

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Eleventh Legislature**  
**4th Day**

**Tuesday, February 21, 1950.**

The House met at 3 o'clock p.m.

**DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY**

The House resumed, from Monday, February 20, 1950, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Wellbelove for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

**Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, my first task is to extend congratulations to the Mover and Seconder of the Motion. I knew of the Mover (Mr. Wellbelove) long before I ever had the pleasure of meeting him, on account of his very fine son serving with me in the Second World War and I decided at that time that as he was such a fine chap, he must have had a very fine father, or perhaps mother, perhaps both. It was one of my grave regrets that that fine young man had to give his life for his country. I felt that I wanted to meet the member of Kerrobert-Kindersley. I enjoyed his speech, yesterday, very much.

I also enjoyed the speech of the Seconder of the motion (Mr. Buchanan). Of course, I could not help but think that they must have found themselves in a very difficult position because men of their great ability with regard to speaking, if there had been very much in the Speech from the Throne to talk about, or anything to be proud of in the record of the Government, I am sure they would not have found it necessary to give almost their whole time to discussing Federal matters. I thought that was the greatest admission that I have witnessed for a long time in public life, of the utter bankruptcy of the programme of the C.C.F. at the present time and, also, of the actual feeling of shame about their record. Otherwise, in a speech designed to thank His Honour for the programme which he laid before us, they would not have avoided almost entirely dealing with that programme.

I would like also to congratulate a former colleague of mine in the House of Commons, the Minister of Health (Hon. T.J. Bentley), on his elevation to the Cabinet. I had not realized the Director of Staff Training was such an important position that it was the next step before you entered the Cabinet. I suppose the former Federal member for Yorkton may now look forward when the next vacancy occurs to also getting in to the Cabinet. Apparently, Mr. Speaker, it is regarded as a very important job to direct the staff training of our civil service. However, be that as it may, I congratulate the Minister of Health — all the more so because there is a large number of very able men in the C.C.F. ranks in this House, and he must have been deemed to be of very great ability otherwise he would not have been chosen,

February 21, 1950

on his entry into this House or even before his entry to the House, to take a portfolio over the heads of so many other able colleagues who have served so long in this House. Therefore he may well be worthy of great congratulations. I did hear mentioned, of course, that it was not so much his ability over that of some of the other members of the House as the dire necessity of the Government to win the Gull Lake by-election, that had something to do with his promotion. However, I would never think that the Premier would seriously pass over his colleagues who served with him so long and well in this House, merely to win a by-election.

I was very interested in one of the lines of thought followed by the Seconder of the motion. I have heard it a great deal, as have all of us – and there is some truth in it, although it may not be all the truth – that the way to combat Communism is to have things so organized in your domestic economy that nobody is going to turn towards Communism. I remember that this was the argument in regard to Czechoslovakia. We used to hear it steadily from the members of the C.C.F. Party not only in this province but throughout Canada, that in that country there was a Socialist Government that serviced its people so well and that loved democracy so much, that never would we need to fear that Communism would get control in Czechoslovakia. Of course, we know what happened. We know that Socialism, or the belief in Socialism, was taught so assiduously in Czechoslovakia and there came to be a sufficient number of people who believed in complete Socialism in Czechoslovakia, that when they got under pressure the Socialist went over to the Communists, and, today, that country is in the grip of a Communist dictatorship.

My best authority for the fact that the believed in complete Socialism, was a statement issued after that happened by the Executive Committee of the British Labour Party. Here is what they said: “Communists cannot achieve their aims without support from a minority within the camp of Democratic Socialism.” I steadily intend to insist, Mr. Speaker, that the people who attempt to teach ultimate Socialism, which in its final result is indistinguishable from Communism in its ultimate and in principle, are actually paving the way for the advent of Communism, as they did in Czechoslovakia. The very fact that it happened in Czechoslovakia, the very country in which my hon. friends opposite were so sure that it could never happen, is an indication that in that regard they were wrong.

Speaking about Communism – one of the things that rather amazed me about the C.C.F. Party in this province was their attitude towards the Atlantic Security Pact. I had thought that, when the Labour Party in Great Britain had taken a strong part along with the President of the United States and our own Prime Minister in working out that Atlantic Security Pact, it would have the wholehearted support of the C.C.F. Party. I believe it had the support of the Premier himself; but apparently there are enough people who are not ready to follow that leadership that, when the matter came before the C.C.F. convention, last summer, there were actually resolutions brought in that the Atlantic Security Pact should, in fact, be repudiated. However, although that resolution did not go through, there were enough people there who were against the Atlantic Security Pact, Mr. Speaker, that it was not endorsed. When we consider the importance of that Pact

the future preservation of peace and our liberties, it is an amazing thing that the C.C.F. Party in this province were not prepared to endorse it.

Surely everybody knows by this time, that no matter how important the United Nations is, as at present constituted, it cannot stop an aggressor. This is because no action can be taken by the executive arm of the United Nations without the concurring voice of all of the great powers. The only power that could really commence an aggression that could cause a world war, would be one of the great powers. If such a power intended to commence an aggression, it certainly would not concur in action taken by the United Nations to curb that aggression. Therefore, it came about that it was decided that the free peoples of the world, bordering on the Atlantic, should get together and say that, if there was to be any more aggression on the part of the Soviet Union, they would meet it as a Western United World together – so that they could not be destroyed one by one. That Pact has been signed by at least twelve nations of the Western World, and it is an amazing thing that, when a matter like that comes before a convention of the C.C.F. Party, they cannot show solidarity with the rest of the freedom-loving world in its endorsement. To me that is very significant as to what must be the state of mind of a good number in the C.C.F. Party in this province.

There are some matters in the Speech from the Throne which I wish to touch on. They are very important matters, largely Federal, but they also have a provincial slant to them in that we in this province are very much affected by them; and, of course, we have the right in this Legislature to express our opinion about them and it is altogether fitting and proper that we should do so.

The first very important matter I wish to speak about is the Crow's Nest Pass rates. Now I, for one, had never thought that, when we win the seven provinces of the Maritimes and the West asked for a Royal Commission on transportation and railway freight rates, we were opening the way for an attack on the Crow's Nest Agreement. When at the National Convention of our Party I moved that a Royal Commission should be set up to look into this question of transportation, it was part of the resolution that in no way should the rights enjoyed by the West under the Crow's Nest rates be in any way infringed upon, or in any way called in question. I, for one, do not think that there is any real danger to those Crow's Nest rates. Nevertheless, they are being attacked by the C.P.R., and it behooves all of us, I think, regardless of party in Western Canada, to stand together and make it very clear that we expect those rates to be left with us as one of the basic foundation stones of our very economic setup in the west; that there should be absolutely no thought for a single minute of interfering with those Crow's Nest rates.

They were established in 1897, as the members know, by a definite agreement with the C.P.R. It was written into the Statutes at that time, that those rates should prevail in regard to the transportation into the prairie west, and it was on that basis that the west was settled and opened up. It was understood that that was a permanent agreement, and on that basis the C.P.R. got a heavy subsidy to help them build through the Crow's Nest Pass. They benefitted very much, as well as the country, by the

railroad being put through there. But at any rate, so far as we are concerned in the West, as the ex-Prime Minister of this country said in the House of Commons in speaking of this matter following the first Great War, the eastern part of Central Canada, the central part, have their rates held down by water competition. On the Pacific coast they have the Panama Canal and water transportation there. Our equivalent, to some extent is the Crow's Nest rates. It is suggested that, if they were abrogated, the rates on grain, on wheat, would go up about 20 cents – almost double what they now are. We only need to contemplate that to realize what a great boon the Crow's nest rates have been to us. They were suspended during the first Great War. They were brought back into effect so far as wheat and grain were concerned, following the first Great War by the Government of the day, which was then the Government of Mr. Mackenzie King. In this he was very strongly supported by the Progressive Party at that time. I do not think there is very much difference in opinion between any party in the whole of the prairie west in regard to Crow's Nest rates. So far as I am concerned I commend the Government for the work it is doing in opposing any consideration of those rates being taken out of the Statute and being made subject to the Board of Transport Commissioners.

