

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Eleventh Legislature**  
**6th Day**

**Thursday, February 23, 1950.**

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

**DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY**

The House resumed, from Wednesday, February 22, 1950, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Wellbelove for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River):**

Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate, I remember what the Premier said two days ago, when the Leader of the Opposition took part in this debate: he said he had had to listen to the same speech over and over again. Well, it is too bad he is not in his seat now, but I can assure him that, yesterday, was the twelfth or thirteenth time in the last six years that I have listened to the same thing, only with the difference that he has now taken a refresher course in Socialistic policies.

Mr. Speaker, on this occasion I would like to take the opportunity of congratulating the new member for Gull Lake, the Minister of Public Health. I was down there for a few days and did my best to keep him away from here, but in spite of that he is here and I am glad to see him here. He is not a newcomer to Assemblies of this kind; he is an old veteran. I have read many of the speeches that he made in the House of Commons and with some of the things he said I agree, and with some of them I do not agree. I would like to make a few remarks which are not applicable to him personally by any means. When he was brought in as Minister of Public Health, Mr. Speaker, the Cabinet once again reached a baker's dozen and the Planning Board is still carrying on in this province and taking the work away from this Cabinet. The Hospital Services Commission is doing the work of that Branch of the Government's business, the Bureau of Publications is working overtime preparing propaganda to disseminate among the people of Saskatchewan at the taxpayer's expense; our broadcasters have been employed by this Government to put this propaganda and the principals involved in them over the province to the people — at the taxpayer's expense again. It is a lovely set-up, Mr. Speaker, so long as the taxpayer can afford to spend. Now it is getting somewhat monotonous so far as the people of Saskatchewan are concerned, and it won't be long, Mr. Speaker, before you will have just the same reaction to that type of propaganda the Government puts out at the people's expense, of Socialistic propaganda of the same type as Watson Thomson and "Nosey" Parker aggregation used to produce. It is just exactly the same thing, only there is a little more finance to it; but the purpose and the result is supposed to be the same.

Now then, I would like to say a few words of congratulation to my deskmate here, the new member from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy). He ought to be proud and I am glad to have opportunity of being able to sit with him here because, after all, he is the highest-priced member in this House. There has never been a man come into this House, Mr. Speaker, who can say he is worth a million dollars. I say that without any fear of contradiction.

The people of that constituency were promised \$800,000 to keep him out of here – and that was not all. They were promised market roads, improvements to the summer resort of Kenosee Lake, and a swimming pool – I think to wash themselves up. When the C.C.F. are up there, the Lord knows they need washing up! Nevertheless, the people of that constituency repudiated, threw this million dollars aside and said, “We want Ross McCarthy.” That is the greatest tribute that can be paid to any man, and the people of the constituency know him, appreciate him as a man and friend, and regard him as an honourable citizen of the community, and I certainly wish to extend my heartiest congratulations to him. I wish him well so long as he remains a member of this House which, no doubt, will be as long as he is able and willing to carry on the duties.

My mind goes back, Mr. Speaker, to the second Session of this Legislature, when the hon. Provincial Treasurer delivered his Budget Speech. This is what he said – I took it down because I thought perhaps if the Lord let us live long enough we might be able to read it back to him. He said this: “I can wish tonight for nothing else but that this Government will be in power for the next fifteen or twenty years, or maybe longer.” What an optimist! Well, we had to sit down and take it at that time. We could do nothing else. We were licked and we were licked properly – just as badly and just about the same way as this bunch across the floor of the House will be licked, next election. We saw them bowed in the Dominion election last summer, Mr. Speaker, and you know that was a terrible catastrophe that overtook the Socialistic Party in Canada at that time. It was a catastrophe, because we had in their group in the House of Commons 32 members, and they come back with 13: thirteen members all over Canada. And only two of these thirteen, Mr. Speaker – and that should sink home with my friends (I can see the Minister of Agriculture or Ag-Rep. Research grinning, but it is a flat grin) that only two of these thirteen members represent rural constituencies in the Dominion of Canada, and these come from the province of Saskatchewan. Not one solitary member, except these two, was elected by a rural constituency.

**Mr. Walker:** — You are wrong.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I am not wrong. In Manitoba the two seats are urban. I know what I am talking about, and anytime you would like to have a little information on this subject you come over here and I will give it to you. That is the situation, Mr. Speaker. What does it mean? Well, it means that the rural population of this province of Saskatchewan and of all the provinces in Canada has repudiated them, and the same indications were visible in the province of Ontario, in 1948, when every member of the C.C.F. who ran in a rural seat lost his deposit. Today they are not a farmer-labour party, Mr. Speaker; they are nothing else but a tag end of the labour unions who are in politics in this Dominion of Canada, today. That is all they are.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Was that a Provincial election in Ontario the member was referring to?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes, that was in the election of 1948.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, the hon. member should know that there are no deposits in Ontario.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, that is pretty handy for the C.C.F. because they don't like to put up any money anyway. They don't believe in capitalism, and any man that has a hundred dollars in his pocket would be a

capitalist as far as the C.C.F. is concerned.

Well, that is the situation; but not one of them, Mr. Speaker, was able to be elected in the rural seat in Ontario and this same indication was plainly visible in this province. There is no question about this. There is one thing which really puzzles me. I cannot understand the sense of some of these people in the northern part of the province of Saskatchewan. Last summer, when we had the Dominion election, the city of Regina did a sensible thing. They kicked out the outstanding spearhead of the Socialist Party in this province of Saskatchewan and put a doctor, a very honourable gentleman, in his place. You all remember the following day, or even election night; I heard over the radio a call of distress from my hon. friend, the Junior Member for Regina (Hon. Mr. Williams). That was a call of distress, Mr. Speaker. What did Regina get out of that election? We got a blacktop road up to Regina Beach.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — And no water.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Hear that Minister of Transportation over there! Just as soon as the election was over in Regina, these two members saw that we had to do something, so they sent for the Minister of Highways and he said, “We’ll have to build a road so that these fellows can get up to Regina Beach and not get any dust on them”; so we gave them the blacktop road. So the city of Moose Jaw, seeing the sense of this action, did the same thing and put a Liberal member into the city of Moose Jaw. Well then, the people got the blacktop road from Moose Jaw to Long Lake, which, of course, will help them along in the scheme of things. These are things we should not forget.

For my friend from Notukeu-Willow Bunch, (Mr. Buchanan) I will have all the respect in the world. He did a marvelous job in a sense; but it is a very difficult task to make a speech on nothing.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Don’t apologize.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Seeing absolutely nothing in the Speech from the Throne, he could not make a speech on it. I was going to get up in the middle of the speech and ask if you had made a mistake in permitting one of his resolutions on the Order Paper; but then I listened carefully and because he was talking about Federal matters all the time, I want to say this. He just had one thing, and that was rent controls. Well, that has been a very difficult matter, Mr. Speaker, and this Government is certain that they will take care of it; but I don’t think they will have very much to do, because I think, if this Government stays in power and carries on like they have done, there will be lots of vacant houses in the province of Saskatchewan. The people are going away from here all the time, and I don’t think we will need to worry about that in the next three or four years, because we have a warning from the Attorney General of this province that there won’t be an election until 1953.

Well, then, we have our friend over here from Notukeu-Willow Bunch, and he may be a mighty nice fellow at that. But there is one thing I would like to make a note of in that address, Mr. Speaker, and it is this. It is a very tragic thing, that reference in his speech about the lady losing her baby. Now, I am not going to criticize the Government for that, but I could not help thinking that, if the situation had been reversed, and we had been there, probably we would have had a special broadcast on the radio blaming it on the Liberal Government for their neglect in not looking after the welfare of the people of this province. These things will happen, and they are the fault of no one. But don’t forget this, Mr. Speaker; when you were

sitting over here, my friend from Canora was carting along a camera all over the countryside to take pictures of some of these happenings and then using them in an election. There is one thing he did say which I appreciate, and he is honest about it. he is not a “hybrid” Socialist, Mr. Speaker; he is a full-blooded Socialist, and he says, “I would be the last one to say that the ultimate in Socialism had been reached.” Well, that shows clearly that he is honest about it, and we can’t call him a hybrid.

