

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Eleventh Legislature
8th Day

Monday, February 27, 1950.

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

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Friday, February 24, 1950, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Wellbelove for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough): — Dealing with some of the prophecies which the Leader of the Opposition has suggested from time to time, I don't propose to gaze into the crystal ball and make any prophecies on my own behalf. However, after what went on here just this afternoon, and even though we are only in the eighth day of the Session, one is free I presume to speculate just how long this Session may last, and my prediction (if I may make a prediction) can possibly be marked by an incident which was related to me of a little girl of four or five years of age who visited her mother in the hospital and in the bed beside her mother was another lady patient and she turned to this lady and said, "How long have you been in here?" and the lady replied, "a month". The little girl said, "Well, my mother has just been here one day, and she has a baby already." Well, if we expect the Opposition to give us constructive criticism or some constructive suggestion, and if what we have seen by the Leader of the Opposition and by the member for Arm River is an example of what we can expect from the Opposition in this Session, then I suggest, Mr. Speaker, we might be here for a mighty long time.

While I am dealing in speculation, it is not too far-fetched, possibly, Mr. Speaker, to speculate as to the future leadership of the Liberal Party in this province, and when another election rolls around, Mr. Speaker, one wonders whether the present Leader of the Opposition will be leading that Party or whether possibly somebody who is more acceptable to both Mr. Gardiner and Mr. Diefenbaker will be leading that Party.

Since last we met in Session here several momentous developments have occurred on every level, whether we consider them on the provincial level, the national level, or the international level. On the international level we have heard of wars and rumours of wars throughout the world, and we have seen the nations with the scientists of all nations bending every effort to create new and better means of destruction. We have had improvements, so we are told, in regard to the atom bomb, and we have the scientists of all nations working against each other to develop the hydrogen bomb. On the other hand, we have those forces which are out working to give us peace and security in this world and, as we survey the events of the past year, one is led to believe that possible sources of destruction have made more spectacular gains than have the forces who are out working for international and world-wide peace. It is only through a confederation of the world, a world parliament, to which we as a province, and to which we as a Canadian nation, are prepared to delegate certain of our sovereign rights along with all the other nations of the world, that world-wide peace can be secured. It was suggested, at the

February 27, 1950

turn of the twentieth century, that the twentieth century belonged to Canada. It is problematical to what advantage Canada has taken that opportunity, but may I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the latter half of the twentieth century should belong to the little people of all the nations all over the world.

On the Canadian level, possibly the greatest event in the past year has been the Federal election in which the political side which the members opposite represent were returned to power in Canada with a fairly substantial majority. I suggest that the onus is on them to give us action in the coming year and in the coming years until another election, and direction as it affects our economy and our social life here in Canada. While it has been suggested by some that the political arm of the people's movement which is personified by the C.C.F. did not make the spectacular gain that some of them were optimistic enough to expect, I do suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the feeling of the members of the C.C.F. is pretty well illustrated by that now famous communique which came from the front line during the war, when a communique came back and said: "We are outnumbered; our troops are tired; we are short of ammunition; we attack at dawn." And on June 28th, the day following the election, we were in exactly the same position as we were on June 26th, the day previous to the election. We, as part of the people's movement, are on the march here in Canada, and we will not rest content until we have removed the apparent inherent inequity within our economic social system that exists here in Canada.

At that time we met in combat with the combined forces of reaction, and they were aided and abetted by outside forces. Those outside forces realized that they must, to use their own terms, stop the hold of the Social Democratic movement within Canada if they were to retain the stranglehold which they have on the economy of Canada, as well as of other nations of the world. Those people who support that type of enterprise can derive cold comfort from the victory which, they suggest, they obtained on June 27th. The people of the C.C.F. come from a group of people who have, on numerous occasions, turned defeat into victory, and we have here, even on the western plains, built monuments to those people who refused to accept defeat when it was administered to them in that manner. We have built monuments such as the Pool Elevators in the prairie provinces; we have built here in Saskatchewan a flour mill; we have built a Co-op refinery; we have built a wholesale distributing centre owned co-operatively; we have built consumers co-operative throughout the province; we have built credit unions, as a monument to the courage of those people who would not accept defeat. I suggest that this February setback which we may have received is simply a stepping-stone to the day when we shall build a superstructure on the foundation which we have laid here in Saskatchewan.

In the by-elections which have taken place in Saskatchewan that trend seems to be indicated. I was interested in the events which took place during those by-elections; I do not wish to refer at any great length to this, because they have been discussed numerous times in this House. However, the events which took place at that time seem to justify to a degree an opinion which some people have of members of the Legislatures and members in public life, and it seems to me events transpired there which seems to justify the opinion which many people have of reasons why they should stay out of public life. I have seen it done previously in general elections in my own constituency, but in no case was there a personal attack mainly directed against myself and directed by people within the constituency, and I did not pay too

great an amount of attention to it. But when I saw, as I have seen these by-elections, the Leader of the Opposition attempting to lower a man's character by inference rather than by proof then I suggest that politics in this province have come, indeed, to a very low level, when he does not give that individual a chance to defend himself on the public platform. However, when it comes to gross mis-statements the Leader of the Opposition must take second place to his seatmate, and when we have public men who hold high offices such as these individuals do, out where no official report can be made of what they indicate or what they say, then I suggest that they should be prepared to come back into this House and make exactly the same statements and attempt to substantiate their statements with some proof, which they are not required to do out of the House. I heard them make reference to The Crown Corporations Act, and they suggested that in The Crown Corporations Act this Legislature had given the power to the Government heretofore never heard of. They suggest that under The Crown Corporations Act we have given to the Government the right to appropriate which they had not previously; but I would suggest that that is far from the case, and I would suggest to him that the members on this side of the House are just as jealous of the rights and privileges of this Legislature as anyone is, and at no time when we delegate to anyone, to any Government, responsibilities which are rightfully ours and which we have rightfully accepted. I pointed out to the hon. member for Gravelbourg that The Crown Corporations Act was similar in effect to the Act which established the Department of Public Works and when I pointed out to him that practically word for word what was in the Department of Public Works was also in The Crown Corporations Act, he suggested that there was mandatory power requiring the Government to go to arbitration in the Department of Public Works, and there was not such in the Crown Corporations. Well I ask him, when he rises in his seat to make his contribution, whether it is in this debate or whether it is in a subsequent debate, that he attempt to prove to this House whether there is any difference in wording or intent between the Act which established the Crown Corporations and the Act which established the Department of Public Works insofar as it effects the corporation power. There is only one difference, Mr. Speaker. In one Act it refers to the Court of the Judge of the District Court, and in the other one it refers to the Judge of the King's Bench Court; and if that is any fundamental difference then I suggest that he prove it to the judiciary that one is liable to be more lenient than the other.

In reference to the operations of the Crown Corporations, he suggested that, through the medium of the Crown Corporations, we had created a "sink-hole" (to use his own term) for taxation, and that we were taking money which we had received from the Dominion subsidy. I might point out that the subsidies of "grants", as they are sometimes referred to, are not something that is given to us but are a matter of right, and that we have been receiving this money in return for fields of taxation which we have relinquished to the Federal Government, money which should in all rights be ours. But when he suggests that we are taking money from taxation or money from the Dominion subsidy, money which would otherwise be available for social services or for grants to municipalities and that we are sinking it in to the Crown Corporations, I suggest that he is far from sticking to the fact, and it indeed is a mis-statement of the affairs as they sit at the present time. Not one penny of revenue voted by this Legislature which could be made available for social services or for grants to municipalities, has been placed in the Crown Corporations. On the contrary, we have an item in our estimates for revenues for the past two years which indicates that we are getting money from the Crown Corporations for the purposes of social services and for grants to municipalities.

February 27, 1950

A few days ago in this House, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, through the medium of an amendment to the Speech from the Throne, asked us to stand up and be counted. In that particular case he was referring to our stand in connection with the Regina Manifesto. I suggest to him that we are prepared, at any time, anywhere, and on any issue which he chooses to bring forth, to stand up and be counted and I can assure him that we will always be on the side of justice and on the side of rights.

However, there are other places in which the people are standing up and being counted in other places than these, and in the Federal House at Ottawa the Liberal members from Saskatchewan have on occasion had to stand up and be counted. On one occasion (and I refer only briefly to one occasion) in which they stood up and were counted was when amendments to the P.F.A.A. were before the House, particularly when the amendments were before the Agricultural Committee of that House. An amendment was moved by Mr. Argue, the M.P. for Assiniboia, an amendment which would have extended the benefits of the P.F.A.A. and removed some of the inequity of the existing Act. He was not, through that amendment, suggesting that it be placed on an individual basis. We in the C.C.F. have been saying that that is our ultimate goal, but at this particular time he was not even suggesting that it be placed on an individual basis. He was simply asking that some of the inequity in an area surrounding an eligible township be removed, so that the area which suffered crop failure might be included in an eligible area; and he was not moving that it be incorporated into the Bill – he was simply moving that the Government give consideration to that particular feature, and the Liberals stood up and were counted. And among those voting against that we find Mr. Studer, the M.P. for Maple Creek, and Mr. Hetland, the M.P. for Humboldt, standing up and being opposed to recommending to the Government that they give consideration to improving the existing Act.

I would like, at some time during this Session, the M.L.A. for Maple Creek to stand up and attempt to explain how he can justify the stand of his colleague, coming as he does from an area in which he has no doubt seen the inequity of this Act as it applies to farmers. Then his colleague in the Federal House stands up and votes against such an improvement in the Act.