With regard to the Hudson Bay railroad, ever since people settled here in the west they have dreamed of the development of the Hudson Bay Route, and on that I would like to say that, so far as we are concerned, we are heart and soul behind the fullest possible use and development of that Hudson Bay Route. It was a Premier of this province who went to Ottawa and took a leading part as Minister of Railways in getting that route completed and opened up. I refer to the Hon. Charles A. Dunning. So it was our Party that opened that route up, built it, and surely we are behind it one hundred per cent today. had we been in office we would have gone, I think, further than the present Government in seeing the support and the co-operation of the neighbouring provinces and of the Dominion itself in the fullest possible use of that route.

One factor that is said to militate against the use of the route is the high marine insurance rates. In view of the fact that there have been practically no losses in connection with the use of the route, it seems to me that there is no real reason for the high rate of insurance which prevails. It is true that, last year, it was reduced by 25 per cent. I understand that, before it was reduced, the insurance rate was eight times as high as the rate into Montreal. Now then I can say that I do not understand, when the present Government and the Insurance Office are so anxious to force people to take insurance with them, actually forcing people to take fire insurance and theft insurance on their cars, why they are so loathe to offer to take insurance in regard to ships coming into Hudson Bay. If the rates for this insurance are, as we believe, far too high and exorbitant, why, Mr. Speaker, does not the provincial Insurance Office take on what must be some very lucrative business, and offer to do it at least on a competitive basis? By so doing it would kill two birds with one stone: it would get a lot of good business and at the same time it would bring those rates down. We have the Government Insurance Office, and so far as we are concerned, that is the sort of use that should be made of it – to keep rates down by competition, not use it to force people to take insurance if they do not want it.

Something was said, yesterday, about the question of overseas markets. Now it is quite true that, owing to exchange difficulties and the fact that Great Britain is finding it difficult to ship her goods into our markets, she is finding it difficult to pay for the goods that she would like to buy from us. I do not think there is any question about that. It has been stated by her leading Government officials, members of the Government, that that is the case. One of the reasons (I do not think there is any doubt about it) is that the cost of their exports have gone up to a hundred and fifty-some per cent as compared with before the war, whereas the cost of exports of the United States have only gone up about eight-nine per cent. The result is that Britain finds it much easier to compete with her exports within the sterling area. Of course that creates a very great problem for us and also for them. I am quite satisfied that they appreciate what was done by Canada in the way of making loans and giving assistance to them during the period of the war and following the war, and so they would buy from us if they had the means to do so.

The suggestion has been made that we should take sterling in payment for our exports; but the British Government itself does not want that to be done. She does not want a whole lot of sterling piled up which will hang over the value of their money indefinitely as is the case today with the vast amount of sterling held by Egypt and India. That is one of the facts that has made it so very difficult for Great Britain in the years following the war. She has had to make exports to try to meet that sterling debt – so-called unrequited exports. These have been one of the great factors that have hampered Britain's recovery, and she has no intention of having the same thing now happen in regard to Canada. So the situation is difficult, unless we are ready to go on donating goods to Great Britain, and there is a limit to what a country can do in that regard. We have done more than any other country in the world in regard to giving goods to Great Britain, considering our wealth and our population. Actually that was one of the things that brought on our difficulties in regard to exchange with the United States, for the large exports we made to Great Britain without getting exports in return did cause a difficult situation. All those exports had a content of dollars, and these used up the large amount of dollars that we built up during the war. Now then, that being the case what do we find?

Somewhat the same situation developed following the first World War – there was difficulty in regard to finding markets in 1929 and in 1930. We had people who began to talk about self-sufficiency, to talk about dealing with Great Britain, dealing with the rest of the Commonwealth and stopping so much dealing with the United States. The situation yet had not developed very badly, but people listened to this cry that something should be done. Instead of leaving the Liberal Party in office in 1930 – a Party which was dedicated to the idea of developing markets where it possibly could – the country voted out the Liberal Party. We know the result. We know the attempt that was made to swing our trade towards the Commonwealth and towards Great Britain, and the attempt to shut out trade with the United States. I hope that we will not make that mistake again, Mr. Speaker, because we should remember what a terrific effect it had not only in our country, but the same attitude having been taken by the United States itself, what effect it had on the countries of Europe and the effect it had in bringing on the great depression of the 'thirties.

I will remember at that time that the attitude of the C.C.F. Party was that there were not any markets left. They laughed at the idea that the way to recovery was through trade and markets. Well, I am very glad to see that some of the leading members of the C.C.F., at least in this province, do not take that attitude any longer, because it is very clear from what happened when the Liberals were re-elected in 1935 and began to go out hunting for markets, and what has happened since, how important trade is to us, that we should not again take an attitude that in any way will interfere with trade. It should be our policy to encourage trade in every way possible. I think that the present Government at Ottawa is deserving of the very greatest commendation for the work it has done in regard to the Geneva agreement and to the work it has done in extending the Geneva agreement at Annecy. It certainly opened up to us the market of United States, and let no one ever underrate that great market. It is growing all the time. Half of our exports, today, go to the United States and half of the other half of our exports to all the rest of the world is paid for by United States' money under the Marshall Plan.

It must not be forgotten that, if in any way we discriminate against the United States without their consent in violation of the fundamental principles of Geneva, there is a limit to what they will agree to in that sort of thing. We may find ourselves in a very difficult position if we endanger in that way three-quarters of our entire exports. So the people who suggest that we blithely go ahead, regardless of consequences, regardless of any agreement with the United States, in trying to make some bi-lateral deals or something of that sort, and so endanger that great market, I do not think really understand the lessons of history at all. They surely do not understand the importance of the great export market the United States provides to us.

A word was said in the Speech from the Throne about the Dominion-Provincial Conference. Realizing the importance of a successful agreement between the Dominion and the other provinces, I say that all of Saskatchewan, regardless of party, is hoping that that conference this fall will be the greatest possible success. We know, today, that, by virtue of the financial agreements which the Dominion has made, we will get, this year, about fourteen and a quarter million dollars over and above what we are entitled to, under our constitution by way of a grant from the Dominion Government. We know that we will get about eight million dollars more than the Government which preceded this Government got by way of a grant. We know that the extra amount that the present Government is spending on social services just amounts to about eight million dollars, so that the entire amount, that they take so much credit for in their expenditure on social services, that entire amount almost is being provided to this Government by that financial agreement.

I am not saying that that financial agreement is not the proper thing; I say it is. I say it is one way of equalizing things as between the weaker provinces and the stronger provinces, financially, in this Dominion. One of the first speeches I made on being elected in 1935 to the Federal House was to advocate the setting up of a Commission to look into this question of trying to give proper assistance to the weaker provinces

in carrying out their constitutional obligations. I am not saying that my humble efforts had anything to do with the setting up of the great Rowell-Sirois Commission, but when it was called I was very pleased.