The Premier, yesterday, had a difficult time and a difficult subject to deal with. It should not have been difficult for him because he has repeated it so many times; so that makes it necessary for me to repeat some of the things you heard from me before, Mr. Speaker. He painted us a very rosy picture of some of the Crown Corporations. he has not only done that in the province of Saskatchewan, but he has even been out in British Columbia telling the people there that they should follow the example of this Government and make some money – easy money. he told them that there was only one Crown Corporation that had lost money.

I am not going to spend very much time on this, but I am going to reply to some of the things that he said. This was at Powell River, June 1st, 1949: “Only one of the Crown Corporations lost money. The total investment in that one Crown Corporation was less than one per cent of the total investment.” He told nothing about the other 99 per cent, or where Saskatchewan Industries Limited – the tannery and shoe factory of about 25 men, and the woollen mill are. I was asked why they wanted a woollen factory. Well, I think I should have said something else in there. I am afraid I might break the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, so I am not going to say anything.

Well, now, I am going to give you a few figures here. I am going to give you the figures of seven Crown Corporations that we have checked over in this House in the Crown Corporations Committee the last few years. They are the Brick Plant, Shoe Factor, Tannery, Woollen Mill, Government Airways, Box Factory, Fish Board – and I am going to add one to these, and make it eight. In the last two years the net operating loss on these seven Crown Corporations was \$695,363; interest on the capital investment at four per cent which cost this Government \$211,364. They did not even charge for auditing expenses for these Crown Corporations; they were paid out of the public Treasury. There you have another \$60,472 in probably two years. We can add the eighth Corporation which are the Bus Lines. for the two years there is a loss, including interest, which should have been paid but wasn’t paid, of \$84,730, making a total operating loss and interest not paid of \$961,929.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, surely the hon. gentleman is not making that statement in good faith. That statement is not correct.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I am making it, then you can sit down and figure it out. the capital invested in this Crown Corporation and the seven corporations, Mr. Speaker, is \$2,642,052, in the Bus Line, \$1,230,000, a total in the eight corporations of \$3,772,052. That is the history of the eight Crown Corporations. And let me clarify myself; I am not starting anything. You can go to work and disprove my figures if you like. The only change in the auditor’s statement is that, two years ago, it took almost \$38,000 – odd out of the public treasury and gave it to the Fish Corporation as a grant, and this has been added to the other losses. It is a two-year statement, Mr. Speaker, and in the case of the Box Factory where there was a small

profit last year, this was offset against it. It was deducted; and where there was a loss last year where there had been a profit before, the loss was deducted from the profit and was offset in that way. My figures are correct and they are there. We can do nothing, Mr. Speaker, for the Planning Board. It is the “brains’ trust” operating these money-making corporations.

**Mr. Loftson:** — They are not worth anything, anyway!

**Mr. Danielson:** — What a businessman would do when he gets a bunch of dead horses around him, supposed to make money for him and failing completely, he would put them on a commission basis, and if they could not make any money they would not get any salary and then they could not eat. Then, I am sure, they would make a little money out of these Government corporations. At least it would have the effect of having them earn their money by the sweat of their brow, anyway. That is what they should do. All this thing is a bunch of parasites on the taxpayers of the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, that is all I want to say about the Crown Corporations, and I think that is plenty. For the time being according to the sort of a mild statement of the Premier, yesterday, I have no hope that the coming information through the auditor’s statement which will be laid before the Committee in a few days will indicate any better conditions this year. I think, if any thing, perhaps they are worse. As a matter of fact, I would suggest to my friends over here, who are so wise to their thinking and who are so particularly critical of someone else. We have been criticized every day about the unemployment in Canada, we have unemployment in Saskatchewan. Sure we have. Why don’t you operate your Salt plant? Why don’t you open your brick plant which you went out and threw away \$40,000 on last year? The Prime Minister himself admitted it to me, and he said, “I guess that’s just about it.” That was his expression when I told him. Now, why don’t you do this? This Government started these things to give employment to our people. What’s wrong with them speaking to these enthusiastic Socialists? and I know we have some genuine ones over there. I am not so sure about the Premier — he is hiding; but after yesterday I would not say he was a Socialist any more. For a fellow who talks the other way today from what he did yesterday, I would kind of believe that he has turned into a hard-bitten capitalist.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is some question about it. There has been some really serious attempt made in this province to try to convince the people of Saskatchewan that this Government is not Socialist. “We are not Socialist because we have stuck to a programme of planned economy in a Co-operative commonwealth Federation.” So, Mr. Speaker, that did not say they didn’t say so in 1944. You did not speak that way when you were sitting on this side of the House. Then it was pure unadulterated Socialism that you stood for. George Williams and the Quintuplet’s sitting here four years from 1934 to 1938, never made any bones about it, Mr. Speaker; they stood for purely the same Socialistic concepts, for state administration and economy such as they have in Russia; and that is the only Socialism in existence on the face of the earth today.

**Mr. Kuziak:** — What about Sweden?

**Mr. Danielson:** — If I did not know any more about Sweden, I would never open my mouth. They have been paddling that fairy story for 10 or 12 years now. We have not got as much Socialism in Sweden today as we

have in the Dominion of Canada; and I know what I am talking about – you don't. When this government was elected in 1944, they immediately set out with grim determination – to do what? They set out to make the people of this province more susceptible to accept the real works, when they got ready to give it to them, of Socialism. I remember one of the first things, Mr. Speaker, that happened. The Provincial Treasurer over here I think will remember the seed grain story – “Saskatchewan's Seed Grain Story”; that was of many different colours and stripes – just like the Socialists: one is pink and other one is red and other is only 25 per cent and some of them on 2 1/2 per cent. That is what it was. And that story was distributed how? through the Postal services? Oh, no! Through the public schools, Mr. Speaker, through the public schools, I remember my leader, Mr. Patterson, sitting here in this seat and he got up and protested, and the Premier got up and said, “Ha, ha! That's nothing to be excited about; you are going to get lots more of it. You will have something to get excited about before we get through with you.” Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, what was the next step? Why this Government came out, went to Manitoba and hired that mountebank Communist Mr. Watson Thomson. He was a Communist, and every person in Canada knows he was a Communist.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Who was he working for when we hired him?

**Mr. Danielson:** — You answer the question because I did not hire him. You did. Then what, Mr. Speaker? We had a group of fellows here who collaborated with him. We had Watson Thomson, Edward ‘Red Nosey’ Parker, we had a gentleman by the name of Wirick, R.D. Henderson, T.C. Caulfield and the editors of the “Living Newspaper” Edward Parker, Bill Harding, Irene Leman, and Hilda Butler. Talk about storm-troopers! These were the storm-troopers to put the Socialists doctrine into the hearts and minds of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. That's what they were, and they did it under the direction and chairmanship of the Minister of Education. They kept on and kept on, Mr. Speaker, and I have a whole file here. I could spend the whole afternoon on this, but I just want to recite what leads up to what I am going to say. They paid that mountebank Watson Thomson \$6,355 for approximately 15 1/2 months; \$1,520.00 travelling expenses and then when they kicked him out (which they had to do) they piled him up and put him on a train and sent him to Vancouver, and they paid the express on his contents. Yes, that's what they did. Well, Mr. Speaker, that shows what the foundation of Socialism was in the Province of Saskatchewan.