I was interested in the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition when he suggests that we have a right to discuss matters which are not entirely within the jurisdiction of this House, and I am glad to see the Opposition coming around to that viewpoint. Possibly he was paving the way for his colleague, the member for Arm River to do a little globe-trotting in an attempt, I presume, to prove that we are Communists on this side of the House. In my opinion all he succeeded in proving is that it is possible in this House to waste a lot of time. However, I am glad to see that the Opposition is prepared to discuss important matters which have affected the economy of this province and are not entirely within our jurisdiction, and one of these important matters is the question of the marketing of our grain, and in that connection, an event transported within the last few days which is indeed interesting. It was only within the last few days that the report of the Canadian Wheat Board was tabled in the House of Commons at Ottawa, a report of the Canadian Wheat Board for their fiscal year, 1948-1949, which ended on the 31st of July, 1949, and in this report we find many interesting things. You will all recall that, on the 1st of April this year, – and possibly the fact that it occurred on the 1st of April of this year has some significance – the Wheat Board undertook to pay to the farmers of Saskatchewan an interim payment of 20 cents a bushel on wheat delivered within the five-year pool, and they undertook to aid the initial payment after April 1st by 20 cents a bushel.

It is interesting to note that they had to borrow the money to pay that interim payment, borrow the money at 3 per cent compounded monthly, borrow it to the extent of \$23,000,000, and at the end of the 31st of July, 1949, there is a deficit in that pool of some \$5,000,000. It has been suggested that they won the election; but I suggest that, when we start paying here in western Canada, 3 per cent compound interest on money used to buy our votes, that is going a little bit too far.

In this report it indicates that the Wheat Board has on hand a considerable amount of wheat which they value at \$2.00 per bushel, which means that they must sell this entire amount of wheat at at least \$2.00 a bushel, or the deficit on that pool will be greater than even the \$5,000,000 which stands at the present time. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that in any case, whether the deficit is greater or whether it remains the same, that deficit must be made out of the coming crop year 1949-1950 for, at the end of July 31, 1950, a final settlement must be made on that pool. And if the deficit has not been made up in this year of 1950-1951, then we can expect no further payment from the Wheat Board.

It was suggested here, when this matter was raised, the other day, whether we were in favour of the farmers receiving this 20 per cent payment; and I suggest that we were in favour of that payment being made to the farmers. But we suggest that it was unnecessary for the Wheat Board to borrow the money and to pay the toll to the financial institutions of this country. We suggest that if the Wheat Board had followed the policy advocated by the C.C.F. in this House and by the C.C.F. members at Ottawa, it would have been absolutely unnecessary for them to have borrowed any money. If, when the Wheat Board had got in operation (and particularly it applies to this five-year pool) they had undertaken to guarantee and pay to the farmers a parity price (and I suggest that we have not as yet received a parity price for grain in this five-year period), and if they had paid us a parity price through a Prices Support Act enacted by the Government, it would absolutely have been unnecessary for the Wheat Board to borrow the money and to ask us to pay interest on it. May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I have not sufficient time at the present to go into all of the details and complications of this important matter, but I can assure the House that in some future debate I will undertake to discuss further the question of the marketing of our grain and particularly as it affects the further of the Wheat Board.

There was reference in the Speech to the Throne to a Transcontinental highway to be built through and across Canada and in Saskatchewan in particular. Once again we see the Trans-Canada highway during the 1949 election being used as an election promise, which the party which now form the Government of Canada suggested that, if they were elected, they would undertake to build across Canada, and now that they have been elected they are asking the Provincial Governments, with their limited financial resources, to fulfil the commitments they made to the people. I suggest to you that the Trans-Canada highway is a national responsibility, and should be broken entirely by the Federal Government. A comparable situation would be that we here in the province ask the municipalities to pay their share of the contribution that would affect highways travelling through their municipality as we in Saskatchewan undertake to build a provincial network of highways. I suggest that it is entirely unfair to the provinces to ask them to make any contribution to a highway which, in general, affects the whole Canadian economy and

February 27, 1950

not any one particular province. I suggest that the Federal Government could have undertaken this programme of construction as a public or national investment programme and they would not have, as we are required to, to pay interest on the money which we invest in that highway; and failing to accept the whole responsibility in this regard, the least they Federal Government could do is provide, and make the money available, to the provinces interest free in the form of Treasury Bills.

In Saskatchewan we sometimes have a tendency to forget those things which we have done. We sometimes seem to forget that we are a province relatively small in population, that we are not one of the richest provinces in the Dominion of Canada, and that our resources as yet have not been fully developed. I think that sometimes we should take a minute or two off and pride ourselves on accomplishments which we have made and to look in the direction of the fields in which we have pioneered and broken new soil. Reference could be made to many of them as it affects the 'Welfare State' here in Saskatchewan. Reference could be made to the socialized treatment, for example our hospitalization plan, in which we broke new ground. When it was introduced in this House, we suggested from this side of the House once the plan was inaugurated, it would only be a short time until other provinces in Canada, indeed other states in United States, would be following our plan. How true that philosophy has turned out to be! Reference could be made to the method in which we attacked our Child Welfare problem; the method in which we attacked our penal reforms necessary in this province; and reference could be made, as it affects the welfare state, to how we have undertaken to provide socialized medicine in this province, and the progress that has been made along those lines. I think that we will all agree we have here, with limited resources, with practically insurmountable obstacles, gone a long way to provide a truly welfare state; but I suggest that, as we progress along to build this welfare state, we will meet more complications and more grief between our governing bodies of today as to responsibility and to resources at their disposal.

Just in passing, Mr. Speaker, I think we can say what we have done in connection with one branch of our social welfare which illustrates, in my opinion very clearly, the attitude that we in the C.C.F., and this Government in particular, have taken towards the problems which face us. I suggest to hon. members that if they had taken a trip and visited any of our Saskatchewan hospitals, whether it was at Weyburn or whether it was at North Battleford, in 1944, and then take a trip to those same institutions in 1949, and if they could do that and still vote Liberal, I am afraid that possibly the wrong people are in these institutions, for the progress that has been made in these institutions, illustrates very clearly the attitude that this Government is prepared to take towards the problems which face it at the present time.

Here we had a case in which we had a problem which the previous administration had been giving only custodial care and sometimes I doubt if you could even call it custodial care. Today we are undertaking, through a system of administration, to prove that the working conditions within those institutions is improving the conditions of the people who of necessity are in those institutions and placing them out in society so that they once again may return to useful and profitable work.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I wish to suggest that I will support the motion for three or four main reasons. I support the motion, for through it we are laying the foundation here in Saskatchewan for a welfare state and that, through the medium of what is forecast in the Speech from the Throne, we are going to continue to build on that foundation. The Speech from the Throne indicates that we are once again in the vanguard in developing an economic and social order which will assure to the people their fair share of the wealth which we produce, and through the medium of the Speech from the Throne we are once again breaking new soil in an effort to get greater production and a greater share of that production. In that speech we are expressing in legislative terms the only ideology and philosophy which can guarantee to all people of all nations that they can have universal peace and complete economic and social freedom.

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I wish merely to concur in all the commendatory remarks which have been made in this House, but I would first like to take this opportunity of extending a welcome to the member for North Battleford. I hope that he will find his surroundings less contaminating than the hon. member for Moosomin found them in that particular group, according to Alvin Hamilton, who issued a statement during the North Battleford election, and I would advise our new member to be very careful because Alvin Hamilton, when making reference to the tactics of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, had this to say about the hon. member from Moosomin:

“Apparently the hon. member from Moosomin came into the House a perfectly innocent young conservative and then in the course of events, (according to Mr. Hamilton) he got very badly corrupted.”

Mr. Hamilton was deploring the tactics of Liberal Leader Tucker when he released a statement on Monday relative to the North Battleford election on Wednesday. Alvin Hamilton, Progressive Conservative Party Leader said such tactics made it abundantly clear why self-respecting people of Saskatchewan will not support the Liberals under Mr. Tucker. And he went on:

“I regret that the Liberal technique of pressure, fear and inducement have once again been brought to the light of day in their efforts to stave off defeat in The Battlefords. It is even more regrettable that they should use a youthful, inexperienced member so shamefully. Such tactics make it abundantly clear that self respecting people in Saskatchewan will not support the Liberals under Mr. Tucker.”

So I say to the hon. member for North Battleford, safeguard your maidenly virtues!

Mr. Speaker, I was quite amused to listen to both the Leader of the Opposition, and my good friend the hon. member for Arm River. It was clearly indicated that neither one of these members were Socialists. The hon.

February 27, 1950

Leader of the Opposition indicated that perhaps he was about a twenty-five per center, but after listening to the hon. member for Arm River for two hours and twenty minutes, I came to the conclusion that he certainly was not a Socialist. He certainly wanted the monopoly on radio time and, above all else, he was not even a good co-operator who think that the good things of life ought to be scattered all over the world, and quoted everyone all the way from Joe Stalin right down to Oscar Wilde, and I don't know what he tried to prove.

Mr. Speaker, as a rule I have heard a political speech described as being something like the horns of a Texas steer – two points and a lot of bull between; but when I think of the hon. member's speech, as a recall it, there was no point to it at all. It just went round and round like the horn of a mountain sheep, with no point anywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I notice particularly that the hon. members opposite have again resorted to their usual tactics of trying to conjure up a whole lot of fear bogeys in the minds of the people. That is understandable. That has always been the tactic of reactionary people right down through the ages of history, so they are no exception to the rule. They used to conjure up all kinds of bogeys, witch doctor bogeys, and all the rest of it, to keep the people from progressing freely in their ability to reason their way out of a difficult situation.