I have been very interested in the matter of a proper Dominion-Provincial programme ever since. Our party in the province is wholeheartedly behind such a programme. We know the things in that programme that have been held up by virtue of the two largest provinces not agreeing to the proposals in 1945. There was the question of the old age pension payment at the age of 65; the question of large public investment programme; the question of a comprehensive health insurance programme. Those things are still dependent upon a proper agreement by the Federal Government with the provinces, and I hope that that agreement will be attained this Fall when the provinces and Federal Government meet together.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that, when people have said ‘since seven provinces agree to this, why doesn’t the Dominion go ahead?’, they were not putting the picture quite fairly. The two provinces that did not agree pay more than 50 per cent of the taxes and they make up more than 50 per cent of the population of the country. So, until they agreed to what is really a fundamental change in the whole basic setup of our constitution, it seemed to me it showed a very very lighthearted and improper attitude towards our constitution to say – “Well, we got seven to agree and, even though they do not make up the majority of the country, we shall go right ahead anyway, regardless of the opinion of the other two.” I hope that we get the consent at least of one of those Provinces at the coming Dominion-Provincial conference, so that we shall have at least the majority of the people behind us in the proposals.

As to constitutional changes – that is the most important thing, Mr. Speaker, because, in the first place, surely the time has come when we should have all the attributes of nationhood; and one of the attributes that certainly is lacking is that we have to go to another country to have the right to change our own constitution. The time has come, surely, when that constitution should be – that is the changing of it, should be in Canadian hands and within Canada. But there is another important feature of the matter that seems to be overlooked all too often, and that is the fact that, due to the recognition of Canada as a fully equal partner in the Commonwealth, Great Britain has taken the attitude that any request for a change in the constitution which comes to her endorsed by a majority of Canada’s parliament, will be passed without question. That means, Mr. Speaker, that the most vital and fundamental rights in our constitution, today, are absolutely at the mercy of the majority of the House of Commons and Senate of our country. There is no constitution in the world in that same position except the constitution of Great Britain herself, where the constitution can be changed by a vote of the majority of the two Houses of Parliament. Surely the time has come, Mr. Speaker, when there are certain fundamental human rights that should be written into the constitution of our country, which should not be at the mercy of any temporary majority in Parliament. There are certain fundamental minority rights upon the basis of which our country was founded which should also be written into that constitution and be unchangeable except with the consent of every single Province

in the Dominion. So, on behalf of the Party that I have the honour to lead in this province, I do hope for and give the greatest wishes for success of the work of the coming conference in regard to the constitution.

In regard to the Opposition in this House, at the present time, we have had three by-elections, and I do not want to take too long to comment on them; but I would like to say that I welcome to this House the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy). I have already paid my respects to the hon. member for Gull Lake. I welcome to this House the hon. member for Cannington; I certainly want to thank the people of Cannington for the wonderful job they did and the splendid way in which they reacted towards the campaign the Government saw fit to put on in the Cannington by-election. There was, of course, the suggestion that the Cannington seat needed highways, it needed power lines; and the suggestion was made that \$800,000 would not be out of the way to spend in that seat in the next four years. That was dangled before the people and when it was put up to prominent members of the C.C.F. that 'if these things are coming to us, we suppose we may expect to get them, even though we elect a Liberal', the answer was anything but a definite affirmative. The people in Cannington all were under the impression that the only way they could get things that the Government themselves said they were entitled to, was to return a C.C.F. member. Well, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I hope the Government learned its lesson from Cannington. The people do not approve, in this country, of saying: 'if you want to get action you have to vote for the C.C.F. candidate, and if you do not vote for the C.C.F. candidate you are not going to get action' – and the action talked about was all these different expenditures of money. If the C.C.F. Government think that they can discipline the people of this country like that, they will find, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan are free British and Canadian citizens and that they do not propose to be shoved around in that way. I think that one of the reasons that the Government got beaten in Cannington was because they thought they could treat the people like that.

Of course they didn't have to offer the people of Gull Lake quite so much because they were giving them – and my hon. friend now sits for Gull Lake – they were giving him a Cabinet position. We had the amazing situation there of the Premier of this province saying, "If you elect this man, we'll give him a job." Well, of course, it is very much against The Election Act to promise anybody a job in consideration of him voting in a certain way or doing something like that, but I suppose that the Premier thought that, if necessary, he could get that Act repealed, Mr. Speaker, and one that I do not think the people appreciate very much. I venture to say there are many members in this House who do not appreciate it very much. I am glad to hear there is at least one who does not appreciate it – there must be others who in their own hearts do not like that sort of thing, and do not like that sort of treatment. I am glad there is at least one who is not afraid to speak up anyway.

In regard to The Battlefords, they must have thought, 'if \$800,00 probably offended people then the candidate there might come along with \$200,000'; I do not know why they should have cut it down so much.



Surely The Battlefords, I would have thought, in the present precarious state of the C.C.F., would have been worth more than Cannington instead of just one-quarter as much; but here the candidate said, "The things that should be done are going to cost \$200,000, and I keep my promises" – and all over the place there were pictures of the Premier advertising that the way to get action was to vote C.C.F. The action talked about was the \$200,000. Now, of course, there again I urged the people, no matter how much they might feel that the Government intended to carry out this sort of an attitude – that they would get this thing if they voted C.C.F. but they wouldn't get it if they didn't; I suggested to them that they might better, in the interests of proper Government in this province, refuse to submit to that sort of coercion. I am proud to say that a consistency that needed roads and power lines as much as The Battlefords, turned the Government down in that sort of an attitude.

Now, of course, the attitude taken by the mover and seconder of the Address showed that they were only following the lead given to them by their own leader in that by-election. You heard of the curtailment of train service due to alack of coal. I do not think there is anybody in this House, today, who does not realize that that was the genuine reason for the curtailment of that train service, yet the hon. Premier referred to that action as stupid and all the rest of it. Well, I think the thought was that the resentment over that curtailment of train services in a fine city like North Battleford, which had had daily train service for thirty or forty years cut to three trains weekly would be terrific. I think that the hon. Premier must have felt that if he appealed to that resentment as he did, he would be able to get a seat which he had lost in 1948. Furthermore that, if he talked a great deal about the apprehension of losing markets and the difficulties we were in in that respect, perhaps that might get some votes. Above all it was realized that it was in the area outside of the city of Battleford, including the town of Battleford, where the majority was obtained for our late member, Paul Prince, who was elected as a Liberal. If an election were to be called in February it would be very difficult for the people outside of the urban area of The Battlefords to get out and vote. If the city of North Battleford had the resentment that it appeared to have, if the country vote could not be got out in the ordinary numbers, with all the talk about curtailment of train service and Federal matters, and as little talk as possible about provincial matters and the provincial record, to try to get the people to forget that if possible, then perhaps that comparatively small majority with which the Liberals had won the election in 1948 might be wiped out. Realizing these considerations, I must admit that, as far as I was concerned, I was apprehensive about the result. In spite of what the Premier said that the people would come out and vote in the wintertime, knowing the condition of the roads, knowing that people a little bit older would not want to go out in the cold weather; knowing that if it was a very cold day, a husband and wife would not dare leave their children alone in homes with fires, – that people who had to go and return a matter of six or seven miles, if it was anything like the weather we were having, I felt that the rural vote was bound to be down. I pointed out, that what was done was not in accordance with what had been done when the two previous vacancies had occurred in this House, for in both those cases the elections were not held till the following year. In one case there were two Sessions held.