There is lots more here that I could say, but I am not going to take up my time for that, but I have got something more to say. I am going to lead up to it, because I noticed that, yesterday, the Premier made a special effort, not for the first time yesterday – it was done in 1948, 1949 and 1950 because the blackout of Socialistic is too costly. Of course on the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker, this was promoted in 1947 because there was an election in 1948. They have talked about everything else but Socialism and it they have tried to keep it on ever since. Now then, I remember the Premier asking a member on this side of the house if he had ever read the Russian Constitution, and the answer was ‘no’. Well, if he had asked me, Mr. Speaker, I could have said ‘yes’, because I have read it. How did I happen to get it? A gentleman in my town had it mailed to him and he handed it to me and said, “Will you read this?” I said, “Sure, I would do it,” and I spent some time and read this thing. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that in the Russian Constitution, the words “Socialism” and “Socialist” appear 49 times but the word “Communist” appears only twice

in that document, and then only with reference to the political party and not with reference to the economic organization of the country.

I want to read you these two short paragraphs, and then afterward I will tell you where they come from:

“The . . . State of today suppressing the working classes and protecting the pirate gains of bankers and stock exchange speculators, Is the arena for the most reckless private enrichment and the lowest political profiteering. it gives no thought to its people and provides no high moral bond of union. The power of money, the most brutal of all powers, holds us in chains. The industrialists, great and small, have but one end in view – profits. Our economic principles are to provide the necessities of life, not to secure the highest rate of interest but to secure the highest rate on capital. All large businesses must be nationalized. All banks must be nationalized. Deliberately an organic order will come from the advice of the best brains untainted by money power and big business.”

Here is the next one:

“We are undertaking to build a new society. Power has become more and more concentrated in the hands of a small irresponsible minority of financiers and industrialists. contradictions and conflicts are the essence of capitalism because an economy governed by the motive of profit is, by its very nature, in conflict with the needs of the people and in contradiction with the objectives of a progressive society. Private banks belonging to the era of private enterprise which is fast fading will be taken over and incorporated in the national banking system.”

And, so, Mr. Speaker, this is two Socialists speaking, representing the two Socialistic systems: the first one comes from Hitler’s Germany and the next one is taken out of the book “Make This Your Canada.”

Again the Premier, yesterday as on every occasion for the last two years picked up his chance to try to make the people believe that the only saviour from Communism is what he called “Democratic Socialism.” There is no such thing as a Democratic Socialism in the world. There is not one who talks more about Democratic Socialism than Mr. Stalin, or Mr. Tito, Mr. Gromyko or Mr. Molotoff. Leaders of democracy in European countries had to flee their countries and come over here to seek asylum in the free nations of Canada and the United States. That is the situation. There were two men who did not get here: one was the great President Benes of Czechoslovakia, and the other the Prime Minister of that country, Mr. Masaryk. One of them died of a broken heart, and the other one jumped out through a window.

I remember the indignation professed, last year, by the Premier of this Province, when one of my colleagues, sitting back in the seat here, made some reference to this matter. “Why,” the Premier said, “there isn’t a man in this House worthy to tie the shoelaces of a man like

Mr. Masaryk.” Well, Mr. Speaker, I don’t actually disagree with that statement. Nevertheless, what was the reason for the tragedy that these great men had to end their days in the manner in which they did? How did they come to do what they did? Mr. Speaker, there were only 34 communists sitting in the Czech. parliament in a House of approximately 220 members. how then was it possible for communists to take control? Because Socialists were Communists; they were real Socialists, they were not hybrids; they were real Socialists in disguise. Tat was the position, and I challenge any member in this House to prove to me and to this House that in every nation in Europe where the Communists have got final control without the Socialists so-called, milk-and-water Socialist shave come first and the Communists, the real Socialists, have come afterwards. The Socialists have preceded.

In spite of what the Premier of this province says – I was just going to mention china – who was the real Socialist in China? I am going to tell you my friend now, if he checks back on Chinese history he will find who was the real Socialist in China, Dr. Sun-Yat-Sen. Where is Mrs. Sun-Yat-Sen today: one of the spearheads in the Communists movement in China today; that’ where she is.

Mr. Speaker, that is socialism. I know these men don’t like to listen to me, they would wish that I was someplace else. Why all the mealy-mouthed Socialists in the whole of Saskatchewan and Canada and every other country have all got their own definitions of this creed. I have one definition here taken from the 14th edition of Encyclopedia Britannica and it says this: “The Communist Manifesto drafted by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, and issued in the year of revolution, 1848, is generally regarded as the starting point of Britain’s modern Socialism. The distinction between Socialism as represented by the various Socialist and labour parties of Europe and the New World, and communism, represented by the Russians and the minority groups in other countries, is one of tactics and strategy rather than of objective. Communism is, in other words, Socialism pursued by revolutionary means and making its revolutionary method a canon of hate. Communists, like other Socialists, believe in the collective control and ownership of the vital means of production and seek to achieve, through state action, the co-ordinated control of economic forces of society.”

Well, isn’t that clear enough? Mr. Cole, what doe she say – G.D.H. Cole, professor Cole, who until very recently, was the chairman of the British Labour Party in Great Britain, and he said this in an article he wrote under the title ‘A Socialized Civilization’. These are his words:

“The characteristics of centralized planning and control which are common to the Nazi-German and to the Soviet Union, they are not accidents, they are the direct outcome of certain technical conditions and are indispensable in some measure to any twentieth century society that is to rest on a solid foundation. They have to be accepted a parts of the order of our daily work, and upon them we ought to build as best we can being the possessors of great scientific powers which we have not yet learned the art of controlling and subordinating to the nobler human desires. Even man as he is, even these forces as they are, it is inevitable that any society capable of standing



the test of the struggle for existence under 20th century conditions shall have built into its very foundation the complement of centralized planning and control as exemplified both in Nazi-Germany and the Soviet Union.”

Now that is G.D.H. Cole’s definition of Socialism. I have another definition of Socialism here, Mr. Speaker, which I will read to you. it is very short and right to the point. Oscar Wilde said: “Socialism is a system which can only be put into operation in heaven where they don’t need it, or in hell where they have it already.” That definition might be a little more easy to pick up.

Premier Douglas of this province – I respect his position as much as anyone – told you in the Forum in Regina here, not so long ago, that capitalism and free enterprise produced riches and luxury for the few and misery, dearth and privation for the many. Two months ago Mr. Mosher, the great labour leader in Canada, spoke at, I think, Calgary, and he said this; that Canada today was the best place in the world to live and work, but he said it could be made a still better place. I agree absolutely with Mr. Mosher. Under capitalism and free enterprise we’ll prove this, Mr. Speaker, that it will be made a better place, just as soon as we eliminate this old moth-eaten creed of Socialism which is trying to entrench itself in this western land.

These fellows don’t like to be called Socialists, that is why I use it all the time; but we have a memory and it used to be said that the good that people do is interred with their bones and the evil they do lives after them. We had a group of people sitting on this side of the House when we were in power, and one of them was Mr. Valteau, with all due respect to Mr. Valteau – a fine gentleman and I have nothing to say against him personally, whatever; but he made a speech when Carl Stewart, from Yorkton, was sitting here and he asked him to elucidate a little longer the platform of the C.C.F. Party, and here was the answer he gave to Mr. Stewart on March 2, 1944. He said:

“We propose to take over the larger corporations, the banks, the larger insurance companies, the saving from profits realized by the larger corporations would under Government ownership go into the public treasury, and would not be withdrawn from circulation. The profits could be used to improve the position of the people and provide them with a better life,” said Mr. Valteau. “ Life insurance policies will be continued in force after the C.C.F. Government takes over the insurance companies. After all, \$700,000,000 in life insurance was lost during the depression, and I was one that lost, too; I lost one policy.”

Well now that is clear enough – I am not arguing the point, I am only putting this on record.