I want, Mr. Speaker, to particularly deal with marketing problems and, like the hon. Leader of the Opposition, necessarily we have to go into the Federal field, and you will probably regret it before I am through and will come right back to the provincial field and see what the situation looks like at home as a result of Federal policies.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, a very definite attempt is being made by the Liberal Government to shirk their responsibilities with regard to the marketing of agricultural products. Apparently they were following so closely the lead of the great neighbour to the south, they did not realize they were getting into some real difficulties. Possibly it was a matter of expediency they had to do so; but they should not be accusing anyone else of being expedient as long as they have had to depend on the Marshall dollars of the United States, in the last few years, to market agricultural products to Britain. I think one of the statements made by the Hon. J.G. Gardiner with reference to Great Britain, is going to go down in history as being a most unfortunate statement, as will other statements made by him while touring the province of Saskatchewan and saying repeatedly why the Provincial Government cannot do a thing without Federal aid. But Mr. Gardiner could not do a single thing without a little Marshall aid, and now he is trying to blame everyone but the right people. And now, when the problems are beginning to accumulate, he wants to gracefully bow out and abdicate his responsibility to the farm organizations and to the Provincial Governments. That is not unusual either, Mr. Speaker, when you take a look at the Liberal record in regard to orderly marketing; and I shall do so and run over very briefly their record of performance in that regard.

Everyone recalls that in World War I we had a Wheat Board, which handling agency was set up by the Conservative Government during that

war. Immediately the war was over an election took place, in 1919, and I think the Liberal Government went into power in early 1920, and it was known then without a doubt where the Liberal Party stood with regard to orderly marketing. They were against marketing through Wheat Boards, and they fought the election on that issue. They came into power and, because of the exceptional pressure put on by the organized farmers, such as is taking place at the present time, they went through the motions of passing Wheat Board legislation. But, running true to form, Mr. Speaker, there was never a kernel of wheat delivered to that Wheat Board. The result of that was that wheat would not take action, the farmers had to organize the Wheat Pool to try and do their own marketing. We all know the record of that, and, of course, all the Liberal politicians got on the Wheat Pool bandwagon at that time.

Then, Mr. Speaker, from the period 1923 to 1929 and 1930, because of the international and world situation, it was beyond the power of the Wheat Pool to deal with wheat marketing under those circumstances, and we all recall the tremendous amount of indebtedness that the Wheat Pool accumulated as a result of their initial payment of \$1.00 per bushels. Finally, during the '30's it was necessary for the Government to step into wheat marketing. Then, again, a Tory Government introduced Wheat Marketing legislation, and, peculiarly enough, Mr. Speaker, it was the Liberal Opposition who, in Committee, practically emasculated the compulsory features of that marketing legislation. So it came out in an emaciated condition was only a floor-price piece of legislation.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the whole period between 1930 and 1942, a twelve-year period, with the exception of one year, wheat averaged 57 cents to the farmer at the elevator during all that period of time. And then, of course, came the war years. Again there was a tendency to hold down prices of farm commodities, and it is interesting to go over the history of the prices received by the farmers in 1942 and 1943. It is more interesting, Mr. Speaker, to recall the delegation that went down to Ottawa and finally asked the Government for a minimum of \$1.00 per bushel. Had it not been for that pressure, heaven knows how long a delay would have taken place in raising the price of wheat to a remunerative level to the farmers!

Mr. Speaker, no doubt there were a lot of good Liberals on that train that went to Ottawa to ask their Government to give the farmer the cost of production. There are things I find difficult, sometimes, to understand, Mr. Speaker. I find good Liberals in the country who constantly believe that their elected representatives are going to do something for them, and they no more than get elected than they have to start organizing delegations to see to it that they fulfil the promises that they made on the platforms. Of course, Mr. Speaker, that is readily understood. It is pretty difficult for friends to serve two masters at one and the same time.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, we have come to the end of the British Wheat Agreement. Now we face the international marketing situation under international agencies. I want to point out to the House that there is a good deal of uncertainty as to whether we are going to deliver any wheat under the international agreement or not. It is not certain yet, if we have got an International Wheat Agreement. It has not been ratified, yet, as is

February 27, 1950

required, by the participating nations; however, we cannot be critical of that. An attempt has at least been made. The agreement is signed and now the implementation must take place. But even though, Mr. Speaker, this may be ratified, I want to suggest to the House that there is no machinery by which the wheat can be distributed to the need peoples of the world, and I propose to deal with that a little further on in the course of my remarks.

Mr. Tucker: — May I ask the hon. Minister a question?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It is interesting to note too, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition when he is on his feet. I wanted to ask him a question and he asked me to just wait. Now I'll have to ask him to do the same thing, and at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I don't want him to embarrass himself too much.

The other interesting feature about the International Wheat Agreement is that, although the maximum price is at \$1.80, the minimum price scales downward. I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is no consideration being given here at all as to what the costs of farm products are likely to be over the next few years. I, like the rest of the organized farm people, know and believe that we must have parity prices if we are going to keep the agricultural industry in business.

During the Federal election campaign the grandiose – well I could not say 'promises' were made; the Liberals merely told the farmers of Canada what they had done. I suppose we were from that to anticipate what they would do in the future. Among other things they said, the first thing was that Liberal policy had built foreign markets. The election was no more than over when the foreign markets had gone. The other thing they said (and they did not tell the whole story, Mr. Speaker) was that gross farm income in 1948 was \$2,835,000,000 and that it was 60 per cent higher than in 1945. That is quite correct, Mr. Speaker; but they did not tell the farmers of Saskatchewan that the gross national income was up a similar amount, and that the share to the farmers was practically no different. In other words, the farmers, at what they termed to be a 'peak' year of prosperity, were only getting 13.6 per cent of the national income, and farmers represented approximately 42 per cent of the population.

Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough for our agricultural industry. It is not good enough now and, surely, any talk of support prices at lower levels is bound to bring ruin not only to the agricultural industry, but economic ruin to the entire economy of Canada. Oh, they said other things too! They said the farmer has got money in his pockets and has money in the bank and has bought new farm equipment. It might be interesting to know that 42 per cent of the new farm equipment purchased, last year, was purchased on credit. That certainly does not indicate that the farm has got money in the bank. I think he has some notes probably, lying in the bank, and if there is any reduction in farm income, he is going to have a pretty tough time to pay that obligation.

I want to turn, Mr. Speaker, specifically to the bacon contracts. There is one interesting feature about the Bacon Agreement, and that is the rapidity with which the quantity in each succeeding contract fell after the war was over. It is also interesting to note that the reduced commitment

in the contracts themselves did not even keep up with the tremendous reduction in hogs which took place in that period of time. You know, Mr. Speaker, when you hear this talk, especially this statement made by the hon. Federal Minister of Agriculture, stating that there was a deliberate onslaught in Britain to drive Canada from the United Kingdom market; I mentioned a while ago that that was a most unfortunate statement. I think that, for the benefit of those people who are laboring under the misimpression that our trade balance with Britain has not been too good, I would like to inform this House that, in the last thirty years, Great Britain has purchased over 11 billion dollars more in goods from Canada than we have bought from Great Britain. That is the part I think we should keep well in mind, and at the conclusion of the war, Mr. Speaker, I think Canada had an excellent opportunity to retain the bacon market. As a matter of fact Sir Andrew Jones, the British Trade Commissioner in Canada, came to see me and he wondered what we could do to encourage farmers to go back into hog production because of the dire need for bacon in Britain. Our difficulty, as I said, was to hold the contract commitments that we had with Britain during the post-war period. I happened to be checking the figures the other day, Mr. Speaker, and I note that the first Bacon Agreement with Britain called for 290 million pounds of bacon. The second Agreement, in 1940-41, called for 425 million pounds of bacon, and the third agreement, in 1941-42, for 600 million pounds of bacon and the fourth one, 675 million pounds. Now we filled all of those contracts right to the full, and then, when I look at the hog population in the same period of time, I notice that it has correspondingly increased. Just as soon as the war was over, a drastic drop took place. For instance, I noticed that, in 1943, we had a hog population of 1,750,000 hogs. In 1944, we had 1,599,000. We have today approximately 400,000. Last year, 1948, we only had 396,000 hogs left in the province of Saskatchewan, and each succeeding contract dropped drastically for the simple reason that we were not able to fill our contract commitments to Britain. In 1948, for instance, our contract obligation was 195 million pounds; 1949, last year it was 160 million pounds and we barely sold 100 million pounds of bacon. Probably we would not have sold them that much had a liquidation not taken place at the latter part of this calendar year. Next year's contract is 60 million pounds of bacon. It is a kind of a token contract, Mr. Speaker; it is at the expense of wheat, yet they called this "postponed deliveries on wheat", but we can just kiss that wheat goodbye. In other words, they are robbing Peter now to pay Paul so they can come back to the farmers here and say that we have a bacon and a cheese and a salmon contract. All of these were taken out of the wheat sales to Britain.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if that was the reason that they stated in the Throne Speech that they are going to continue the Wheat Board for another year. Naturally they would have to, because we want to see Britain take delivery of this other 12,000,000 bushels of wheat.

I want to mention, Mr. Speaker, that one of the reasons our hog production has fallen so drastically was because that was the deliberate policy of the Federal Government. You will recall that they permitted a disalignment to take place in coarse grains. You will recall that they completely decontrolled coarse grains, having those grains out of reach of the hog producer or the feed producer as well. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition recalls his part in trying to urge the Dominion Government to once again make restitution, not only to the farmers, but to everyone else who lost money in the year, 1947.