**Government Member:** — Two Sessions? No.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Yes. The first Session of the last Legislature was a special Session, and you can look at the Journals yourself to find it described as the first Session, and the second Session is described as the second Session which was held in the early part of 1945. You only need to look up the Journals yourself to find this is true. In the other case, one whole Session was permitted to pass. Now, I would take it that the hon. Premier knows something of what goes on in this House; yet I was amazed to listen to him myself and hear him say over the radio that the only thing wrong with my statement claiming that those seats had been vacant in one case for two Sessions of the Legislature and in the other case for one Session; to hear him say to the audience, “The only trouble with that statement is that it just wasn’t true.” Well I just challenge him to prove that when he gets up so speak, and I suggest that before he says that I say things that aren’t true, he should try and make sure of what he is talking about.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, we are very happy about the results. We hated to see a lot of good people disfranchised for, as a matter of fact, outside of the city of North Battleford and the town of Battleford, the vote went down by 28 per cent. The people living in those rural areas had just as much right to go and vote as anybody in this province and yet, for reasons which seemed good to the Premier, he called an election at a time when those people could not come and vote. I am glad that that particular manoeuvre got the answer from one of the constituencies of this province that it so richly deserved.

I have said that very little was said during that campaign about provincial matters. I listened to the speeches made. The hon. Premier, in the opening part of one of his speeches, mentioned some provincial matters, but all the emphasis was placed upon the curtailment of train service and Federal matters. To me, it was quite a confession that a Premier, leader of a Government that had been in office over five years and who pretended that he was going to do so much for this province, in fighting a by-election in a close seat like the Battlefords, should resort to all these different methods to try and win that seat instead of saying, “Here is my record. Here is what we are going to do, and on that we ask for your support.” Everybody who took part in that campaign knows, Mr. Speaker, that that was not done. Was that not a confession that the C.C.F. leadership was ashamed of its own record? Was that not a confession that they had no real programme to deal with the problems that face the province? You could have no greater proof of it than that. There they stood exposed before the people of The Battlefords, and that is the reason I think they lost the election. The people of The Battlefords said: “We know this is not a Federal election. We know the province has got nothing to do with running the C.N.R. We know it is one of the basic ideas that the C.N.R. should not be under control of Government, but that it should be run by its own Board of Directors.” They knew all of that, Mr. Speaker, and when the hon. Premier tried to get them to vote on that basis, they said to themselves, “Well, of course, their record must be something that they can’t be very proud of”; and they voted accordingly.

In regard to rent controls, I am glad to find that the Province has seen fit to act in this matter. So often in the past this Government, where it had that power to act itself, has cried out to Ottawa for action instead of going ahead and acting within its own powers. Everybody knows that, in peace time, the question of rent control is clearly within provincial jurisdiction. There can be no argument about it. It only comes within Federal jurisdiction in case of emergency, as in wartime, and when the emergency is deemed to be over the Dominion has no jurisdiction. At any rate, there is a certainty that the Province has jurisdiction if the Dominion is not in the field. And when the great outcry was raised about this question of rent controls, I must say that my attitude was, at once, that this rent control question, in a time of peace such as we are in today, is a matter to be handled much better in each provincial capitol than it ever possibly can be handled far away at Ottawa, because each provincial capitol should know the local conditions and be able to take them into account better than a group of people trying to enforce an Act from Ottawa, trying to apply the same rules to cities like Toronto or Montreal as to cities like Regina or Saskatoon. And so I said, why in the world do we not take the situation over, take power to act under our Mediation Board or something of the sort, deal with these things on the basis of our own needs and our own requirements within the province of Saskatchewan and on a fair basis between landlord and tenant? If that is the intention of the Government, they will have our support in taking that attitude. It is only following along the line, Mr. Speaker, of the long line of legislation passed in this province, largely by Liberal Governments but also by the Co-operative Government to protect debtors when they were in difficulties due to no fault of their own. So, in taking over control in this matter of rent, there is nothing unusual, and if the legislation is along that line dealing on an individual basis with these matters so that it will be possible to deal fairly between the landlord and the tenant in case of hardship, then there is no difference of opinion between us on that.

In regard to marketing policy, a great deal was made of that, Mr. Speaker, by the Premier. Of course, he could see just the same as others the difficulties that were coming up, or he should have been able to see them; he was bound to see that these questions of setting up marketing boards and so on, the right to enforce compulsory marketing of any item of goods, any natural product, are provincial matters under our constitution. Other provinces recognized that, and they passed marketing Acts to provide for the handling of different natural products. This Legislature passed a Natural Products Marketing Act, in 1945; other provinces passed Acts and then appointed boards. They were consulting with producers' organizations, with co-operatives, with the Dominion Government, with the Agricultural Prices Support Board and so on, trying to get ready to meet this situation. What did this Government do, Mr. Speaker? It did not even appoint the Board which was authorized five years ago, until January of this year. Then the Premier goes into The Battlefords and accuses the Federal Government of delay in taking action to meet this problem? Why the Federal Government passed a Federal Marketing Act, last year, getting ready for this situation. If this Government had even set up its Board, last year, instead of in January of this year, we would not have had the situation develop, for instance in regard to eggs, that did develop.

The fact remains, and it cannot be denied, that this Board was never set up and had not been set up, Mr. Speaker. This Board could have consulted with the representatives of the farmers, and of co-operative organizations. It could have taken steps in co-operation with other representatives of other provinces in trying to meet this situation, so that it would not have developed as it did develop. I do not think that is an unfair criticism to make. It seems to me very obvious that, if the hon. Premier had the foresight that he says he had and saw this thing coming for the last two years, the least he could have done was to make some preparation to meet the situation.

In regard to the help given to the drought areas, a by-election took place in Gull Lake, and I was through that area, last fall. One of the things I must say, Mr. Speaker, is that I was amazed at the optimism, the lightheartedness and confidence of the people there. They certainly did not show the effects which you would expect them to show after some of them having had six years of crop failure. Now our attitude at that time was one that we took long before the 1948 elections. We took that attitude at that time, realizing that a great burden had been taken off the Provinces back by the passing of P.F.A.A. which previous Provincial Governments had had to carry. There will be paid into this province this year, under P.F.A.A. no less than \$14,000,000. There has been paid into this province to date over \$93 1/2 million under P.F.A.A. Now, realizing that this Government did not carry before 1939, we felt that we should do more than it had been possible to do before. So we said that the Province should pay freight and handling charges on feed and seed grains, with further financial aid, if necessary, to supplement Federal assistance in drouth areas. Surely that was warranted in those areas where they have had six years of crop failure. Yet I went into municipalities in that area where this Government was giving the meagre assistance that they were giving, and, at the same time, those municipalities were being forced to collect the public revenue tax and send it here to Regina, Mr. Speaker, – an average tax in municipalities in this province of \$4,000 a piece. That was the help that they got. Well, so far as we were concerned, we thought the government of this province, with the large revenues at its disposal as compared with previous governments, and without the burdens on its back due to the fact that the Dominion Government was handling the P.F.A.A. question, should have done a bit better than it did.

Let me now deal with grasshoppers. I would like to say, first of all, that I think that the farmers in the grasshopper infested areas, the municipal officials and the field men of the Department, worked very hard, last year, in connection with fighting grasshoppers. I know the people I came in contact with, the people working for the Department and the municipal officials and the farmers, all worked very hard. Last year, I made a suggestion, and I will repeat it, and I shall do it with deference because I realize that experts are entering into this picture in regard to advising what should be done; but I wonder to what extent the question of the expenditure of money is entering into it. I am satisfied that, last year, we probably lost seven or eight million dollars' worth of crop on account of not being able to do away with grasshoppers, and I am satisfied that, if we went at that campaign in a stronger way than we did, we could have exterminated the grasshoppers. I said, last year, that I felt that we should use chemicals more

than the Minister of Agriculture was proposing to do. I ventured that option with deference, because I knew that the Federal Entomological service was being consulted by the Minister of Agriculture. Last summer, I was quite convinced again, and anyone that was in a grasshopper area must have been convinced, that while the use of bait had its place when there was a reasonable amount of green growth on the land, the actual campaign that really killed the grasshoppers was the use of chemicals. I do hope, when it is a matter of saving millions of dollars' worth of crop, that a Province that today is spending twice as much as we spent not so very long ago, should not hesitate to step in and do all possible to really save the crops of our farmers. I believe that the Minister of Agriculture is anxious to do what he can in this regard, and as far as the Opposition is concerned, in anything that he may bring forth in this Legislature to try to deal with the grasshopper pest, he certainly can be assured he is going to get the wholehearted support of the Opposition.