It is only one year ago, last summer, Mr. Speaker, since they had a Convention in Winnipeg, and that was a National Convention, and here is some of their platform. In some respects their convention has gone even farther than the Regina Manifesto. This socialist document called to

make a public ownership of banking, insurance, transportation, communication and electric power; a second step – there was to be socialization of mining, the pulp and paper industry, and the distribution of milk, bread, coal and gasoline. This programme adds to the list of those things to be socialized immediately the primary iron and steel industries, meat packing plants, farm implement factories and fertilizer factories. What can be left, Mr. Speaker? They have stood on the floor of this House on several occasions and declared that this Socialistic Government platform is the same as the Labour Party's in Great Britain. Mr. Strachey said, last summer, that the socialization of land in Great Britain has by no means been abandoned; he said the only reason that it had not been put into effect was the fact that it would mean disruption of production. But it is coming. Everyone knows that the socialization of farm land in this province was not abandoned by this province but it kept running up against the constitution, but just wait until this group with this political philosophy preached from the other side of the House ever gain control of the Dominion House, then, Mr. Speaker, there will be no hold-back from putting the platform as a whole into concrete operation.

These are the things that I want to remind this House of. After putting this Government and this party on record so clearly and so concisely, there is no getting out of this thing. We all know that putting into full effect the Socialistic programme is not possible in the province of Saskatchewan; but there is no doubt, and it has never been disowned by this party in the National sphere that the socialization of land is one of the things in that programme that can not be put into effect until control of the National Government has been taken. I have said on numerous occasions in this House, Mr. Speaker, that there is no difference between Socialism and Communism when it is put fully into effect. Well now, why do I say that? Because I know – I take the word of these men who have pioneered this Socialistic movement in the province of Saskatchewan and in other countries of the world and I quoted to you that Mr. G.D.H. Cole says so, and Sir Stafford Cripps says so, Joe Stalin says so, John Strachey says so.

Mr. Speaker, on April 23, 1934, Mr. Woodsworth was speaking in Winnipeg and he said this: "The doctrines of the C.C.F. are the doctrines of the United Front towards Communists, and all that keeps us apart is a difference of tactics and suspicion of insincerity." That is Mr. G.S. Woodworth – he was not a hybrid; he was a Socialist and he said he was. Now then, what did he say here? Some people shouted, "This is Socialism"; "This is Bolshevism"; and he said, "Maybe it is. What about it?" That was reported in the 'Border City Star', December 12, 1942. Mr. M.J. Coldwell, Leader of the National Party says this: "Profits and ownership have to go," reported in the Leader-Post, December 23, 1942. Mr. Wince, M.L.A., said: "The C.C.F. must be broad enough to include extreme leftists and extreme rightists. This condition of the class struggle is the basis of our economic system" – Toronto Evening Telegram. I am not going to quote the Minister of Reconstruction, because he is not in his seat. Mr. Nollet, the Minister of Agriculture in this province, when he spoke to the Regina 'Forum' here one Sunday, said this: "Price control is not the whole solution, but it would give us a breathing-spell on the road to Socialist or planned economy." Is he a Socialist? If you had been anyone that came into this House in 1946 or 1947 when some of these debates something like this were going on, Mr. Speaker, there was a group of Socialists here, and they were so pro-Russian that they could not get any work, and if anybody doubts that, I am going to read the pages out of Hansard for them, for that particular Session, to prove my statement.

The “C.C.F. News” on November 11, 1943 had this to say: “The approval of the church’s conditions provided the C.C.F. respects private property is not revolutionary. Well, if the C.C.F. accepts these conditions it may be adopted into the church, but the C.C.F. will then be dead.” That is the ‘C.C.F. News’. If they adopt the principle of respecting private property then they will be dead. Sure, they will be dead, because that is the spearhead that they follow. I can still go a little further. Sir Stafford Cripps, speaking in the House, in London, February, 1946, made this statement: “No country in the world, so far as I know, has thus succeeded in carrying through a planned economy without compulsion of labour. Our objective is to carry through a planned economy without compulsion of labour.” Since that time, Mr. Speaker, that same Sir Stafford Cripps put through a Bill, in the House of Commons in London, the Labour Government, that conscripted under that bill 675,000 persons in Great Britain. That is Socialist legislation for you.

This paper I am quoting from there, Mr. Speaker, is the “Scottish Co-operator”, October 23rd, 1948 and this article that is written by Mr. Frank Bestwick, Labour M.P. in the British Parliament at the present time. He said this – it was at a social gathering and he mentioned that Field Marshall Viscount Montgomery was holding for the other day about the menace of Communism and someone said, “If we were asked, what is Communism, what should we reply, Mr. Field Marshall?” The Field Marshall at once, from the fund of his own knowledge, enlightened the enquirer as follows: “When I was in Moscow I saw Stalin, whom I know very, very well, and we had some interesting discussions. I said to him, ‘Mr. Stalin, what is the difference between Communism and Socialism?’” Stalin replied that in a Socialistic state everyone worked for the State and was paid according to what each had earned. Under communism we also work for the State but we are paid according to need. So I said to Mr. Stalin, the Field Marshall went on, have you got Communism in Russia? “Oh, no!” he said, ‘We can’t afford it. There is only one country in the world which can afford Communism and that is in the United States of America, because the productive capacity of United States is sufficient to supply everything that every human being in that country needs.’” Now that is all we have on Mr. Stalin.

Mr. Strachey was in Toronto in 1946 (this is dated, June 27, and I think some of his leading lights of Socialism from the province of Saskatchewan were down there to meet him; and, you know, Mr. Strachey was an out-and-out Communist at one time and he wrote a book just like my friend George Williams. He was asked questions about Socialism and he said he was not quite as strong about Socialism as he used to be, but he was finally asked whether he thought the Russian Government was a real Communist Government. Mr. Strachey said, “The Russian Government, is not a Communist Government. I have no doubt that the Russians would say so themselves. It was the government that has not progressed to Communism that was practising Socialism.”

And again, there was my friend George Williams – and he was a friend of mine and I respect him: he was not a hybrid, he was a genuine Socialist. He also wrote a book in which he said: “The Communist Party is the spiritual head of the Socialist movement. Communism can best be described as the new religion of Socialism.” And here is another quotation: “One cannot join the Communist Party unless one renounces all ethical religion, and all Russian officials must be Socialists!” That was said by Mr. George Williams. What about your friend Carlyle King. Certainly you won’t repudiate him; you won’t backtrack on him will you? Well, I am going

to read you what he says. In this publication, printed in Regina here, "Saskatchewan Commonwealth", November 1, under the heading "Communism" he makes this statement: "When the Bolshevik group seized power in Russia in 1917, Lenin suggested calling the party Communist, and this suggestion was adopted. This calls to mind the chief difference between the Communist Party and the democratic Socialist parties of Europe and America. It is a matter of the best method to be used in achieving Socialism . . . the objective of the Communist is the same as that of the Socialist." And just so someone cannot accuse me of cutting this sentence short, Mr. Speaker, I am going to read the rest of it. He said, "We believe in the raising of the standard of living of all of the people through the community ownership of the means of mass production and the planned development of the community's economic life." You are not repudiating Carlyle King are you?

Now then, Mr. McLeod, a member of the Legislature in the province of Ontario, he came in here to help the Communists in Regina to help the C.C.F. in Regina; now this was done in a round-about way but that is what happened. In the last election of June, 1948. He said this: "There was no Communism even in the Soviet Union – that was a Socialist country. Socialism was the first stage of communism, and Communism was the last stage of Socialism." That is a complete assertion. Mr. Lloyd George said this: "We cannot trust the battle of freedom to Socialists. Socialism had no interest in liberty. Socialism means the community in bonds. if you establish a Socialist community it means the most comprehensive, universal and pervasive a tyranny as this country has ever seen." That is Mr. Lloyd George.