That, as I say, Mr. Speaker, was a deliberate policy. Not only were the prices of coarse grains disaligned but, in addition, the Dominion Government continued the freight subsidies on feed grain to the Eastern hog producer. I have no objection to that, particularly; but I think that our western farmers should have been given some encouragement to remain in a diversified type of agricultural production. I have gone over the figures and made some comparisons. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that in the period, 1930 to 1933, there were slightly more hogs in western Canada than there were in eastern Canada. In the period 1941 to 1944, there were 4,000,000 hogs in the west and 5,000,00 in the east and, in 1949, there were twice as many hogs in the east as there were in the west, which shows the tremendous liquidation of hogs which took place in the west because of deliberate policies carried out by the Dominion Government.

I want to inform the hon. Leader of the Opposition, who is always talking and making a big to-do about P.F.A.A. payments in south-western Saskatchewan, that the Dominion Government has paid approximately \$19,000,000 every year up to the present; a total of some \$190,000,000 in all to the eastern feeders. I want to say to him too, that if he takes the trouble to look up the records, he will find that the farmers and berry growers of British Columbia have also received tremendous subsidies in one way or another. We do not object to it one bit; but we certainly object to our hon. friend leaving the impression here that we have got a benevolent Government at Ottawa that will take care of the farmers under crop-failure conditions, and leaving the impression that they are the only beneficiaries in the Dominion of Canada.

I want to mention another point in connection with this hog contract we have now. It is expected that the entire delivery will be made by July, after which time there will be absolutely no support under the hog prices. I was wondering if the Rt. Hon. Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa was expecting the hog producers to organize under his famous Natural Products Marketing legislation (which I propose to deal with) with which the poultrymen got into real difficulty, but were finally able to get under prices support without organizing under the Natural Products Marketing Act of the various provinces.

In 1949, at the Food Production Conference held in Ottawa, we went away from that conference knowing that there were no contracts signed with Britain. Everyone felt the uncertainty of the situation, particularly the poultrymen, because they were definitely told they could not expect another contract. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa could have prevented a whole lot of confusion and a whole lot of loss of revenue to the poultry producers of Canada had he announced then that he intended to support the price of eggs until the poultry producers could get organized under the Natural Products Marketing legislation; but he very brazenly told them that they had been warned, and that was it. In other words, he was picking on the poultrymen to experiment in this attempt to abdicate the responsibility for price support. The result was a drastic drop in the poultry products, and, you know, peculiarly enough, while there was an actual scarcity of eggs in Saskatchewan, we were facing a situation where the prices of eggs were actually dropping. Generally under free enterprise supply-and-demand as it should work, according to our friends opposite, prices should go up when there is a scarcity; but actually in Saskatchewan the prices kept dropping, and the price of eggs would have gone down to 15 cents a dozen had it not been for the pressure of the organized farm movement and the organized farmers in Ontario.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture went back to Ontario from here, and he learned there he was not going to get away with it. Then, of course, without putting up a dime, he just simply announces that the Government would buy up any surpluses at the end of this year. No one knows whether there will be any surpluses or not. But, immediately, that did have a stabilizing effect on the poultry market. What I would like to see someone answer is, why didn't he do that simultaneously with his announcement that there would not be a British contract? That was his first concrete attempt to get away from stabilization and orderly marketing.

As a matter of fact when the matter got very serious, I wired Mr. Gardiner on December 21st. The reply that I received might be interesting to the hon. members. I mentioned to him that egg prices had declined a further five cents and that they were down to 24 cents for "A" large, and the producer was now receiving less than the cost of the product, through drastic reductions in price attributable to Special Products Board ceasing the purchase of eggs. To prevent demoralization of Saskatchewan's Poultry industry, I urged that the Price Stabilization Act be invoked and support prices announced immediately. My reply from Mr. Gardiner in effect was: "I have your wire of the 21st," and states, calling attention to the fact that egg prices declined following the announcement. No other authorities could be made to apply to the British contract owing to the fact that there is no contract as of December 31st. Then he went on, "this is a product which would be most difficult for a government to deal with satisfactorily. By purchasing the surpluses, we would in all probability get all the eggs. In other words, we would be in the egg business if we attempted to apply the only means a Federal Government can, that of price-fixing. We have no authority under the War Measures Act. Immediately the contract ceased to exist, we would have none of the authorities which we originally had under the War Measures Act and later under the Agricultural Products Act. The basic authority in connection with price control in the marketing of a commodity the great part of which is consumed in the province where it is produced, rests with the province."

It is pretty clear that he did not intend to invoke any price support assistance to the poultrymen unless they were organized under the legislation, under legislation, by the way, that the Minister passed on the eve of a Federal election. He had some remarks to make when he was in Regina, 'passing the buck', that we had not utilized our Provincial Marketing legislation. Here is what he said while in Regina:

"Had an egg marketing board been established in Saskatchewan before the expiration of the British Egg Contract, producers would have been in a stronger position to re-adjust themselves to changed marketing conditions, and they would have been in a better position to benefit from the Federal prices support legislation."

I want to comment on this point. The hon. Leader of the Opposition, if he does not know it, is either playing ignorant or he does not

know anything about marketing legislation at all, and the Dominion Minister ought to have known that, as long as there was a British contract, there was no possibility of organizing producers. He knows as well as I know that a vote was required. He ought to know, if he pays attention or looks at the record, that the B.C. poultrymen got an adverse vote while there was a British contract in existence. He knows, and if he does not he ought to find out, that every province has got to have similar legislation and that you at least have to have provincial governments lined up before any scheme of that nature would be workable. Mr. Gardiner knows all that; but Mr. Gardiner is more interested in playing politics than he is in coming to the rescue of hard-pressed producers.

He had a few more things to say, Mr. Speaker, that made it quite clear where the Liberals stood on marketing. He said, when speaking to the Chamber of Commerce here in Regina, that control of civil rights rests constitutionally with the province and legal precedent as established with trade and farm products, when it takes place in the boundaries of the particular province, is a matter of civil rights. We all know that. Only in time of national emergency can provincial rights be over-ridden. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a good deal of discussion on this constitutional question, but what the farmer wants to know is this, and here is the answer that he wants. If a thing can be done in wartime, it can be done in peacetime just as well.

Here is another thing that Mr. Gardiner said, which was most interesting. Mr. Gardiner felt that he had sufficient experience to say that the Federal Cabinet could not handle the problem of food marketing better than either the private trade or the provincial government. Most interesting statements. It pretty well indicates their position on orderly marketing. I have a whole fist-full of quotations here, Mr. Speaker, but I will not bother with them.

I want to draw the attention of the House to this famous legislation which Mr. Gardiner passed in the dying days of the 1949 House of Commons – before a federal election! Mr. Speaker, this is a whole lot of ‘eye-wash’ in my opinion. I am going to read this particular Bill, as I am sure the farmers in the country will enjoy it. This is the marketing legislation which Mr. Gardiner keeps talking about. It is a piece of legislation that is not complementary to any marketing legislation as we envisioned it. It is just a complete fabrication of responsibility:

Section 1 of the Act: “This Act may be cited as the Agricultural Products Marketing Act.”

Section 2: “(1) The Governor in Council may by order grant authority to any board or agency authorized under the law of any province to exercise powers of regulation in relation to the marketing of any agricultural product locally within the province, to regulate the marketing of such agricultural products outside the province in inter-provincial and export trade, and for such purpose to exercise all

or any power like the power exercised by such board or agency in relation to the marketing of such agricultural products, locally within the province.”

That particular paragraph sounds just like the hon. Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa. Oh yes, a whole lot of double talk! Sub-section (2) is most interesting:

“(2) The Governor in Council may by order revoke any of the authority granted under sub-section (1).

Section 3: The Governor in Council may make regulations prescribing the terms and conditions governing the granting and revocation of authority under Section 2, and generally may make regulations for carrying out the purposes and provisions of this Act into effect.”

That’s Mr. Gardiner’s famous enabling legislation. Quite a joke! By the way, Mr. Speaker, this is the legislation Mr. Gardiner had the audacity to suggest at Stockholm, Saskatchewan, during the Federal election campaign, that we should market our coarse grains under. He knew better than that. He knew that we were all set to purchase coarse grains under the Wheat Board; but when the hon. Premier here started to burn Mr. Gardiner a little, he made that statement, and, later on, running true to form, he went through the motions of putting coarse grains under the Wheat Board under duress of facing the voters in a Federal election.

I warned the electors of this province then that I wanted to wait and see until I would believe that coarse grains were under the Wheat Board – and they are not under the Wheat Board yet. They still gamble on the speculators’ market, leaving the door open for their speculator friends to come in; permitting a situation whereby the farmer is the one who guarantees any loss of price or carries the insurance for any loss in price under the old speculative marketing system. What the farmers wanted, what the organized farm movement, the Canadian Federation, requested was that coarse grains be put under the Wheat Board first, and speculators be put out of the Wheat Board – period! And that speculation cease, with the purpose in view of keeping a proper relationship between the price of feed grains and the price of livestock, dairy and poultry products. It is only on that basis, Mr. Speaker, that we can expect to have a stable agricultural economy, and it is because that was not done that today we only have a handful of hogs left in the province of Saskatchewan.

That pretty well explains, Mr. Speaker, the performance of the Liberal Government as against the promises made at election time. The organized farm movement is particularly concerned because of the effect of decontrol policies.