In regard to rural electrification – when the Bill was brought in, last year, I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, and I intend to keep pointing it out, that experience has shown that you cannot have any really extensive farm electrification under ordinary circumstances unless the state as a whole pays a substantial part of the cost. You did not have any real extension of rural electrification in either Manitoba or Ontario or in any part of Europe until you had the state paying a substantial part of the cost. The only place where you had any amount of farm electrification without state subsidization was in the very thickly-settled areas of Belgium and of Great Britain. That has been the experience. Now there may have been people, at the present time, in a period of comparatively high income of our farmers, who have been able to put out \$1,500 to become connected to electricity, but you cannot have any real province-wide development on that basis. This was looked into by Manitoba very carefully, and it was found there that the way to bring electricity to the farmers was for the Province to face the fact that it should pay half the cost. And why shouldn't the state so pay half the cost? People living in cities and the larger towns have amenities that they haven't got on the farms. People could not live in the cities and towns if it were not for people being willing to live on the farms and do the work that is necessary there: the long hours – no forty-hour week on the farm especially on a mixed farm or anything like that; no waterworks unless you have electricity; none of these modern conveniences to lighten the burden on the woman of the house. Surely to goodness, Mr. Speaker, the state as a whole should be ready to step in and help to bring those amenities to the people who are the very foundation of our whole setup!

There is no provision made for that at the present time by the present Government. It is true there was something in the Speech from the Throne about some amendment to this Act. Well, if there is some amendment to the Act to provide for some subsidization along the lines which I have advocated for the last three years, the Opposition will uphold it with all their strength. I hope there is something in it in that regard, and so I will not say anything more about it except to again bring it to your attention that in Manitoba the electricity is brought right to the farmer's house just the same as it is in the city. He does not have to pay five or six hundred dollars to get the electricity right to his buildings, as they do in Saskatchewan. all he has to do is connect up the electricity and buy his fixtures and

provide his wiring. Then in Manitoba, the province pays one-half of the ultimate cost. If Manitoba can do it, Mr. Speaker, why cannot our Government do it?

The difference is, Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba has not engaged in a whole lot of ways of wasting money the way this Government has done. That is why they are able to do these things for the farmers, and I hope that, before we are here very much longer, this Government will realize that it should do just as well for its farmers as the Government of Manitoba is doing. Manitoba, in the time that this Government has been in office, has connected up 17,000 of its farmers with electricity and proposes to connect up 5,000, this year, on a basis, Mr. Speaker, not that the farmers are going to pay back the whole cost of the scheme, but just half the cost. Now I say that, so far as we are concerned, we feel that what Manitoba can do in that regard for its farmers, Saskatchewan should be willing to do and should be able to do.

In regard to the Royal Commission's report on coal, we, of course, only have the summary of the report, so far as I know, as to what that Royal Commission found; but if they only found what they are reported to have found – that it would be unfair to have payments into the miners' welfare fund based upon tonnage of coal mined instead of upon the actual wages paid out, in view of the fact that there are so many more tons of coal mined by an individual in Saskatchewan compared to Alberta; if that is all the Royal Commission found, we have spent thousands of dollars of our money to find out something that is obvious. That is just another case of squandering and wasting public moneys, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the only reason the report has not been made public is that there is so little in it. However, I cannot say very much because, as yet, we do not in its entirety know what they did find; but I will say, Mr. Speaker, that I am going to wait with a great deal of interest to find out what they have to say about that concerted raise in the price of coal of 20 cents a ton, not only by the people who had a strike on their hands but by the company which didn't have a strike on its hands and which, I am informed, did not want to raise the price and only did it under pressure from this Government.

**Premier Douglas:** — That is not true.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, you have said that before.

**Premier Douglas:** — I repeat it.

**Mr. Tucker:** — And you can repeat it again if you want to; but I wonder if you want and gave sworn evidence to that effect before the Commission? You know very well that that is one of the things that I brought up at the last Session and said that I expected the Commission would deal with it, Mr. Speaker.

**Premier Douglas:** — Why didn't you appear before the Commission?

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, I didn't have anything on my mind, like that.

Something has been said by the members opposite about combines and price fixing and all the rest of it. Here is a combine – a price fixing

arrangement right here in this province, Mr. Speaker, and the Attorney General, talking over the air, with full power to prosecute under the Combines Investigation Act. We were told that they had a Royal Commission that is going to look into that. Now, have the Royal Commission looked into it? Well, we'll see. We will see if the Premier went before that Royal Commission and dealt with that very important question, because the concerted rise in the price of coal from that field of 20 cents a ton – a rise in price from a company that was not affected by the strike at all, that did not have to raise its wages, and did not want to raise the price – that affects not only the people who have to buy that coal but affects the price of other fuel because it removed the competition to that extent. And here is fuel, one of the most important things, Mr. Speaker, in this cold country of ours, and all the Attorney General can do is make speeches over the radio but take no action; and when a charge is made in this House, when I say I expect it to be dealt with by the Royal Commission, apparently it isn't dealt with at all. Well, that is the attitude towards the public, that is the attitude towards the consumer – the Premier smiles. He thinks he has a majority behind him to back him up. Well, we will see. Certainly, the country is not prepared to back him up as was shown by the by-election returns.

Now in regard to the attitude towards labour, the present Government has sought to give the idea to labour that it is their real friend. I want to say in that regard at the outset, that I think every far-sighted labour leader will admit that the best protection for the working man in getting good pay, and getting steady work, is to have an expanding economy when everybody can get a job. You are not going to have that situation if you frighten risk capital out of the province, and keep it out. You are not going to bring about that situation. That seems to be so obvious that I am not going to spend any time on it; but there is another thing. Something has been said about, "Why is this risk capital frightened out?" Well, one of the reasons it is frightened out is because of the attitude of the Labour Relations Board in our province. They know that that Board has been given very great powers, and if they can invest in a province alongside of us where the Labour Relations Board is known to be fair in its attitude towards everybody, towards all branches of labour, then naturally they prefer to do business in that particular province.

I thought it was an amazing state of affairs for the situation to have developed to the extent that the Chief Justice of this province actually found in regard to the Labour Relations Board set up by this Government, what he did in regard to a matter that appeared before the Labour Relations Board and which came before his particular court for review. "I find myself compelled to say," Chief Justice Brown declared, "That in the light of the material before me, the Board, through this so-called hearing utterly failed to display evidence of good faith and fairness and impartiality to either the company or its employees. The Board appeared to act as if it were in league with the union and was determined to unionize the employees whether or not the company or the majority of the employees desired such a result." They (the Board) asked for leave to appeal from that finding and the Chief Justice then said: "It would be an outrage to force these men into unionization under these circumstances, and I will not in any way facilitate such a result."

There is the finding of the Chief Justice of this province, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the Labour Relations Board. Well, in that attitude apparently he is joined by one of the prominent men in one of the leading labour organizations in this province, if we hope to have the development that we should have. Everybody who knows anything about labour matters knows of the high standing of Mr. Carl Berg in the labour movement in Western Canada – in all Canada, for that matter – and here is what he said on April 5, 1947: he accused the Labour Relations Board at that time of giving time to the Canadian Congress of Labour to go ‘fishing’ for new members. The Canadian Congress of Labour, of course, is the organization which has adopted the C.C.F. as its political arm, and here is a leader like Carl Berg accusing the Labour Relations Board of this province of absolute partiality in favour of the movement which supports it. Well, Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that we have stagnation in this province, and that people are afraid to come into the province?