Now, I will come closer to home and certainly no Socialist, not even a hybrid Socialist, will repudiate this gentleman. Mr. Douglas went to New York. I think that he went there to see his friend Dr. . . . , who is the Director of the League for Industrial Democracy in the United States – a Communist organization who was investigated by the Un-American Committee of the Senate several times. He was here to a Convention in 1946 or 1947. Mr. Douglas, the Premier of this province, went down there to New York, and conferred with this man, and the first thing he did was to go into the "Town Hall" – which is the same as your "Forum" here in Regina – and he made a speech, and he just took the hide off all the capitalists in New York city. But anyhow, he made another speech of which I have two reports here – one from eastern Canada and one from the province of Saskatchewan – and here is what he said: "There were only two great ideologies in existence in the world today; the one was Communism which offers security in return for freedom; and capitalism, which says we can retain our Freedom but we must forego all freedom in regard to social security." He said there was only two. How true! I hope he will say this to the people of the province of Saskatchewan. I hope he will be just as frank with the people of this province as he was with the Americans in New York City. He said, "Two great ideologies exist in the world today." I think this establishes once and for all, Mr. Speaker, that when this group across the country talk about the Co-operative Commonwealth, and when they talk about Socialistic Democracy, and Socialism, they are just trying to hide the true nature of the ideology and the philosophy they are trying to put into operation. There is no doubt about that. I think they should tell the people in Saskatchewan who trusted them, took them for being genuine, not hybrid, Socialists, and dissatisfied today, because they have retreated, they are back-tracking; and the people who never were Socialists but were only social reformers, they have betrayed them because they have gone far beyond where they expected them to go. As a matter of fact what we have seen in Saskatchewan will prove how far they go.

They did not tell you that they were going to put in the Regina Manifesto in regard to the socialization of land. But, Mr. Speaker, they come at it in another, round-about way. So far as this Government can devise, through this Government today you have socialization of land. At any rate no person can go out and buy a piece of land from this Government, pay cash and get a title. If that has been changed, it has been changed lately, and I would be extremely glad to find that it has been changed; but it is a fact, and has been a fact, so far as I know, up to this time.

I want to say a few words, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the Education Tax. I know the Provincial Treasurer will like this because, after all, I know he sheds tears every time he has to collect a dollar of that tax, because he does not want it; and I know the members on the other side of the House think of this as a “stinking” tax. But the Premier of the province made another speech in which he said this: “Taxes: a main tax when we took office was the sales tax. We said to the people before election – we cannot take it off immediately but will do so immediately we can develop other resources of revenue. We now have removed 60 per cent of the tax. We took the tax off all meals and all food, off everything sold in grocery stores, drugs, school-books and, today, there is only 40 per cent of the tax left. We cannot take it off because we need the revenue, but the main tax has been reduced on that basis.” Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish I could find some way that I could apply his method of arithmetic to some of my business on the farm and we could beat the Income Tax Department all the way. Two years ago we were told, first by the Provincial Treasurer (I never heard it said by the Premier) that the reduction in this tax was 40 per cent. They have added 10 per cent each year for the last two years and now they have 60 per cent. They took off 60 per cent now there is only 40 per cent left. Well, the peculiar thing about that, Mr. Speaker, is that 40 per cent brings in more than twice as much money as the 100 per cent did a few years ago. It might be interesting to know that perhaps there was not 60 per cent., or even 40 per cent of the tax reduced by any action of this Government because, in the original Act, there were many exemptions – bread, flour and milk including buttermilk, cream, butter, eggs, sugar, fresh meat, fresh poultry, fresh fish, water, coal, wood, newspapers, gasoline taxable under the gasoline Act, farm implements and cars, farm machinery, grain and mill feed, binder twine, fishing nets, cars, farm machinery, grain and mill feed, binder twine, fishing nets, agricultural products (including livestock) produced within the province when sold by the producer, railway rolling stock, ties and steel rails. Well now, that is clear enough so the articles on which the education tax was removed, Mr. Speaker, after all are small articles and what is the biggest loss of removing taxes off the meals in restaurants and hotels. I have no objection to that, but certainly when it comes to pickles, spices, etc. that purchase at anytime is not as great as we would be lead to believe.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, is he denying the statement which was prepared by the officials of the Government in the Taxation Branch, by men who were employed by the Government for the last ten or fifteen years? Is he denying the figures which they gave us?

**Mr. Danielson:** — As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, just as soon as the hon. gentleman sees fit to let me have these figures I shall give him my answer to that question. The tax has been used for purposes for which it was never intended under the Act. On every platform in the land, on the radio, in this House, on the street corners and everywhere else, we were told of the benefits gains by this tax. When the Royal Commission was appointed to investigate the tax here is what Mr. Justice Martin has to say: “The Commission desires to state most explicitly that

every dollar derived from the Education Tax since its enactment, has been and is being expended for educational purposes in accordance with the provisions of The Education Act, Chapter 9 of the Statutes of 1937.” this was the condition which existed under the Liberal interpretation of the Education Tax, and I think you will all agree that Mr. Justice Martin is a man the people in the province of Saskatchewan will believe, and will be willing to accept that as being a fact, not just can’t. However, at the present time, that is not so, to my mind, because millions of dollars have been taken out of this fund for the purpose of constructing buildings at the University of Saskatchewan; that money should be going to pay more salaries to the teachers and more grants to our schools in the province of Saskatchewan. That is what it was there for, and there is not a man on either side of the House who was not firmly convinced at the time the discussion took place in this House, on second reading and in Committee, that that was the true intent of The Education Tax Act when it was passed by us.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Why did you not abolish it then?

**Mr. Tucker:** — You are the one to do that.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I am not through with you yet.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Good!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Now I am going to read you a letter from one of the people of my constituency. An implement man handed me this letter, dated October 3, 1949:

“Dear Sir:

We have been advised by the Taxation Branch of Saskatchewan Treasury Department that fertilizer attachments cannot be granted exemptions from the two per cent Education Tax during the present year 1949. This matter is to be given further consideration early in the new year. It will, therefore, be necessary to collect Education Tax on all attachments until such time as you are advised that they are exempt from this tax.”

I wonder if fertilizer attachments on a drill or on a one-way are not a farm implement, Mr. Speaker. I just wonder.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Ask the Minister of Agriculture.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — It is not under your Act.

**Mr. Danielson:** — It’s the Treasury Department, your Department. That’s the way the Treasury Department operates.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — It is not the Treasury Department.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I would like to ask something of the Minister of Agriculture, now that he is engaged in revamping and renovating, and trying to elevate the standard of living for the people of Saskatchewan, and has hired all kinds of men to help him – agriculture representatives.

He is carrying on a small P.F.R.A. in the province, and I hope he will make a success of it. From what I have seen up in Western Saskatchewan, North-Western Saskatchewan and even in my constituency, there is a great need for something to be done. I am not so happy as my friend from Willowbunch to be able to say that I have had \$32,000, spent in my seat. I have not got 32 cents in my seat. When they handed to the hospital grant they gave me \$300 a bed for the Imperial hospital and they went up about 22 miles away to Watrous, and gave them \$1,000; that is the fairness and the policy of the C.C.F. Government. Well now, let me get back to what I was talking about. The Minister of Agriculture is now trying to elevate the province of Saskatchewan's agriculture up to a higher level of prosperity and I think, if he had about fifty or a hundred million dollars, he could put all the seats in the province on the Government payroll and get something done, and he would have a little more left than what it takes to start with: he would have some workmen. I am not criticizing but I would like to ask him does he know whether the grass seed, when he is contemplating the regressing of land, is under the same ruling as the fertilizer attachments in regard to the Education Tax? I would like to know, Mr. Speaker. I think they must be, because the same Treasury Department looks after it; they have plenty of time to figure these things out and if they have not got time they can hire another fellow. That is the position we are in, Mr. Speaker, but after all, before the election in 1944, there was not a single voter in this province of Saskatchewan who did not believe that it was the policy, and part of the platform, of this Government to take that tax off. We did not promise that. We had to put it on, and we never said we would take it off. They said that. I will tell you what the Provincial Treasurer said in his first Budget Speech in 1945-46:

“We hope, however, before another Session to bring in certain recommendations which will remove the nuisance feature of the tax. We also hope to eliminate the more obviously regressive features of the tax through its progressive removal from all commodities that are recognized as necessities. At the same time we hope to convert the tax into what would be in effect a selective excise tax on luxuries, semi-luxuries and non-essentials.”