Well, when Mr. Gardiner went back and faced that situation, he naturally had to do something about it. He established by a verbal reference a floor price on poultry products, and then he came back to The Battleford by-election, and he told the farmers there, "You have nothing to worry about," when, just before, in December, he told the Production Conference at Ottawa the future looked pretty pessimistic and he did not blame the farmers if they were worried about the future, because, he said, you never know when those Americans are liable to declare some particular agricultural commodity surplus and then we won't be able to earn these vaunted Marshall dollars. It seems, Mr. Speaker, that these Capitalist governments are afraid of the accumulation of food surplus. If there is anything that frightens them it is the prospect of a surplus of food. They do not know how to distribute it properly – and not only foods but other goods – and the economy which they support will never do that particular job.

One of the primary reasons that farmers want some stability in not only wheat and coarse grains, is that we are all thinking in terms of stabilizing our entire agricultural economy. We, in Saskatchewan are somewhat concerned as a result of the emphasis on a straight grain farming policy. We know that a well-balanced agricultural economy is necessary if we are going to retain soil fertility, if we are going to prevent erosion and deterioration of soils, both through wind and water. It is necessary, therefore, to restore fibre to the soil and, when you think in terms of fibre, you immediately must think in terms of forage crops and, quite naturally, forage crops are associated with a mixed-farming type of economy. It is of considerable concern to agriculturalists that any government should bring in fiscal policies that will throw that production picture into disalignment. The farmers themselves, too, are getting sick and tired of being told one year to get into hogs and then the next year to be liquidated of them entirely.

Then too, Mr. Speaker, we realize full well that, in addition to parity prices for farmers, we also appreciate and know that the working people must be guaranteed an income if they are going to be able to buy the foodstuffs produced by the farmers. In other words, not only our working people, but farmers too, are asking governments now to take the responsibility of seeing to it that our income both to rural areas and to urban centres is maintained at a stable level, and that is all in the interest of giving permanency to our entire economy to get away from the ups and downs that we have experienced so often in the past. Therefore, we are wholly within our rights in demanding that the Dominion Government discharge its responsibility in regard to fiscal policy in a manner that will give us that over-all assurance. But not everybody, not all business institutions by any means with the exception perhaps of the small businessman, are interested in seeing price supports for agricultural products. The Winnipeg Grain Exchange particularly have been arguing and very vigorously condemning the British contracts which we supported to the limit and they have been pointing out to the farmers of the west that they have lost millions of dollars because of bulk trading. Now, these same people are saying that the Government should not support farm prices. They are just being a little contradictory on that point.

It is generally know, Mr. Speaker, that the Winnipeg 'Free Press' has been right out in the vanguard against not only orderly marketing, not only against the British contracts, but more recently has been very vigorously opposed to any floor prices at all. They are using the specious argument

that it means more taxation; that the taxpayer has to assume this responsibility. I think they are very fearful that they will not be able to get their fingers into the pockets of the farmer any longer.

The Winnipeg 'Free Press' has always been the sworn enemy of the organized farm movement, and I have been particularly noting their line of propaganda. I noticed the similarity between their appeals to man's primitive fear instincts and that adopted by the hon. members opposite. For instance, Stanley Jones, President of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange has this to say (and imagine this coming from the President of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange) when he was commenting on the coarse grains being placed under the Wheat Board. Of course he did not know then that they were only going to be half-placed under the Wheat Board. He said this: "Farmers in Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan alone are regimented and lose their freedom of action while producers in other provinces retain their liberty to sell their products as they please." Just exactly the same line of reasoning used by the hon. member from Arm River – "They are losing their liberty."

The thing that interested me more than anything else, was that this same Winnipeg 'Free Press' that has been so opposed to the policies followed by the Dominion Government during the war years, and who are opposing so vigorously anything that might be in the interests of agriculture, has seen fit to enter into an unholy alliance with the hon. Leader of the Opposition. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know who wrote this particular pamphlet. It says on top, "Winnipeg Free Press Pamphlet No. 27," and the title is "The C.C.F. Record in Saskatchewan examined by Walter Tucker, Leader of the Provincial Liberal Party" – and comments by the Winnipeg 'Free Press'. Now, I do not know where Mr. Tucker's examination lets off and the Winnipeg 'Free Press' comments begin, so I just came to the conclusion that it is a joint effort.

It is interesting to know that here we find the Leader of the Opposition in the camp of the enemy. I wonder if that is not his natural home. I rather imagine that, when the farm people of Saskatchewan began reading this pamphlet and seeing that it is published and apparently edited and put out by the Winnipeg 'Free Press', they are going to have some doubts as to the sincerity of the Leader of the Opposition when he stands up in this House and starts crying over the poor farm people and the poor farm women particularly, that they can't get electrification and all of these conveniences. He does not seem to understand the background and history of the fight over the years between the publications that stand for the organized farm movement and those that are opposed to the interests of the farmer and uphold the interests of the speculative grain exchange in Winnipeg.

In going over my records, I have had occasion to take a look at some of the pamphlets being circulated by this same Winnipeg 'Free Press', and the mails are full of them at the present time. They all follow the identical story as Mr. Tucker has here in his story of Saskatchewan. All the way through there is a threat held up that people are going to lose their freedoms, they are going to lose their human rights and all the rest of it. The 'Free Press' talk exactly the same way. I am going to read an extract from one of these pamphlets I received in the mail quite often now. It is entitled, "Where the Responsibility lies," and clearly indicates the position

February 27, 1950

of the Winnipeg 'Free Press'.

“The reason,” they say, “for the constant pressure of the Wheat Pools and the Federation of Agriculture for Government contracts which made necessary the outlawing of all other export markets is readily identifiable. It is their opposition to the market system of doing business. By persuading governments to enter into these unwise and exceedingly costly contracts, they made the closing of the wheat market and the strangling of other export markets inevitable. To serve these contracts it was necessary to shut down markets and to block all other outlets and even now, when the failure of the British market is staring them in the face, these misguided people are not criticizing the Government at Ottawa – note Mr. Hannon’s almost daily tirades in Ontario for failing to open up export markets long closed; they are attacking the Government for not granting costly subsidies to farmers either by direct government payments or by high floor prices, as if it were the duty of the consumers and taxpayers to compensate farmers for the costly mistakes of these very men.”

There is the attitude and the type of propaganda that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has found himself allied with. This whole type of reactionary free enterprise, term it 'capitalist' propaganda that is floating around is getting to a dangerous level. I have heard many references to the Bureau of Publications and the “Saskatchewan News” that it is a propaganda sheet, and that the Government thereby was utilizing funds that they should not utilize in that manner; but I want to state in this House that, when the daily Press or any other Press is not going to present the true facts, then it becomes necessary for governments to get out a publication, if the people are going to know the record of performance of the administration. The same attack now is being made by other people in regard to the C.B.C. It seems that our reactionary friends cannot stand criticism. They only want their side of the story presented either on the radio, or in the press or anywhere else. The Leader of the Opposition cannot claim any pride for any achievements in politics in Saskatchewan. They are not a credit to his astuteness or his political cleverness. But if I had a Press like the hon. Leader of the Opposition, or if we on this side entirely had a Press of that nature, the Opposition would not have a ghost of a chance.

The thing that concerns us is this. I notice, coming to my desk there is an organization set up to service 'big business'; in other words they are going to have a listening post here and there, a listening post in this case on the C.B.C. to try to keep their friends informed as to who these dreadful radicals are. They set up a monitoring service, and (you have to get this!) it is called a Universal Personal Service, Robson Street,

Vancouver. Here is what they say – and they are quoting extracts for the benefit of their business friends, so I suppose they can list all the potential progressives in the Dominion of Canada, and at the same time, discredit the C.B.C. by saying that the C.B.C. is slandering and biasing the broadcast in favour of progressive thinking. Here is what they say:

“There will be no sweeping away of controls and planning in the event of a Conservative victory in the British general election, because Britain cannot live except under a planned economy. That is what Matthew Halton said on the C.B.C. programme ‘Capitol Report’, discussing election promises of the major contenders.”

They are holding Matthew Halton as one under suspicion, and they go on to say that Halton said:

“If the Tories win there will be a whoop of joy from the Right Wing all over the world and especially in the United States where so many people regard Socialism in Great Britain as a kind of crazy apparition on the part of an otherwise splendid people.”

They quote this for the information of their business friends. This is the beginning of Fascism, Mr. Speaker, in this Canada of ours.

Then too, Mr. Speaker, they wish to intimidate some of the progressive people. They think that they have got this communist bogey up to a point now where it is unpatriotic to criticize or say anything progressive at all, and they are going to see to it that they are going to run these people down just as quickly as they can.

“For the information of some business friends, in another of his series, Left Wing, Professor Arthur L. Phelps described his impressions of Britain, last summer, contrasted to his previous trip in 1937. He spoke over C.B.R. and the Trans-Canada network on the evening of November 26th. He said, and here is the propaganda element of his remarks, “We gaze in wonder at the children, the happy children. Things are better in this part of England than they have been for generations. There is self-respect and cleanliness and happiness. It is not all redeemed yet, by any means. How can you redeem generations of misery overnight!”

Here is a statement that a man wasn't supposed to deliver over the C.B.C. He would be suspected of being a radical for making a statement of that nature. Another example from this monitory service:

February 27, 1950

“The so-called documented programme on the subject ‘What does Labour want?’ on the C.B.C. Dominion network on the night of November 24th was one of the slickest pieces of propaganda the C.B.C. has managed to turn out. It was presented on the programme “Cross-Section” and took the form of a drama.”

Then they go on and relate the whole drama. That was ‘slanting’ in favour of Socialism!