Now, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the general question of the attitude of labour towards Socialism, I think that probably the two greatest labour movements in the whole world are the two great labour movements of the United States headed by Messrs. Green and Murray, and I just want to read a statement which they put out in regard to their attitude towards Socialism. It is found in a ‘New Charger for Labour and Management’ put out on March 29, 1945, and they said this:

“The rights of private property and free choice of action under a system of private, competitive capitalism must continue to be the foundation of a nation’s peaceful and prosperous expanding economy. Free competition and free men are the strength of our free society.”

I know, Mr. Speaker, that if we said that, we would be accused of being ‘stooges’ for the big interests. Is it to be said that Messrs. Green and Murray are stooges for the big interests when they condemn Socialism, Mr. Speaker? Well it isn’t any wonder that this province cut down the C.C.F. representation in the Federal House, last summer, from eighteen to five.

Much has been said by the Minister of Highways (Hon. J.T. Douglas) about how much is being done, and a lot of people pay considerable attention if anything at all is being done, because, during the period of the war, it was very hard to spend anything on highways or roads from the standpoint of labour, materials and so on. But to get a proper perspective, it is necessary to go to other provinces, and there again, I think a good province to go to is our neighbouring province of Manitoba. I would just like to give you some figures, Mr. Speaker, as to what is being done in Manitoba compared with Saskatchewan. Manitoba spent, last year (that is the present fiscal year we are in), on its highways and roads \$10 million. That was 27 per cent of their entire budget. Saskatchewan did not spend ten million; it proposed to spend \$7,600,000, almost \$2 million less. It is only proposing to spend 14 per cent out of its entire budget, not 27 per cent.



Then take the estimated revenue from gas tax and licence fees. Manitoba spent ten million but only got \$6.9 million from her motorists. She spent \$1.45 for every dollar she got from her motorists. What did this Government do, Mr. Speaker? They got in gas tax and licence revenue from our motorists, \$9,100,000 and they spent \$7,600,000. Instead of spending as Manitoba did, \$1.45 for every dollar they got from their motorists, we only spent 84 cents, Mr. Speaker, and held back 16 cents of what the people who used the highways paid. Then the Minister of Highways boasts about it. Well, no wonder he didn't win The Battlefords, because people know these facts – and the funny part of it is that while Manitoba is spending \$10,000,000 and we are spending \$7,000,000, we have 40,000 more registered vehicles than Manitoba! Manitoba spends \$79 for every registered vehicle; we spend \$48. All I could think, when I heard the Minister of Highways talking in The Battlefords by-election, was that he was very good at making something of a very bad case.

In regard to Crown Corporations, I listened to the Premier speaking, as least I listened to a re-broadcast of the speech and I recognized his voice – I had no difficulty recognizing it – and in the course of his speech he said this: “We are getting money . . .” (and this will surprise you; I'll bet it did surprise them). “We are getting money from our Crown Corporations,” he told them, and, he said, “that would surprise them” – and I guess they were surprised. Then he goes on to speak about the annual profit on the power lines.

When the power lines and telephone system were set up in this province, they were set up to give service at cost. Any profits that were made were supposed to be for the extension of the lines and so on. They were not supposed to be making a profit.

**Premier Douglas:** — They never made a profit.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Oh yes, they did.

**Premier Douglas:** — The Power Corporation never made a profit.

**Mr. Tucker:** — The power system was not expanded on account of the War. But the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that when the Government knew that they were going to lose money on the other Crown Corporations, they then made the Telephone system and the Power commission Crown Corporations so they could boast about these so-called profits. They were never supposed to be thrown in with the profits of other Crown Corporations. Then the Premier said that that money would be used to extend the system. My recollection is that the same thing was said in this House, last year, about the money made in the Telephone system – that that was not to be regarded as profits to be used for any other purpose but to cut down the charges for those services and to extend those services.

Here is what the Premier said and, incidentally, he talked about an audited statement in regard to the Transportation Company. He said: “When I say we will put an audited statement of the Transportation Company showing the profits of the Transportation Company for this year at almost \$100,000.”

He talked about an audited statement, Mr. Speaker. He offered to bet \$100 that it was correct. Now, then, surely to goodness, if that audited statement is available for the Premier to use in a public meeting it should be tabled in this House, Mr. Speaker. I heard the answer yesterday that we had to get these things audited, but I have the exact words of the Premier here. He said, "I've got an audited statement here."

**Premier Douglas:** — I did not.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, I've got the exact words. I heard them myself.

**Premier Douglas:** — Read it.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I'll read it again: "I say we will put an audited statement of the Transportation Company showing the profits of the Transportation Company for this year by almost \$100,000."

**Premier Douglas:** — "Will!"

**Mr. Tucker:** — Oh well, here's what he says: A man from the audience says, "Can you prove it?" "Yes, yes! Can I prove it? I want to tell you gentlemen I am not in the habit of having people call my integrity into question. I am putting an audited statement before the gentleman in quest . . ." I am putting, Mr. Speaker. There it is. now then wiggle out of that if you can!

The Premier went on: "We made a clear profit after paying for depreciation and setting aside reserves and so on — we made — us, the people of Saskatchewan, \$3,152,502.70. That, my friends . . ." This was said by the Premier in his best rhetorical manner — "That, my friends, is \$3,152,000 that normally would have gone out of this province into the pockets of big companies in New York or Toronto or Chicago. These \$31,152,000 which stayed in the province to help build roads and schools and hospitals, to help the people of Saskatchewan . . ." Two mis-statements one after the other: one, that the money would have gone out of the province . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Sure it would.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Did anyone hear of the profits from the Telephone system going out of the province before this Government came into office?

**Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer):** — There never were any.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Yes, there were.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Never a dollar!

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, the Provincial Treasurer can tell us how much of these so-called profits has he got to pay to these social services, as the Premier told this audience in Battleford.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — A whole lot more than there ever were before.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, you didn't get any as a matter of fact, because outside of the Telephone system and the Power Corporation, there are only \$418,000 of profits; and again after you pay interest on the money invested and other costs of operating those Crown Corporations, there are no profits, and so there could be nothing turned over. Now there's the situation, Mr. Speaker. Is it any wonder they lost The Battlefords by-election telling the people that sort of thing?

Now then, just a nice little touch, Mr. Speaker. We found fault with the using of public money for propaganda purposes for the C.C.F. At times I watch the papers very closely. here's a nice little advertisement appearing in the 'Star-Phoenix' of February 7 — just the day before The Battlefords by-election. Of course, the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office put this ad in the 'Star-Phoenix' just the night before The Battlefords by-election, boosting up the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office; of course that was just a coincidence. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not think that public moneys, either of the Crown Corporations or any other public moneys should be used for partisan propaganda.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Tell your friends at Ottawa.

**Mr. Tucker:** — During a time of war, I am quite aware that, for the sake of carrying on the work of the war, speeches of leaders were made public without public expense; but when we get into a time of peace there is no excuse in the world in a democratic country for one party, which happens to be in office, putting our partisan propaganda at the expense of the people as a whole.

I recall, for example, that one of the speeches made by the Premier in the Cannington by-election was released to the press through the Bureau of Publications. Was that a misuse of public moneys, Mr. Speaker, or was it not, taking part in the by-election as leader of the C.C.F. Party and using public funds to get that across to the people of this province? Well, as far as we are concerned, Mr. Speaker, we protest against that misuse of public funds and we intend to protest against it.