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, they have had six years now with an excise tax on luxuries and non-essentials.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — And you'll hear some more of this. You have had six years now with an excise tax on luxuries and non-essentials:

“Such a programme would involve the ultimate removal of this tax from foodstuffs, clothing, hardware, lumber and materials of production.”

**Mr. Danielson:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask him in all seriousness, what has been done? The member for Swift current had the courage to speak up against this tax when he called it the ‘stinking tax’, and I think maybe he was right, after all the promises that we would not have to pay it/

What has this government done for these poor farmers, Mr. Speaker. They were crying over the “poor farmers” in this province and they were going to do so much for them. They have been crying over the housing situation and the cost of building and how one poor man in this day and age could not even start to build a house for himself on his farm, or even repair his buildings and all that sort of thing. What have they done? Have they taken off the Education Tax on building materials? Have they taken off the Education Tax on fertilizer on all gas for farm purposes? No, Mr. Speaker, have they taken it off on heating oil – yet there is no tax on coal? If they were being fair they would take it off some of these things for the benefit of the farmer. Have they taken it off weed killer chemicals, grasshopper poison bait, chemical spray?

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Sure you should keep up.

**Mr. Danielson:** — If it has been removed, good for you and I commend you for it.

In the House of Commons, a little over a year ago, Mr. Coldwell was up and he criticized the Dominion Government because they still retained the sales tax on building materials. I suppose he thought that would go over the air and appear in the newspapers and someone would say that and they would not make any statement to the contrary. Well, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the Dominion Government took the sales tax off all building materials and all farm machinery and implements of production two years ago, almost 2½ years ago now. Half of this province, Mr. Speaker, have not had a crop, some of them not for five or six years. If there was need to do something the least this Government could do that is in their power to do, is to remove a burden which makes a profit which skyrocketed to about six and a half million dollars, last year. There is no credit coming to this Government for doing anything for the farmers. They have shown conclusively, not just now but for the past five years, that they have no concern for the farmers, and their will has been directed towards some other things which are of no benefit to the farming population of this province. The people of Ontario, which is always considered to be a farming province, saw that and understood that before the people of the province of Saskatchewan finally got the hang of the matter and decided for themselves: that that is one thing that is inherent in their policy, that the farm population of the province of Saskatchewan can look forward to no assistance, no consideration for this C.C.F. Government.

I want to say a few words in regard to education; there are just a few things here that I want to get my mind clear on and the only way it can be cleared up is from the other side of the House. As a member of the House, Mr. Speaker, I think I am entitled to the facts as they are, not greeting one statement from one man and one statement from another man. On February 5, 1947, replying to a question from Mr. Hooge, Education Minister W.S. Lloyd listed the names of proposed larger school units where applications had been received asking for a vote for the establishment of a larger unit. These were Willowbunch, Moosomin, Regina, Melville, Canora, Wakaw, Yorkton, Tisdale, Indian Head, Gull Lake, Watrous, Elrose, Rosetown, Rosthern and Lloydminster. Now then, on February 19, 1946, Mr. Hooge asked the following question, answered by Mr. Lloyd. (Now this is from the Votes and Proceedings).

“1. From what proposed Larger School Units were petitions received asking for a vote to be taken before the Unit was established?



**answer:** Petitions for a vote were received from one or more school districts in every one of the sixty proposed Larger School Units, but in only fifteen proposed Units did the number of petitions approach or reach a majority as required by Section 3 of the Act.”

I want the gentlemen whom I am about to quote now, also to admit that he is wrong or made a mistake. This is from a speech made on Wednesday, December 17, 1947, by Premier T.C. Douglas in a radio broadcast. He said that not a single larger Unit had been set up without a vote of the rate-payers in question. Now I want to go back to the dates of these things. Here you have February 5th, 1947, and February 19th, 1946, and, 1947, a quotation from the Votes and Proceedings February 19/46, the Regina ‘Leader-Post’, February 5, 1947, and here you have the broadcast on Wednesday, December 17, 1947, at the end of the year. Now then, is the Minister of Education not giving the correct information, or is the Minister who is holding the responsible position of Premier of this Province making a mistake, or is it something else which is not allowed to be in this House? I want to know, and as a member of this House I have a right to know and the people have a right to know. It is time this ‘double talk’ was stopped, Mr. Speaker; you bet it is time it stopped.

Mr. Speaker, The Larger School Unit Act was on the statute books when this Government came in. And your platform which was in every place in the land was this: “We will foster and promote . . . implementation of the permissive legislation now on the Statute Books”, and nothing else. What did you do? When you came in you just chucked that platform into the waste-paper basket like you did with everything else, and you come in here with this dictatorial measure that said, “You shall do so.” We protested. My Leader sitting here was called a scoundrel by the Minister of Education, and I was included in the same definition. What were we protesting for? We were protesting because there was not provision in that law that would give the people who were interested in the future of education of this province an opportunity to express themselves on the subject. That is what we were fighting for; that is what we are fighting for today. Because we were protesting it, which was all the little group over here could do, the Minister came with an amendment to the Act, and he finally grudgingly consented that there could be a vote taken with the consent of the Minister. That was the 1945 Special Session Act. It was later on in the regime of this Government that provision was made for a vote by petition by the people in the district. Now then, how many school districts, where the Unit is provided have been voting and have been permitted to vote? That is, what we have been asking. We have one answer from the Minister, and we have a statement over the air that is entirely different and of contradictory nature from that of the Premier of this Province. Now, these are the sort of things we want to know. These are the things that the people of this province want to know. They finally become convinced that there is no faith in the pronouncements of this Government when one man says one thing and another says another.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, when I get up on the floor of the House to speak, all the Ministers sitting over there whom I like to talk to are hiding out on us. They don’t want to listen to me for some reason or other. It is a remarkable thing the only one that did not do so is the Minister of Education. He and I can face each other across the floor of the

House and not blink an eye; neither him nor me. And I admire him for it, because he can talk straight. These other fellows sneak out.

Now then, I want to speak a little bit about the mineral rights . . . I will get after the Minister of Agriculture on some of the Resolutions.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I will get after you, too.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I haven't any more time to spend on you, this afternoon. Let us talk a little about the mineral rights. The Minister of Natural Resources came into the House here bringing in an Act — The Mineral Rights Act — which provided for a five-cent tax on every acre of land in which the mineral rights belong to the registered owner. He was frank about it; he was honest about it, and he said there was another way we could do it — we could confiscate these rights, but that it was better to do it this way in the long run.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, this question of mineral taxation is before the courts and it is out of order to debate it at the present time.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think the point of order is well taken.

**Mr. Culliton:** — On a point of Order: It is out of order to debate the legislation as law, but it is not out of order to debate what the Minister said on the introduction of the legislation. The member has a perfect right to refer to the statements made by the Minister when this legislation was introduced providing he is not dealing with the legislation itself or the constitutionality of it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — My ruling is that the matter is sub judice — before the courts.

**Mr. Culliton:** — Then, Mr. Speaker, I must appeal from your ruling. (The question: Is the ruling of the Chair sustained? — having been put, Mr. Speaker's ruling was sustained on division by 26 votes against 19.)

**Mr. Danielson:** — (continuing) I should have thought of this before; I could have got some of the Ministers into their seats so that they could have heard some of the things I said about them.

I want to talk about a pipe-line now; that is not before the Courts, is it? Yes, I know it was before the C.C.F. congregation in the Regina Dominion election last summer, when they told the people of Saskatchewan, and the co-operative-minded people of the province, that they were going to be shut off from that pipe-line with their gas and their product and any of the other things they had in Alberta. The gentleman who made that statement is a C.C.F. — is a Socialist. He sat in the House of Commons when that bill was before that House, then he comes out here and tries to tell the people of the province that such a thing is going to happen to them which he knows could not happen, and would not happen. I wish the hon. Minister, six years ago, had told the farmers rightly and clearly what was going to happen to their mineral rights. That is all I have to say about that.

