understand the men had their fares paid in and their return tickets bought; their hotel expenses paid, with the exception of breakfast next morning. So somebody had quite a bill to pay. I do not know just who it was.



**March 11, 1949**

It might be said in passing that a lawyer in the town of Estevan is counsel for both the employees' union and the owner. I do not think I have ever heard of that before, but it is quite a cozy arrangement.

The Department arranged a number of meetings between representatives of the miners and operators after it was obvious that our conciliation officer could not get them to agree. We found the union representatives quite reasonable and they came along and modified a good many of their demands. The operators, however, stubbornly held onto their demand for a pension plan as against the Union's demand for a welfare fund. Both of them are good things, but the miners all over the United States and Canada have a welfare fund. There are between 200 and 300 miners in the Estevan field, almost 9,000 in Alberta and British Columbia, and I suppose 2 or 300,000 in the States. That is the principal way that the miners have of setting up their pension, and it is doubtful if 200 or 300 miners in the Estevan field are going to be able to change it, although, as I said a pension plan might be all right. We have something along the same line right here in the civil service.

**Mr. McDonald:** — May I ask the hon. member a question? With regard to this welfare fund you speak about, could you tell me how much they were asking for a day or a man-hour, or whatever they were asking for?

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — They were getting three cents a ton as compared with ten cents a ton in Alberta. The operators were adamant, though, but one by one they agreed to go along until there were only two holdouts: the representatives of the M. and S. and the Roche Percee. Time after time we would get them here to meetings, and they would ask to have the meeting adjourned and meet again in three or four days; they would go back to Winnipeg to their Boards or Directors or go down to Estevan to see their lawyer. It was only after Premier Douglas criticized them publicly, and quite sharply too if I remember the way it was worded, that they gave in to sign the agreement. Even then this lawyer that I refer to made a trip to the Building while negotiations were being signed and accused his employers that the representatives of these two mines were selling out. He later resigned as their counsel although we understand he is back with them. This fellow is reported to have made a fortune as counsel for the mine operators; he is said to be one of the wealthiest men in southern Saskatchewan, being part owner of two of the hotels in Estevan and with an Island home at the Pacific Coast.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I would like to ask the Minister a question.

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — You may ask me any questions you wish after I am finished. I haven't very much more time.

It appears, though, he is largely responsible for the miserable wages and conditions that exist in this field and has been personally well paid for the part he played. I knew this person before the war and he seemed to be quite a decent young fellow at that time. In fact I was in the same battalion as he was. At that time he spoke, we will say, just the same as the Minister of Municipal Affairs and myself, but over a period of years he had adopted some sort of mongrel Irish accent — the accent is mongrel, not the Irish, Mr. Speaker.

I suppose that is the prerogative of the legal profession. Some of them adopt an English accent. Perhaps it is more impressive in Court; I don't know. Anyway he has adopted this accent and when I first met him after a number of years I had a little difficulty understanding him. However, if he wants to talk that way, I suppose it is his affair. He recently appeared in front of the Labour Relations Board, and when it became evident he did not have much of a case, he walked out. That is a tactic that is fairly familiar. I think Vishinsky uses it once in a while. I think it will be a great day for the coal industry in this province when this particular individual retires to his Pacific home.

The men down there have been working for 92 cents an hour. In the other mine they have been getting \$1.10 an hour for quite some time, and the result of the settlement was that they got up to \$1.10 an hour with a 44-hour week which they accepted in place of a 40-hour week. It should be understood that these men have families, the same as in any other part of the province, and most of them only work during the coal mining season — approximately six months a year. It is to be hoped that we have seen the last of the strife in this field, and that scourge of poverty is at an end.

The Royal Commission is being set up just as soon as we can get a suitable chairman, and we have an excellent man in view who will be unable to come, though, until about the end of next month.

Now, just a brief resume of the Minimum Wage. I will not embarrass my friends opposite by mentioning what it used to be before 1944, but merely state we have a rate of \$18.50 in the cities and in towns of over 500, and \$16 per week in all other towns, and they apply to both male and female help. Most of them come under the 44-hour week. This protection is mainly used in places where they have no organization and low-paid employment. Well-organized groups of course do not need it at all. During 1948 almost 7,000 inspections were made and approximately \$83,000 was collected from employers who had misunderstood or had underpaid their employees in some way. This money, as you know, is sent to the department and forwarded out to the employees concerned by cheque. The largest amount collected was \$660 in a single amount, and the highest amount from an individual was \$2,600. This Board only meets twice or three times a year and I would like to impress on the House that whenever it does meet advertisements are put in quite a number of papers and the Board welcomes representations from persons who want to appear on behalf of labour or on behalf of the employer. It does seem as though violations run in circles. At the present time we are having difficulties with some of the operators of Ladies' Ready-to-Wear shops who have been keeping their employees ten, fifteen, thirty minutes, or an hour, overtime, so, as far as he can, the big industrialist down in Montreal might have a statement on his desk the next morning as to actually what was done in Regina the day before. That is quite all right if they want to keep them after hours, but they have to pay them and they are going to find that out. Some of them have been falsifying their books by showing them off at six o'clock. That is going to have to stop, and I think it has stopped. Some of them even take advantage of making the salesgirls clean up the washrooms after six o'clock to avoid hiring a charwoman. They are not all like that, Mr. Speaker. We have some very fine employers among them. I know of one, for instance, who pays the girls \$28 a week to start with, and that is very good.