“Here is another one from the ‘Citizens’ Forum’ which we should also take off the air as slanting in favour of Socialism. On this programme on December 8, on the same network, listeners were told by a representative of labour that it is not unusual to find employers using one group against the other to get cheap labour. The speaker was Lloyd Phelps, a member of the Provincial Legislature and of the United Packing House Workers, on one of the panel discussions ‘Racial and Religious Tolerance – How can we combat it?’ Strangely enough there was no speaker representing the management on this C.B.C. programme.”

I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that when you reach that point you are getting to the dangerous stage of Fascism.

I was more than interested in the statement made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, particularly the expression “stand up and be counted”. That has a familiar ring to it, and I wondered where I had heard that expression before, until I went back into some of my material and found that this originated with a certain B.A. Trestrail, another paid agent of our Capitalist free-enterprise friends, up here from the United States to do a little job in fear-mongering. What a beautiful story he had to tell, and, in true capital fashion, he had suitable inducement – a \$5,000 cash award for any of the good Canadian people who could answer certain questions correctly, yes or no, unqualified answers.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Did anyone obtain this award?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Oh, I think they did – \$1,000 for the first prize and \$500 for the next prize. By the way, when this first came through the mail to me I thought it was Simpson’s catalogue because it was written on identically the same paper. So we get a pretty good idea of the kind of people who are behind all of this talk about freedom and loss of freedom and human rights, and particularly our press. They talk so fervently about democracy and the right of people to govern themselves I say, Mr. Speaker, that when these people deliberately confuse issues by conjuring up a whole lot of bogeys they are doing the democracy a great service.

Mr. Tucker: — Like you, about the American troops.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — They are the ones who are paving the way for totalitarianism on one side or the other, and they ought to have a better sense of their public responsibility than that. We see it right in this little prairie town of ours. We cannot even have a Press here that will be fair to all the sides of the questions, and still they stand up and talk about freedom. They have to stop talking about freedom and human rights as long as we have to put up with this sort of thing.

Mr. Tucker: — Anything about the American soldiers in Canada in that?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I can tell you a whole lot about that. Mr. Speaker, our hon. friends opposite are very adept at taking extracts out of speeches, or taking a few words from a speech and then making a great thing out of it. They are in a very peculiar position. One of them over here would like us to be about 50 per cent Socialist and the hon. member from Arm River spent two hours and twenty minutes trying to prove that we were not only 100 percenters, but we were linked with Communists, Fascists and everything else, and he quoted for two hours and twenty minutes to try to prove that. So they would like us to be bad on one side completely, and then on the other hand they would like to be able to say, “Ah, they are in retreat completely; they have lost all their prejudice,” – and I want to thank the Leader of the Opposition for bringing this squarely to the fore again. He said: “We want you to declare whether or not you stand for the Regina Manifesto. Stand up and be counted.” Well, I am mighty proud to stand up and be counted on the side of the Regina Manifesto and Socialism.

My friend picked an unfamiliar battleground when he picked that and, believe me, if anyone has ever been of service to the C.C.F. in this province, it was the hon. Leader of the Opposition when he moved that amendment.

There is one thing more, Mr. Speaker, that I want to make reference to and then I will wind up my remarks. Mr. Speaker, there are many people who suffer from the delusion that farm income depends only on the prices that the farmer receives. That is not true, and I want to make it clear here that the C.C.F. is always behind orderly marketing in bulk purchases and bulk exchanges. We have always stood solidly behind it. Our great complaint at the moment has been that although we had orderly marketing, we had assured markets, with Britain for the five-year period, we have little hope that we will have some stability for the next four years unless certain other things are done and providing that they have an International Commodity Exchange set up that will see that the surpluses are properly distributed. As I said, the marketing machinery is set up. But, Mr. Speaker, our main objection lies in the fact that while making these long-term agreements they did nothing to keep the cost of farm production down at home. They announced in 1945 that they were going to decontrol. They said they would do it in an orderly way. The Conservatives said we should take it all off at once. Well, it did not make much difference how you did it, the result would inevitable be the same. So, we have seen farm production cost reach an all-time high in Canadian history and I want to say to my hon. friends that not only did the cost of farm production go up, and not only did many items necessary for farm production double, but the cost of living has certainly doubled. All of them talk about the money that should be available for education; that there should be more money available for municipalities. Do they ever stop to think that the basic

reason that municipalities find themselves in difficulties, today, is because they have to pay twice as much for everything that goes into municipal administration, that goes into providing educational facilities for the schools? Municipalities are caught in the same up-surge of prices and the same vicious circle as the farmer is caught himself. This Government here, provincially, is paying millions of dollars because of the decontrol policies of the Dominion Government. I think our cost-of-living bonus to employees runs about \$21 per month; cost of materials and foods, and everything, has gone up; cost of construction material has gone up. Why, I think that our hon. friends instead of directing criticism and drawing attention to fields where there is no responsibility of the Provincial Government involved, ought to direct their criticism to their own Government at Ottawa who permitted this situation to develop . . . (interruption) . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, are we going to have to sit through while the Leader of the Opposition is permitted to sit there and shout across the floor? I make a protest again, Mr. Speaker, that, unless the hon. member will rise to his feet and ask questions properly, I am not going to myself. If ever there was a 'cry-baby' in the history of the House, it is the gentleman who sits across there, who has done nothing but sit there and howl and has not the courage to get up and ask an intelligent question.

Mr. Tucker: — The hon. gentleman says I haven't the courage to stand up and ask a question. I ask him to withdraw that as I asked him a question, and the hon. Minister would not answer it and so I jest at him, which is the usual thing, and there is no reason for the Premier to get so excited, as it is the usual thing which I have done.

Mr. Speaker: — I have been trying to keep down the comments across the floor of the House and as the Leader of the Opposition does have a fairly heavy voice it does interrupt considerably anyone that is speaking, and I would ask every member, on both sides of the House, to give the courtesy to anyone who is on his feet and if they want to rise to a point of order, kindly get up and obey the rules, instead of this cross-comment across the floor of the House.

Mr. Tucker: — The Premier is more guilty of this than any other man in the House.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. From now on I am asking all members to refrain, as far as possible, from this crossfire across the floor of the House. If it is continued I will take the proper parliamentary steps to stop it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the remarks by the Leader of the Opposition from across the House do not disturb me. If he would like to ask any questions now, or later on, I shall be glad to try and answer them.

Mr. Tucker: — I would like the Minister of Agriculture to tell us whether he is in favour of the Wheat Agreement or against it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Apparently the hon. Leader of the Opposition was not listening very closely when I stated that the C.C.F. has always stood firmly behind bulk purchases and bulk exchanges of agricultural commodities, and most assuredly we are in favour of the International Wheat Agreement; but our objection is that we are fearful that the International Wheat Agreement

may not be implemented. We are very fearful, Mr. Speaker, that the methods and machinery will not be provided to make it effective, as I said in the course of my remarks. It is all right to have an International Wheat Agreement, but the Agreement is no good if you cannot sell wheat and you cannot provide wheat to the need areas of the world. I suggested that an International Commodity Exchange be set up, and I want to remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition that the Canadian representative voted against that suggestion, and the Dominion Minister of Agriculture was not very much concerned when he was down in the United States that he had no surpluses, and then he came back here to find our agricultural production having fallen off during the post-war years we should have increased our over-all production, and then made the proper distribution of it, not through the assistance of Marshall aid, or any kind of mutual aid from any nation, but through mutual agreement between nations whereby the subscribing nations would set up a fund to subsidize deficiency areas of the world. I suggest that is a sound principle.

Within the nation we subsidize certain areas which are of low carrying capacities. For instance, we get a Dominion subsidy for the far north provinces to discharge our responsibilities under the constitution; we get P.F.A.A. payments, we get subsidy assistance to the eastern stock producers; all for which is the principle of distributing wealth. We have, I think, to recognize that that is the thing that has to be done on the international level, and that is the function we would like to see an International Exchange perform, and naturally they have to have the wherewithal. I am willing to believe that you will never have a perfect balance of trade between one or two or more nations, no more than you can get a perfect balance of trade between one or two more provinces, or states to the south of us. I think we have to face squarely up to the fact that the higher nations of the world, those nations which are the farthest advanced in technical knowledge, ought to assist the backward nations, first of all by subsidizing them for immediate food supplies, and also assisting them by technical advice and technical assistance to develop the resources of their own country so that they can be self-sustaining. That is my 'foreign policy'. That is my answer to all this fear that is flying around in the atmosphere today. I am one who believes that the plan provides the best and only solution to the spread of totalitarianism. You cannot contain any kind of totalitarianism within a given limit when we, and democracies, don't improve our case at all.

I think that point was very well illustrated when I had occasion to listen to the Director General of F.A.O. To me, that gentleman is a modern Christian millionaire, because his mission is one of the scientific distributing to the needy people the food resources of the world. And, I want to say to the hon. gentlemen that Mr. Dodds informed us that, despite the fact world population had increased since 1938 by two hundred million souls, our actual food production has not as yet reached the 1938 level. That is why I complain so bitterly, Mr. Speaker, when I see we have reduced our agricultural production all through the post-war years. That is why our markets have come to a dim end. We could not go on forever on Marshall aid, you could not go on with bilateral trade agreements; but what leadership did Canada give to the idea of an International Commodity Exchange? None that I know of; none – but I follow the policies of our great neighbour to the south.