Now then, we will talk about Old Age Pensions for a minute. I cannot spend very long on it, because I do not think it is necessary. The Dominion Government is paying \$30 out of the \$40 and this Government is paying \$10 a month. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, they are paying exactly the same now as the Government of Saskatchewan did before 1926 and 1931 when the pension was \$20 a month and the Liberal Government of this province paid half of it and the Federal Government paid half; so you have nothing to brag about, nothing to brag about at all! But this Government has the luck of the world. After 1947, Mr. Speaker, the Dominion Government increased the old age pension, taking effect from May 1st. That was \$647,000, of old age pensioners money coming from the Dominion Government that went into the coffers of this Government in the province of Saskatchewan and held away from the pensioners of that day.

If I wanted to I could take up your time by doing some reading. Surely, Mr. Speaker, I am entitled to do it because the Premier himself read a book here, yesterday. The Attorney General, two years ago, read a whole radio speech that he had delivered three months before and half of the one he was going to deliver the next week. So you should not be too hard on me.

This, now, Mr. Speaker, is from the Minister of Ottawa, Mr. Martin. I am going to read it to you. December 30, 1947:

“My attention has been drawn to recent newspaper reports in the daily press in Saskatchewan quoting Premier Douglas as having made a statement in respect to old age pensions paid by the Provincial Liberal regime in that province, and which are wholly incorrect. The correct facts and figures are available to Premier Douglas either by reference to the periodical reports on old age pensions which appear in the Labour Gazette or by reference to his own departmental officials. If Premier Douglas were to take the trouble to check the accuracy of his statements with either of these two sources, he would find that he is making allegations which are not in accordance with the facts. I can only conclude from his failure to do so, and from his constant repetition of incorrect figures, he is not interested to have the correct information placed before the public and I am, therefore, asking you, if you would be good enough to take whatever steps you may consider to be necessary to acquaint the public of Saskatchewan with the true facts of the situation.

Here are the facts. Prior to the advent of the C.C.F. Government in Saskatchewan in June, 1944, the Liberal Government was paying an average old age pension amounting to \$23.08 per month, very nearly the maximum payable at this time under the Old Age Pension Act and the Federal wartime Order-in-Council which fixed the maximum pension payable in any one case to \$25 month. The Federal Order-in-Council referred to which was passed on August 10, 1943, and which raised the basic pension from \$20 to \$25 a month, made it possible for the Saskatchewan Government to replace the \$1.25 provincial supplemental allowance, which they had been paying at their own expense since July 1, 1943, with the larger supplemental pension

of \$5.00 per month paid jointly at the expense of the Federal and Provincial Governments. This \$5.00 supplemental pension went into effect on September 1, 1943, and took the place of provincial supplemental allowance of \$1.25 monthly in all cases. Then in those cases, however, which for some reason did not qualify for the larger Dominion-Provincial supplemental pension the Liberal Government in Saskatchewan continued the provincial supplemental.

Yet, with these facts available to him, Premier Douglas makes the statement that the time the party came into power in Saskatchewan, average old age pension payments amounted to only \$17.25. What did the C.C.F. do, when they came into office? For the quarter ending June 30th, 1945, after the C.C.F. had been in power for a whole year in Saskatchewan, the figures show that the average old age pension had risen slightly to \$24.63 per month, which was a raise of \$1.55 monthly, as compared with the quarter ending June 30, 1944, the last quarter for which the Liberal Government was in power. But even this slight increase was more apparent than real, because it was due to the fact that it was just on the eve of the C.C.F. Government coming into power that the Federal Government passed an Order-in-Council increasing income ceiling for old age pensioners from \$3.65 to \$4.25 annually. This made it possible for the C.C.F. Government on coming into power to absorb the Provincial supplemental \$1.25, which the Liberal Government would have still been continuing in some cases into the amount of the pension itself. This made it jointly shareable by the Dominion and Provinces. The higher income ceiling authorized by this second Federal Order-in-Council accounts for the slight increase in the average pension paid during the first year of the C.C.F. Government in office.

The only effect of this transfer from supplementary allowance to the slightly higher old age pension payment was to transfer 75 per cent of the cost involved to the Federal Government instead of paying it entirely out to Provincial funds. For almost a year after the C.C.F. Government came into power, it is fair to say that the position of the old age pensioners in Saskatchewan remained essentially unchanged except for the slight advantage occurring to them as result of the Federal Order-in-Council. In May 1945 the C.C.F. Government introduced a Provincial supplemental allowance of \$3.00 per month, straight from its own funds. It also introduced medical services for old age pensioners in the early part of the same year. It is not the first Government in Canada, however, to have implemented such a programme for old age pensioners, because both British Columbia and Ontario had a medical service scheme for old age pensioners in effect since 1942. With these adjustments made in 1945, the situation with respect to old age pensions in Saskatchewan then remained the same until April, 1947, by which time the average old age pension paid in Saskatchewan was actually three cents less than it was two years earlier,

when the \$3.00 per month Provincial supplemental was originally introduced.

In April, 1947, (and this is what I want to bring to the attention of the House) the Government had been advised of the Federal Government's intentions with respect to amendments to the Old Age Pension Act did increase its provincial supplemental allowance from \$3.00 to \$5.00 per month. This meant that the Provincial contribution for both pension and supplemental together was raised from \$9.25 per month per pensioner to \$11.25. Prior to the C.C.F. Government and under the previous Liberal Government, it had been \$6.25 per month for pensioners. All these figures take account of the fact that the Province received re-imbursement from the Federal Government of 75 per cent of the amount paid out in the Old Age Pension Act itself, but theirs is the entire cost of any Provincial supplement to the old age pensions in any case. When the amendment to the Old Age Pension Act was passed by the Federal Government on July 1, of this year, it provided for an old age pension of \$30 per month, of which the Dominion would contribute \$22.50 a month and left the Province free to pay as much as they wished to do.

Had the C.C.F. Government under this legislation done no more than it had set out to do in April of this year, it would have maintained its contribution of \$11.25 monthly and this added to the Federal contribution of \$22.50 per month, the combined pension would have amounted to \$33.75 per pensioner per month. The C.C.F. Government did not maintain its contribution, however. As soon as the Federal Act was proclaimed in September of this year, and the agreement signed between the Province of Saskatchewan and the Dominion Government, the C.C.F. Government promptly reduced its contribution from \$11.25 per month to \$7.50 per month per pensioner, thus depriving the old age pensioners in Saskatchewan of the entire increase that the Federal Government had made possible through its amending legislation.

The effect of this latest move on the part of the C.C.F. Government in Saskatchewan is that the Government pocketed the entire increase of \$3.75 per month per pensioner, which the Federal Government had intended as a means of improving the position of the pensioners themselves. The Saskatchewan Government claims that, by this action, it will save an estimated \$675,000 per year at the expense of the old age pensioners of that province. Not only that, but the C.C.F. Government, in taking advantage of the more generous Federal Terms of contribution under the amending Old Age Pension Act, abolished in September the provision it had made in April for a \$5.00 supplemental allowance at the expense of the Province, and then it even went as far as to abolish the supplemental allowance retroactive to May 1st.

In other words, the \$5.00 supplemental allowance which the Saskatchewan Government announced in April of that year was paid at the Provincial expense for exactly one month. All the Provincial supplemental allowances which have been paid by the Saskatchewan Government since May 1st, 1947, will now be claimed back from the Dominion to the extent of 75 per cent of the total cost involved under terms of the Federal amending legislation which makes solely the pension amendment retroactive to May 1st, 1947.

These facts, I think you will agree, speak for themselves. They give clear picture to which the extent the C.C.F. Government has given aid to old age pensioners at their own expense, and the extent to which they have endeavoured to claim credit for the more generous nature of assistance which was made possible through the effort of the Federal Government.”