Just in passing, the Provincial Treasurer, I know, is very happy, and so are we, that the cost of money is coming down for us. We are glad that we can borrow at least as cheaply as the City of Regina, and it is time that we should be able to so borrow. If they would have spent more money in paying off public debt and less on some of their fantastic experiments, we would have been able to borrow money as cheaply as the Province of Manitoba. The Province of Manitoba is paying 3.1 per cent on their money, just about 1/2 per cent less than we are paying. That is one of the reasons they can go ahead with their plans.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Give us time.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Oh, you'll need a long time at the present rate to get to that position. I don't think the people will give you the time you need either.

On the question of Federal grants, I just wish to deal with that partly, Mr. Speaker, because one of the things we hear from C.C.F. speakers is this. They say, "Oh, we haven't raised taxation. It has been the municipalities and the school districts that have raised taxation." Well, of course not. Because . . .

**Mr. A.G. Kuziak (Canora):** — The Liberal Government.

**Mr. Tucker:** — There is no Liberal Government in this province. If there had been one, we would have shared the grants from the Dominion, and taxes would have come down in the municipalities and school districts.

**Premier Douglas:** — As you did before.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Manitoba got an increased Federal grant of \$5½ million. They turned around and, in one way and another, they passed on increased school grants of \$2¾ million more than twice the increase in school grants in Saskatchewan. They cancelled the municipal levy of \$800,000 for old age pensions. They made a grant of \$300,000 to the municipalities for road work, and there was a total increase in the money that was paid by the road work, and there was a total increase in the money that was paid by the Provincial Government of Manitoba, from that increased grant from the Federal Provincial Government of Manitoba, from that increased grant from the Federal Government of \$5½ million, to the municipalities to the extent of \$4,000,000. We passed on less than \$1½ million in increased school grants. If we had done the same as Manitoba, we would have passed on nearly \$5½ million. Manitoba and then this Government has the nerve to tell the municipal councillors, "You're the ones who are raising taxes." Well, it's no wonder that they lost the by-election in The Battlefords.

Now then, take the Province of British Columbia. They put on a sales tax, the same as our Education Tax, one-third of which they passed on to their municipalities to cut down school taxes in the amount of \$6,000,000. British Columbia is passing on to her municipalities now a total of \$28 million to help carry the cost of education and the cost of municipal services. What do we do? Well, we keep the money, increase school grants by about \$1½ million; take out around a half-million to help with market roads — mark that! A good part of that out of the equalization fund; leave these people struggling with increased costs; pay no greater share of the cost of running the schools than was paid when the C.C.F. came into office, and then they go and tell the school districts and municipalities, "You are the ones who have increased taxes."

**Premier Douglas:** — We haven't.

**Mr. Tucker:** — What effect did it have right in the City of North Battleford and in the Rural Municipality of Battleford. In 1944, the municipal rate was five mills. Because of rising costs of maintaining T.B. Sanatoriums and other things, the rate went up to twelve mills. The school rate went up from nine to eighteen mills; Public Revenue Tax the same, two mills. The total T.B. levy, because this Government saw the costs rise and continued to pay just a dollar-a-day per patient — the cost to the rural Municipality of North Battleford went up to \$2,000 from \$740. In the City of North Battleford, the total taxes levied are given on the basis of taxes paid rather than assessment,

because there is a change in the basis of assessment. The total taxes levied in the City of North Battleford in 1944, were \$150,000; in 1949, they were \$288,000 – almost twice as much. The T.B. levy in the City of North Battleford went up from \$2,500 to \$7,000. The total cost of public schools in the City of North Battleford increased by \$55,000. This Government increased its school grants to help pay that increase of \$55,000 by \$2,500. The taxpayers put up \$20 for every dollar extra put up by this Government. Is it any wonder that they lost The Battlefords by-election. Let them realize that they are going to have to face the people.

**Premier Douglas:** — It's a pleasure.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Luckily, the Attorney General is giving them comfort now; they can hang on for a full five years. But whether they hang on for five years or four, they are going to have to face the people ultimately and the same things that made the people of The Battlefords turn them down, will make the province turn them down.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, I come to the question of stagnation in Saskatchewan and why we have it. One of the things we find in regard to Saskatchewan is that, last year, while our natural increase in population was about 15,000 people, our increase in population was only 7,000. We did not keep even half of our natural increase. We had the smallest increase in population of any province in Canada except little Prince Edward Island, because of the policy of our Government. Everybody knows that. The Minister of Agriculture apparently does not and of course, he should have learned it if he took part in The Battleford by-election. We are having a great expansion throughout the whole of Canada today, and we are not sharing in it in Saskatchewan. That is the whole situation; and why are we not sharing? Take, for example, the situation in regard to oil resources. Oh, yes, we were told that it was very bad to have these outside United States interests developing our oil resources. We were told that we were going to develop them ourselves.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Make up your mind!

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, you should make up your mind, because you're the Government, and we are going to ask you to make up your minds in a few minutes. Now then . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — You have to have a mind first to make it up.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I know it must be pretty tough from where you are sitting. I have here a book written by the Leader of the C.C.F. Party in the Dominion of Canada, and he cites from the 'Regina Manifesto' in the course of this book, this very article I am going to read to you. This book was written in 1945, and here is what he said in 1945: "We believe these evils can be removed only in a planned and socialized economy."

**Mr. Kuziak:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Tucker:** — "Hear, hear?" I didn't hear everybody over there say, "Hear, hear!" What changed the back benches even? The same original enthusiasm seems to be missing from the front benches.

**Premier Douglas:** — We have heard this record so often; the record is worn, the needle is gone.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Of course, they may not laugh very long when they get before a convention, one of these days. I continue to quote: “In a planned and socialized economy in which our natural resources and the principle means of production and distribution are owned, controlled and operated by the people . . .” Now then, just one person applauded that out of a bunch of C.C.F.’ers opposite to me; just one, Mr. Speaker. That is very interesting. I read in the Speech from the Throne that they are not going to reserve all the natural resources and oil; they are going to reserve 25 per cent of them. To put it right, it is in the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker. Now the 25 per cent is just a quarter of what they started out with. The question is, Mr. Speaker, where do they stand? That’s the question everybody wants to know. The Premier goes to a convention in Winnipeg and, of course, there at the national convention they actually come out for public ownership of fuel industries, including gas, oil and electricity, in addition to coal. There is the attitude of the party as a whole, or the fundamental policy which the C.C.F. Party had laid down by its national leader.

Then, of course, we have the Premier saying, “Come In” to outside interests, handing out millions of acres of land. He even gives out 10,000,000 acres in such a good deal that the people can turn around and make an over-riding commission in turning it over to somebody else. These United States’ and outside companies that were so bad, are permitted to come in and do this, and yet the very company that produced the Leduc oil fields and all the developments in Alberta, was driven out of this province by this Government. The Provincial Treasurer knows says that we hope for the same development as they have in Alberta. He must know that the reason we have not got it, today, is because their Government was elected in 1944. That’s the only reason.

**Premier Douglas:** — Baloney!

**Mr. Tucker:** — We know it is. You have in The Mineral Resources Act, under the amendment to it in 1947, that the Government can, in effect, tear up any contract in regard to natural resources charge any royalty any time they want. Now there is the situation.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — They did that in Alberta.

**Mr. Tucker:** — At the same time, they want people to come in and invest in the province. There is the decision of the national convention. You go to your convention in Saskatoon, where some of your own people, who believe in your policy of Socialism, find fault with this business of letting outside business interests in and turning over these great resources to them. They say, “We should live up to our own policy.” The Premier says any time that a convention decides on anything, I am at their disposal to carry out their will.