**March 11, 1949**

The duties of the department can be summed up by the statement that we do insure the wage earner is given a fair break in regard to standards both in wages and conditions. We have machinery to enforce our laws, which we do not hesitate to use if there is good and sufficient reason, but only flagrant or repeated violations occur on the part of the employer. I would like to say right here to the people of Saskatchewan that the employer group in this province are, generally speaking, very fair and want to do the right thing by their employees and the legislation passed. Mistakes occur and misunderstandings arise from time to time, but once the average employer is informed he co-operates with us fully, and we seldom have a second offender.

Now I want to get international here for a moment, but I promise I will stay on this side of the Atlantic and this side of the Pacific. We were told a few days ago that President Truman owed his re-election to the fact that he was supported by labour in the United States. In my opinion, that is quite correct. On the other hand, it was stated that the corresponding party to the C.C.F. received only a million votes. That was a suggestion, I think, that we were silent supporters of the left-wing faction led by Henry Wallace. I feel quite sure that had the members of this House been living in the United States during the time of the election, the 31 members on this side of the House would have supported President Truman. Possibly the 21 on the other side would have supported Mr. Dewey; I don't know. But President Truman got the support of labour because. . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — I suggest that you stay with Saskatchewan politics.

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — You just keep quiet and listen to me and you will find out . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Why don't you tell us about the Royal Commission.

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — President Truman indicated his friendliness to labour by vetoing the Taft-Hartley Bill which was brought in sometime during 1948 and had the effect of watering down the Wagner Act. This latter Act, by the way, was the one used by this province as the basis for setting up The Trade Union Act a little over four years ago. Here is what I am getting to: what support did President Truman get from the various means of publicity in the United States? Little or none. Journals, radio commentators, newspapers, pictorial magazines, Gallup Polls, etc, with hardly an exception predicted his defeat. They even went to the extreme of printing Mr. Dewey's picture in the paper two or three days before the election, with the heading: "The Next President of the United States". I suggest all this publicity and false predictions were entirely political and done with the express desire to defeat President Truman. The wage-earners, however, were not swayed in sufficient numbers to desert him and quietly supported him at the polls in spite of the storm of publicity predicting defeat. I am sure that we were greatly disappointed at the use put to the principle of Gallup Polls which seemed to lend itself to abuse while the average citizen thought it was on the level. In my opinion, these polls were faked and it should be made illegal to use them for pre-election purposes. Many people like to be on the winning side, and the concentrated prediction that Mr. Truman would lose might have cost him

many thousands of votes. To repeat what member on the opposite side say: "It could happen here." To sum up my thoughts on this matter I reiterate that it should be made illegal to publish pre-election 'straw' votes. They can do no good and can do a lot of harm. How could these dopesters — using the slang — columnists, radio commentators, etc. all be wrong. I suggest they got together in an effort to defeat Mr. Truman by creating a false impression. In any case it was amusing to listen to their alibis and the way they tried to laugh themselves out of an awkward situation after the election.

My time is getting on, but just before I close I want to mention . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Didn't Mr. Truman say he wasn't a socialist?

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — Are you making a statement or asking a question? From time to time, Mr. Speaker, I hear the hon. Leader of the Opposition on the radio and I am quite an admirer of his voice, the texture of the deep tenor that he has. I am an admirer of the quality, not particularly the quantity. I don't know how his voice mixes with mine; perhaps not very well. Maybe after the session is over we can get together and sing a duet or something.

**Mr. Tucker:** — You have a very nice voice.

**An Hon. Member:** — A mutual admiration society.

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — I want to mention something about fires, seeing the Provincial Fire Commissioner's Office now come under my department.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, before the hon. Minister leaves the question of the Estevan coal fields and labour, I wonder if he would not indicate to the Assembly . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Is the hon. minister willing to answer the question now?

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — No, not for a moment. I want to say something about fires. As we all know, we have read in the paper, and we have been greatly perturbed, every few days we read about a serious fire, many of them being in the province of Saskatchewan. The total number we had during the year of 1948 was 1,293, and the total amounted to \$2,105,560. Here is what I want to bring to the attention of this House, and I am sorry that I am not on the air: it is that the leading causes of fire are: First, smokers — cigars, cigarettes, etc. caused 236 of these fires; second chimneys and flues is next with 129; third, stoves, furnaces, boilers and smoke pipes, 117; four, electricity, 104, five, matches — mostly children playing with matches — caused 73. The total number of fatalities were: Men 13, women 11, children 12. That is, 36 people lost their lives in fires in Saskatchewan in 1948. To my mind it is entirely too many, and I am just going to read two or three examples that are contained in the annual report, as many fatalities are cause usually by some liquid. Here is one: child 15 months old who poured gasoline on a lit gas lamp and was fatally burned.

**March 11, 1949**

Another one: a can of diesel fuel exploded when she was using it to light a stove; a child playing with matches set fire to a barn, another died as a result of burns from a fire as a result of lighting a fire with coal oil; another died as a result of burns when apron caught fire while drinking tea, and so forth. I just wanted to draw the attention of the House to the large number of fires in this province, and I think a good many of them could be avoided if ordinary care were taken. We had a prosecution last fall — I think the first one that has ever been brought to Court in this province — whereby a man was taken up in Police Court for smoking in his bed. He dropped off to sleep and the cigarette he had in his fingers damaged the mattress, the room and so forth, and he was taken to the Police Court and fined.

I have a good deal here I want to say but I have run over the length of time I set for myself. I just want to close by saying that I think the budget we are going to be called to vote on, possibly today or Monday, indicates the amount necessary for this government to carry on during the coming fiscal year, and I will support the budget.

The Assembly adjourned at 8:25 o'clock p.m.