I think it is about time that we, as Canadians, have some ideas of our own on some of these questions, because I am going to tell you that our

agriculture here is going to depend on optimum production if it is going to operate efficiently. You could not expect any factory to operate on a 50 per cent production basis and operate efficiently, and it is the same with the agricultural industry. We ought to have more hogs. We should be producing more butter, more cheese, more of all of those commodities. It would give us more stability. It would give agriculture across the Dominion some degree of stability; and my principal objection and criticism to many of these agreements is that they have not anything sound behind them, and they envision that prices are going to come down – and who can say what prices should be four years from now. I think all of us should be aware that it is based on the concept that our farmers must have parity prices if they are going to stay in the business and survive. Those things are necessary.

My hon. friends could serve this province and the people a whole lot better if they stopped all this fear-mongering and faced the situation as it exists today. All we are trying to do is face up to problems, not only the problems of distribution of foodstuffs on an international level, not only problems of concern of the Dominion, but problems which concern us in the province, too. We do try to be realistic and I don't care, Mr. Speaker, what they call us as long as we are conscientiously endeavouring to provide a solution. They are trying to get everyone on their side. They are even trying to get the churches on their side, and everyone else, because they haven't a reasonable argument to put forth, because they don't want to find a solution for the common man. They are more interested in the political faction than they are in anything else.

Mr. Tucker: — The hon. Minister suggest that what he has said is his 'foreign policy', and that any attempt to contain Communism would not be of any great advantage. Now I am wondering if he means to suggest that he is against the attempts of the Western nations to get together to compete against Communism?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — As I said, Mr. Speaker, you are not going to contain any kind of an 'ism' on the basis of trying to settle the issue by military conflicts. I am firmly convinced that the only way you can contain the start of any ideology such as that, is by the democracies delivering the goods, and Maurice E. Dodds very specifically put his finger on this at the Production Conference when he told us that he travelled hundreds of miles by plane over the various countries, particularly the far East, Indian, China, and he told us when he went into the Communist-held territory of China he asked these Chinese people – why did you support the Communist Government? And they just answered, quite simply – “because the others didn't deliver.” He told us that the needs of those people were very basic needs which we could not even imagine – that a lot of them didn't have enough clothes to cover their bodies – a case of food – a case of bed to sleep in.

I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that had we given food and technical help to the Chinese people in a friendly spirit we would have accomplished a whole lot in the interests of preserving the status quo in China – if you want to call it that. But we did not do that. We took sides in the issue, and now we are on the outside looking in. The sad part of it is that the people in China, the people that God created, are still starving and people are still starving in India and totalitarianism will spread there too, unless we begin to 'deliver the goods' as Mr. Dodds said.

I want to conclude my remarks now, Mr. Speaker, – to come back to our fair province of Saskatchewan, sometimes I like to move ahead pretty quickly, too; but when one looks back and sees the progress that has been made since this administration came to power, one cannot help but believe that the people in the country certainly realize that a terrific change has taken place in the province of Saskatchewan and that the inertia which existed for thirty years has been broken. All one needs to do is to look at the construction of highways. To be sure, we have got more traffic than we ever did and the depreciation on our highways is consequently greater. One only needs to take a look at the hospitals in the province and one sees fine hospitals in practically every part of Saskatchewan – and, by the way, Mr. Speaker, these hospitals enjoy stability today, both the religious institutions and the others. They enjoy today security they never had before in the history of Saskatchewan. One merely has to look at the development of the bus transportation, bringing good service to the remote areas of the province. I have one in my own constituency that recently got a bus service, and the people are most appreciative of that. I am one, Mr. Speaker, who never goes about my constituency making any kind of promises, and I do know that those people thoroughly appreciate what has been done for them in the administration end. Two hospitals have been erected since this administration came into existence. Now, I see my hon. friends smile; but I tell my constituents that, “If you want someone to get you a road, or get something for you, elect a Liberal – they can do that; but I am thinking more in terms of the main fundamental issues that are eating at the base of our social structure.” Now, Mr. Speaker, one only has to look at the expansion in electrification, despite the fact that the Leader of the Opposition points to Manitoba, when he ought to know (and I think he does know) that in a densely populated area it is much easier to electrify than in the broad spaces of Saskatchewan. He knows that, but he wants to make it political capital. He realizes that all people don’t know that yet, but people are beginning to see. And then, too, the farmers of this province know that if adversity comes they are assured protection under a C.C.F. administration. Mr. Speaker, when I speak of the progress that has been made, I am not saying there is not a whole lot yet to be done, and I am not suggesting either that some mistakes have not been made; but the major mistake in which the former administration so grievously erred by doing nothing, we certainly have not made. We are on the road, and we have certainly arrived at our first destination which is quite evident to everyone concerned.

I rather think, Mr. Speaker, that our friends opposite are going to have a pretty hard time in the next few years, because as one of these Socialists, as one of those persons who has given considerable thought to economics, I know that the economic situation is going to deteriorate. It must be that way under capitalism. We can see it operate now. We can see it in the decontrol of prices – another opportunity for ‘big business’ to clean up the wartime savings and all the rest of it, at about 60 per cent of the former value of the purchasing dollar. We see all that. And perhaps that is the reason we are getting these things to distract attention from the real issues; but I can assure my hon. friend opposite that, when another two years is over, he is going to have some explaining to do on behalf of his friends at Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, I know these things are inevitable. I once heard this Capitalistic system described, and I thought it was very apt description, because it fits the case perfectly. One speaker once said, “There are certain fundamental economic laws which you cannot ignore,” and he held his pencil and dropped it, and said, “This is the natural law of gravity. There are natural laws in economics, too. If there is a profit made, someone has to

be the loser, and naturally it has to be someone at the source of raw production.”

My hon. friend from Redberry laughs – he never heard of it; but I want to tell my hon. friend that a cream separator acts exactly the same way. By a certain set of laws, when the bowl begins to spin the lighter elements come to the top and they come out of the cream spout at the top. But, you know, some of this fear-mongering propoganda has been so effective that I have actually know farmers to sit for thirty years as the skim-milk spout expecting cream would come out.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Mr. B.L. Korchinski (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I would like first to congratulate the new members that we have in this house in this Session. I take great pleasure in congratulating the member from The Battlefords. I had the opportunity to go out there during the campaign for a very short while and to help with that campaign, and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, there were some of the C.C.F. Ministers and supporters agitating. In one cafe at one time there were three Ministers and I suggested to them that we should have a Session right there at the cafe in North Battleford.

When I was sent down here, Mr. Speaker, by the people of the Redberry constituency, I was sent down here with the purpose to take part in the debate that would be carried on in this Legislature, and I would like to reduce this whole thing to simple terms. I understand that in debating there that are certain rules that are to be followed and that there are certain issues that are to be discussed and that there are two sides to the question. Now, in my opinion we came down here to Regina to debate the issues that are concerning provincial matters and we came here with the purpose of finding out what this Government is doing in provincial matters; but when we have Minister after Minister who represent the Government get up and try to evade the issue and debate about something completely out of the question, dealing with something that has nothing to do with the provincial issues, I am at a loss as to what I should be saying here, because when you are going to debate against somebody, you should have at least some points from the other side of the House which could be debatable. So far I fail to see anything that we could discuss on Provincial government here, because most of the speeches of the Government speakers have been discussing Federal issues, Chinese issues, Russian issues, and some other places except Saskatchewan. As a good illustration you had our Minister of Agriculture here talking for one hour. I time him because I was interested to know whether he was running true to their colours. He was talking for one hour denouncing the Liberals in Ottawa, attacking Mr. Gardiner for one hour. That was, of course, going over the air and that might be good stuff for the public outside to hear. And then at the end he dealt with Provincial issues for seven minutes, and there was not a minute that he spent on the Department of Agriculture or the grasshopper campaign, or the weeds, or anything that concerns matters in Saskatchewan here.

I think we came up here to hear something from the hon. Ministers about the progress of this province. So far we have not heard them. Perhaps they will come out when some of the others get up and present their viewpoints.

It was very interesting to listen to some of the speeches; they were very entertaining. I was interested in the speeches made by the Mover and the Seconder of the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne. There was quite a bit of entertainment in them; but there was a very significant statement made by one of them in respect to China. He said something like this: "People of China chose Communism – not that they like Communism more but that they like starvation less." It was his opinion, and that was again repeated by some others, that the people of China chose Communism. I think that the people of China were conquered by Communism – they did not choose it. Stalin, and his politburo from Moscow, through their stooges, conquered China with the aid of the Communist Party with their ammunition obtained from Russia. It was the stooges in China who conquered the Chinese people and the Chinese people had no choice and, therefore, they should not be so happy about it and they should not spread this stuff around that the Chinese people chose Communism – because they did not; they were forced by suffering. But I remember one example, one little story that a very kind Chinese gentleman once told me. He said that, during the time that the Japanese were invading China, he was not very much worried about this fact because China was like a pile of dry sand and when it is conquered it can be compared to somebody poking a stick into this pile of sand – as soon as you pull the stick out, the mark where the stick was poked in covers up, and there is no sign of it. I think that is what will happen in China. As time goes on, the Communists and their stooges, the Communist in Russia and their stooges in China will disappear, and the people of China will be able to reassert themselves and live freely as they did before.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition and the member from Arm River. They presented the case to the province of Saskatchewan and succeeded in having the Government and the members on that side confess that they were Socialists. We had a long and hard battle to find out what they were and now, finally, they stood up and they confessed that they were Socialists. I wonder why they did not call themselves that before. I wonder why they adopted such flowery names as Canadian Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. Why didn't they come out and say they were Socialists? I think the question behind this whole thing was that this Socialist pill is very bitter, and they tried to cover it up with nice, sugary sweet words so that the people of Saskatchewan would swallow it. They did swallow it; but now they are beginning to find out what is inside the pill, and they began to spit it out as time goes on. I think that we succeeded wonderfully well in nailing them to the spot. Now we know who they are; we know that they are Socialists. The people of Saskatchewan wanted to know that. They wanted to know that for a long time. Now we can go out and tell the people of Saskatchewan that we have a Socialist Government in Saskatchewan because they got up and confessed that they were Socialists. So that we now can declare an open season on Socialism.