**Premier Douglas:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Tucker:** — There, he says it. What security ahs anybody got today, if a convention decides to take over any oil well that may be brought in?

The Premier says that he will bow to their wills. They have the power to do it; the legislation is on the statute books. Is it any wonder that all we have today, is exploration and that sort of thing? We may get some development.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — We won't if you talk that way.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I hope we do, but we can't possibly get the development we should when there is that uncertainty about the situation.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — What would you do?

**Mr. Tucker:** — I would follow the policy that, today, is being followed by the present Government, in reserving 25 per cent Crown reserves, charging 12½ per cent royalty; but I wouldn't give out rights in ten million acres to other people that they could turn around and sell to somebody else at a big profit. But when I was handing out those rights, they would know that we belong to a party that hadn't passed a Bill giving us the right to tear up any contract., that we didn't belong to a party that has as its fundamental policy the socialization of all natural resources. What security is there for anybody there? Well, Mr. Speaker, there is but one man who believes in socialism in the House apparently in this Session; but we will see if the rest are going to follow him or the Minister of Natural Resources in his repudiation of the fundamental policy of their party, as shown by what they are doing with regard to oil reserves, in regard to the oil leases and so on, a repudiation, as C.C.F. followers told you at Saskatoon, or your own policies.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Louder!

**Mr. Tucker:** — Yes, you may try to make a joke of it; but it's not joke to people who elected you on the policies you have repudiated and thrown overboard.

Now, I just wonder, Mr. Speaker, if this C.C.F. group in the Legislature have definitely repudiated their policy once and for all! This is their chance to show the whole world whether they have or not. so, Mr. Speaker, I propose to move an amendment to the motion put before us, seconded by Mr. Danielson (Arm River):

“That the following words be added to the Address: ‘but regret that your Honour's present advisers have, as their ultimate objective, the socialization of our economy as laid down in the Regina Manifesto.’”

I move that amendment and have as the basis for it, the statement made by the Premier of this province, speaking in the House at the last Session, that this ‘Regina Manifesto’ remains their ultimate objective, and this took written by their national leader, that this still remains their ultimate objective. You say you want people to come into this province and invest their money on the strength of the fact that you no longer intend to adhere to your fundamental objectives, that you have repudiated them. Well, now, it is up

to the people of this Legislature to show whether that is the case or not. Have you become only quarter-Socialists, or are you ready to say that this still remains your ultimate objective and that this present policy is just a temporary manoeuvre forced on you by circumstance? It is now time, when this Saskatchewan comes to be voted on, for the members of this Legislature to stand up and to be counted whether they are for Socialism or against it, whether they support this Government in its retreat from Socialism, or whether they are going to stand by the principles upon which they were elected.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The debate is now on the amendment.

**Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, I should first like to extend my congratulations to both Mover and the Seconder of the motion for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I am sure that all who listened to the mover, the hon. member for Kerrobert-Kindersley, yesterday, must have listened with a good deal of envy that a man, who is past his allotted three score years and ten should still have as such mental agility and as fine facility of speech as he displayed. I think he is to be congratulated.

I would also like to offer congratulations to the hon. member Notukeu-Willowbunch for the very concise and able manner in which he presented not only his own views but the views of his constituents on the problems that are confronting the people who he represents in this Assembly. While it is true that the Leader of the Opposition felt that the hon. member spent a little too much time on Federal matters, I would like to point out that the Leader of the Opposition very conveniently forgot that he spent a lot of time telling about the benefits that had come to the people of his constituency. But, of course, there are none so deaf as those who won't hear — unless they be dumb, also.

**Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin):** — Do you have a hundred bucks?

**Premier Douglas:** — Did the member for Moosomin ask if I had a hundred bucks? Before I finish this speech, and deal with the member for Moosomin and the record of how he has conducted himself in the political affairs in this province in the last few weeks, I don't think he'll be talking about a hundred bucks.

I would, also, like to extend my congratulations to Mr. George Stephen, who has become Clerk of this Assembly. Mr. Stephen has a long record of association with this Legislature, and I know, as we all do, that he will discharge his duties faithfully and to the credit and dignity of this Assembly. I am sure that we wish him well in his new office.

I wish also, to extend my congratulations to Mr. Delmar Valleau, who is for this Session acting as Assistant Clerk. He sat in this House as the Armed Forces' representative for the European and Mediterranean Area, and he has been intimately connected with the Legislative Assembly for the past number of years. I know that during this Session we will be pleased to have him here in that capacity.



I would also like to say just a few words of welcome to the two new members who have taken their place during this Session. Mr. McCarthy, the new member for Cannington, we welcome here. We did our very best to keep him from getting here, but now that he is here I am sure that he will be a worthy representative of the people who sent him. I would like him to feel that he is very welcome and that we on the Government side are very glad to associate with him in his new responsibilities.

**Mr. T.A. McCarthy (Cannington):** — Thank you.

**Premier Douglas:** — I would also, of course, extend a welcome to my own colleague here who has taken over my former department and my first love, the Department of Public Health. The Leader of the Opposition did his best to try to arouse any pangs of jealousy that might linger in the breasts of the members on this side of the House, by saying that so many of them had been passed over. I don't think that the Leader of the Opposition will get very many suckers by trailing that kind of bait in these waters.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River):** — You caught them all.

**Premier Douglas:** — The members on this side of the House, I am sure, are well aware of the outstanding abilities which the new member for Gull Lake has — abilities which he displayed in his work with the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, which he demonstrated in the term which he spent as a member for Swift Current in Ottawa, and which he has already demonstrated in the very short space of time that he has been Minister of Public Health in this province. I want to say, personally, that, much as I regretted the fact that the burden of other work made it necessary for me to relinquish the Department of Public Health, I know of no person to whom I would rather have surrendered those heavy responsibilities, and I know very few people who could discharge that responsibility more excellently than can the member from Gull Lake.

I am not going, at this late hour, to deal with the speech which was made by the Leader of the Opposition. He spent a good deal of time telling the Government how to be C.C.F. — condemning us for being Socialist and claiming that we are not Socialist all in the same breath. He did do a little better than last year, in that he found one or two things to commend the Government for. That's an improvement; and I think, if we have him here a few years, we'll get him commending a lot more things that we have done.

I was glad to hear him say that as far as the Hudson Bay Route was concerned, he was behind it. He didn't say how far he was behind it, but it could be; his party has been a long way behind it for a good many years. After he said he was behind it, he said: "If we were the Government," — Well, of course, his party is the Government at the one place where they can do something about the Hudson Bay Route, and that is at Ottawa; and if instead of paying lip-service here the Liberal Party would put some pressure on their friends in Ottawa, certainly more extensive use could be made of the Hudson Bay Route and of Churchill than is being made at the present time.

There isn't any need for my hon. friend or his associates to declaim here about the terrible things that would happen if the Crow's Nest Pass Agreement is interfered with in any shape or form. They have all the

February 21, 1950

power they need at Ottawa, with the tremendous majority they have, which they secured last June, and of which my friend has been boasting for the last hour and a half. With that tremendous majority they can see to it, if they wish, that nobody interferes with the Crow's Nest Pass Agreement.

**Mr. Tucker:** — They will.

**Premier Douglas:** — If my friend thinks they will, then he doesn't need to beat his breast here and call on all people of all political parties in the West to stand against any change. The Liberal Party at Ottawa, with its great majority, can see that there is no change and that no action is taken that will discriminate against the interests of Western Canada and western agriculture in particular.

Having said those few words, Mr. Speaker, and having paid tribute to the new members and to the Mover and Seconder of the motion for the Address-in-Reply, I would beg leave to move the adjournment of the debate.

The motion was agreed to and the debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:55 o'clock p.m.