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member to tell us from what he was reading?

**Mr. Danielson:** — I told you when I started to deal with this subject.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Was that all the letter from Hon. Paul Martin?

**Mr. Danielson:** — All but just one paragraph . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Ted Davis probably wrote it.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Now then, Mr. Speaker, a similar situation, not to such a great extent, has taken place in the province of Saskatchewan in regard to old age pensions, this time. Last spring, due to the effort of the Opposition and pressure of public opinion, there was a provision made for \$5.00 supplementary pension for the old age pensioners, and that was paid by this Government here. Then they went to work, and what they did was this. They took \$2.50 out of the supplementary pension and provided the \$2.50 to supplement the \$7.50 to make up the \$10.00 increase in the basic pension of \$10.00 a month up to \$40.00. That left only \$2.50 and that \$5.00 was the basic pension. When this matter was before the House in Ottawa, Mr. Martin pleaded with the provinces, made a particular stand in this matter, that this had nothing to do with a means test or anything else, and he pleaded with them to continue the supplementary pension in full, as they were now doing. Every province in the Dominion of Canada, Mr. Speaker, so far as I know, did that, and some of them even increased it, except the C.C.F. in Saskatchewan, except this Socialistic Government.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, that is not true. There are only two provinces besides the Province of Saskatchewan that are paying supplementary allowances in the Dominion of Canada. So the statement that all Provinces in Canada continued . . .

**Mr. Culliton:** — Mr. Speaker, you cannot raise a point of privilege except in respect to yourself, and the point of privilege is not well taken.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. Minister, I understood, was correcting a statement affecting his Department.

**Mr. Culliton:** — I beg your pardon, with all due difference, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister was referring to two other provinces. The point of privilege refers to a statement made by yourself, and you cannot raise a point of privilege in respect to anything else. There is no point of privilege at all.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, here is what I said: “Every province in the Dominion of Canada, in so far as I know . . .” I did make that statement.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — You don’t know very much.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That’s all aright. sometimes you wish you knew as much. They heeded Mr. Martin’s suggestion and continued the supplementary payment in full except the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan, which Government, with its slogan “Humanity First”, cut it down 50 per cent, to one-half. The Minister over there gets up on a point of privilege and he says, “That is not true. There are only two Provinces in Canada that pay supplementary pensions,”; but is there any sense in that statement? I think he is wrong when he says there are only two provinces in Canada besides Saskatchewan that pay supplementary pensions, and I know he is wrong.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Alberta, B.C. and Ontario.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I know just as much as you know. If he minds his own business until I am through, then he can talk all night. Here is the point, Mr. Speaker. We had this thing going in principle exactly the same as it was in 1947 when \$675,000 was withheld as a retroactive payment coming from the Dominion Government. This was an ingenious device. I will again repeat what I said a moment ago, that Mr. Martin, when he made this statement on the floor of the House, pointed out that any supplementary pension paid in any province had nothing to do with a means test, that is, the total income that a pensioner could have. There are two pensioners in my constituency that have an income of \$1,080 a year; they are both over 75 years of age. These people need something more to live on and their house is in very poor condition. These two old people are entitled under the Act and under the regulations if they are interpreted in a human way, to the \$2.50 supplementary a piece a month, but they cannot get it. I imagine there are hundreds and maybe thousands of people who are similarly affected in Saskatchewan. On March 20, 1948, (I have a copy of the Gazette, Mr. Speaker), this Government went to work and passed an Order-in-Council stopping themselves from paying any supplementary pension to any person who has any income in the amount of \$1,080 going into one family, where they are both drawing a pension. Here is paragraph 8:

“The maximum supplementary allowance payable in the case of a married couple living together and both in receipt of an old age pension under the Old Age Pension Act of Canada, shall be \$5 per month each or such portion thereof so that the joint total income of such pensioner, including pension payment and supplementary allowance pension payment shall not exceed \$1,080 in any calendar year.”

**Voice:** — Shame, shame!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Now that is a slick trick, Mr. Speaker. There is no excuse here. There cannot be any excuse because this Government put this Order in Council on the regulations under The Old Age Pensions Act to stop themselves – not the Dominion Government or any other Government – from paying.

I just want to say to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, with his tremendous and buoyant revenues which are flowing in from liquor profits, Education Tax and all of these things, couldn't he scrape another few thousand dollars to give to these poor people \$2.50 a month? B.C. are paying \$10 a month bonus. They are paying \$50 a month pension in B.C. Alberta is paying it.

Now this is a fact, Mr. Speaker, and it is one of the points that I want to bring to the attention of this House. Clean up your house, and clean up your Statutes, and then come down and do business on a fair and open-minded basis with these poor people!

I got two of these – two letters sent out by the Minister of Social Welfare just before the Dominion election. One was dated May 31, and the other June 30, 1949. I am not going to tell you who got them, because they all got them; you cannot trace them because they all got them. This one says:

“You will undoubtedly have heard recently that the old age and blind pensions have been increased from a maximum of \$33 per month to a maximum of \$42.50.”

Now that is all right – \$42.50; but you are not paying that, not paying \$42.50. You are only paying these fellows \$40 a month. As a matter of fact, in the case I mentioned it is only \$39.94.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Out of the 470 blind pensions paid, 390 are getting \$42.50 a month besides their medical services.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, I did not mention the blind pensioners at all; I am talking about the old age pensioners . . .

“Your increase in pension will be payable retroactive to May 1st, but unfortunately the agreement with the Federal Government providing for increased old age pensions did not reach us in time to include the adjusted pensions in May with the May cheque. Any additional pension due for the month will be forwarded as early as possible in June.

We are disappointed, of course, that the Federal Government did not authorize an increase in the allowable income so that every pensioner might benefit more equally. In other words, the income ceiling under which your pension was established remains the same.”



I am complaining, I confess; I think the Dominion Government did wrong that they did not place the income fairly. I am honest about it, and I am going to say so. I had a short talk with four or five Federal members that I met during the summer and I told them so plainly, and I hope that the Dominion Government will increase it; but that has nothing to do with the proposition that we have here. It says here:

“In other words, the income ceiling under which your pension was established remains the same.”

Mr. Speaker, it remains the same on account of this Order in council that I read to you, which the Government passed to stop themselves from paying it. That is the most definite reason.

Here is another one:

“We enclose cheque representing the increase in your pension for the month of May that is calculated in accordance with the Dominion Old Age Pension Act and regulations thereunder, and this also includes whatever supplementary allowances may be due and which are paid in all or in part in the Province of Saskatchewan. It is our hope that the old age pension will eventually be raised to \$50 per month without a means test. In the meantime, we hope that this additional pension, together with the free health services, compensate in some small measure for the high cost of living which now exists.

With best wishes for your future health and happiness.

Yours sincerely,

“John H. Sturdy”

Minister of Social Welfare”

**Mr. Tucker:** — There is nothing about your own Order in Council there though.

**Mr. Danielson:** — No. I guess you don't remember that at all.

These people are so sympathetic; they were so concerned about the plight of the old age pensioner. Then why in the name of commonsense did they cut off their \$2.50 and leave the \$2.50 less and then pass an Order in Council that would stop them from paying it if they did not want to? That is the question I would like to get answered. That was the ‘million dollar baby’.

I have endeavoured, as a member of the Opposition, to criticize this, and I hope I have been able to make myself understood.

February 23, 1950

I want to say that this old moth-eaten creed of Socialism imported into this western country from Central and Eastern Europe is on the way out, and the prophecy of being sitting on the Treasury benches for the next fifteen or twenty years made by my friend in 1945, on the floor of the House, is not going to be fulfilled; and he has got to build many blacktop roads to Regina Beach and the United States, and to some fishing ground or swimming pool for his friends in Regina, if he is going to be able to sit there for that length of time.

Mr. Speaker, I definitely shall not support the motion.

**Mr. Kuziak:** — I move the adjournment of the debate, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

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