When it comes to a debate, the affirmative side (which I take to be the Government in this case) is supposed to advance certain arguments, and we, on the negative side, are supposed to take these arguments apart and show where they are wrong. Now, I suppose the first speaker on the affirmative side who was supposed to advance the arguments was the Premier himself, and he took some consolation in the result of the North Battleford by-election. He tried to make it sound as if he won the election. I am surprised that he talked that way, because I notice that, today, we had the member from North Battleford introduced, and he is sitting on this side. They are always trying to make things appear as they are not; and the British Election is

February 27, 1950

another example. Anyway I am going to mention the things I took down as he was speaking, because it is difficult to get that information any place else and you have to depend on your own notes.

At this particular point, I would like to say something about the method of recording the proceedings in this House. I do not think that they are satisfactory, at least they are not satisfactory as far as I am concerned. I do not know about the other members, but my own personal conviction is that the method of taking recordings of proceedings in this House is not satisfactory for the simple reason that, last year, I had the privilege of making a speech and I wanted a record of that speech, a written record. I asked for that record twice and up to this day I have no record of the speech I made. After my speech I was followed by certain Ministers in this House who made reference to me and to some of the things I had said. There was the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of Education. I wanted to know where those records were kept and I wanted to know what they had said, because I wanted to defend myself; but I could not find what they had said. I have had to sit here for sometimes four and five hours with the dictaphone earphones on and listen to the whole thing over again to find out what they had said about me. Now there is no record except in those mysterious cylinders of what happened in this House, and I think that is just C.C.F. technique to shroud everything in mystery. But still, they say, "There it is, go and get it!" But have we a chance to get it? I asked twice for my speech and I have not got it yet. I cannot compare notes. I do not know what they have said.

I do not think that the broadcasting of the proceedings in this House is satisfactory, either. The people in the country do not get a true picture of what we do in this Legislature. That might sound funny to the Minister of Finance; but I do not think that you disagree because a debate is not something that you can't take a part of it and call that cross-section the whole debate. It is not uniform all they way and, therefore, how can the people in the province decide for themselves what is going on in this House from what they hear? If they were listening, today, to the Minister of Agriculture, they would have been thinking they were in Ottawa in the Federal House. I would suggest that, if a debate is to be made over the air, all of it should be broadcast, and all of the speeches should be broadcast so that the people will get the true picture over the air of what is going on.

Turning back to the Premier of this Province, I notice that he stated that Czechoslovakia was not a very good case to study as far as Socialism was concerned, because, he says, that there was a putsch there. He used that famous word 'putsch'. He said that the Communists performed a putsch on Czechoslovakia. The fact remains that Czechoslovakia was Socialist – and how does he know that the Communists in Saskatchewan will not perform a putsch on him? There is no guarantee. Then he was saying something about "Communism cannot be contained by military force". I wonder what he proposed to do? Sit down and sing them a C.C.F. lullaby to stop them from coming to Canada? I consider Communists as criminals when they are out of bounds, and the only thing that will stop them is force, because that is the only thing they are using.

I was interested in his amusing explanation and definition of Socialism. He went to some length explaining what was meant by Socialism, and in one place he claimed that the Capitalist system considered human beings as economic animals in front of which there was dangled continually the

“carrot of profit”. That is to say, that human beings, being economic animals, would follow this carrot of profit and would achieve certain things and, of course, he deplored the fact that human beings were used so. I suppose in a Socialist economy human beings are uneconomical animals, and we have had a very good example of this as it is operating in Saskatchewan in some of the Crown Corporations – there must be lots of those uneconomical animals because we have been continually offering lettuce. But it is peculiar to notice that they deplore the word “profit”. The Minister of Agriculture said that if somebody makes profit, somebody must be taking a loss. That is a very funny argument. He thinks in terms of a static world; that nothing can change. He does not believe that human effort and energy can create things that did not exist there before. How about the Crown Corporations? How about the Power Commission? There is a profit there! Who is sustaining the loss? He says that if one person is gaining a profit another person must be suffering a loss. I think that the consumers in the Power Corporation would like to hear that one. It must be that this Government is robbing them of money that belongs to them as there is a profit which they claim, and that means, according to the Minister, that somebody is sustaining a loss. If the profit be a million dollars, there must be a loss of a million dollars to the consumers who are using the Corporation’s services. It is very useful to them to denounce this word ‘profit’, but if they have profit in anything, it is also useful to show that profit and a fellow likes to read, “Now look, we have made a profit for you! – this doggoned word that we have been running down for so long, but you see we have made a profit.”

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that there is no one in this province of ours who is working for anything else but profit. Every person is working for profit. The profit may be in various forms, but everyone engaged in an occupation, whether a farmer or teacher or doctor, is trying to get some profit. I do not think that they should denounce that word so much.

My hon. friend from Canora (Mr. Kuziak) came out with an excellent speech that was heard all over and he used that worn-out term “Democratic-Socialist”, which I can say to be pure bunk as there is no such thing as Democratic-Socialist as I will later on try to show to this House. Instead of discussing provincial issues, he found some little case of an old-age pensioner. He claimed, offering some doubtful evidence, that this particular person, not understanding English, was, therefore, denied the benefits under the Old Age Pension Act. He tried to make a big case out of it; but I think that the hon. member should study the applications of the Old Age Pension Department as it works under this Government. During the last year I had the opportunity to observe bureaucracy in action, and I do not think they had grounds for accusing the particular party that was in power at that time about the particular old man who could not talk English. I could bring out scores of examples of old ladies and old men who could not talk English and who could not get pensions last year, and I have cases that are tragic; but because bureaucracy is in power, you can do nothing about it. I will just give an example of one lady. She is 72, but she cannot prove that she is 72 by what this Government considers to be the necessary proof. This lady came from the old country, and settled in this country. She did not bring any birth certificate with her, and she lived in this country for the last forty years. In the meantime, two world wars destroyed her birthplace. Just before the war she wrote for her birth certificate, and it was just at the time of the outbreak, and somebody, presumably a clergyman in that particular village, tore out the page from the Parish Records. Her name and the names of many others were on that page, along with the date of birth, etc., and they sent that to her.

But that is the only proof of her age that there is. According to the other people whose names appear on that page, that record is authentic; but, of course, that cannot be accepted by this Government because they say it is not a birth certificate. They say there is no signature on it, and they say there is no other way to prove that it is authentic. I took this particular page to a clergyman at home, and I asked him if he ever saw a page like that, and, being a displaced person, he knew it was a page from a Parish Record kept in the old country. I wrote to the Old Age Pension Department office and they still rejected it, and then they said that Ottawa does not allow such things. They usually fall back on Ottawa for a dodge.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. My statement is that the final authority for deciding on the eligibility of any old age pensioner is the Pension Authority at Ottawa.

Mr. Korchinski: — I do not care who the final authority is. This lady, in my opinion and in the opinion of other people, is entitled to her old age pension. I do not care who the authority is. If Ottawa is the authority, I am willing to get up and criticize them as well, because I think that the old lady is entitled to her pension. I can point out similar cases where people came from the old country and the places where they were born were completely destroyed by war, and now they can get no records. There is the case of a man who has friends who are willing to take an oath that he is 72, but that is not acceptable. I think that, in the name of justice, something should be done, because these people have no other sources of income, and the only thing we can give them in the way of social aid is an old age pension.

Mr. Kuziak: — The census records.

Mr. Korchinski: — The hon. member from Canora suggests the census records. What would you do if you cannot find them in the census records? I know of two cases where there were no census records, or records of any kind. These people are here and they are of eligible age, and they cannot prove it except with dubious records. I do not think that they should have to interpret the law to the letter, but should try to use a little commonsense.

There was quite a case made of our returned men being defrauded, by the Government, of what was coming to them. I do not think that the hon. member from Canora knows that our returned men have received the best treatment of any returned men any place in the world.

What has the C.C.F. done for them: They have attempted by every means to organize collective farms, and they are trying to put these boys on collective farms. They are trying to introduce collectivism by the back door of this province. I do not think that they should be proud of it. They try to make a big issue out of it; out of how successful the co-operative farms are. They continue to call them “co-operative farms”, but the fact remains that they are collective farms, and these people are trying to start collective farms in our province, and I do not think that we should let that go by without challenging it.

I don't think that there is any necessity to mention the British election results. The members across are taking some consolation in the fact that Labour got in, in Britain, by the skin of their teeth, and they even sent a wire, which money could have been spent on something better. The fact

remains that they should have thought of this before they started celebrating. It takes two terms to throw out the Socialists.

We had, in 1944, a big Socialistic victory in Saskatchewan. Now we have them back with a very reduced majority of members in the House. Then we had the Federal election, and they hate to think of it. What happened? They said that Socialists were on the march. Yes, on the march; but they forgot to add the word 'out'. According to a certain way in other countries the Socialists sweep into victory and then the next election they just about have it, and then the last election tells the story. That is the way it will be when the next election rolls around in Saskatchewan.

Now there was nothing stated by either one of the men that I have been mentioning about the provincial issue and then, the other day, we had the Minister of Natural Resources; but there are some things I would like to know about this oil stock. Everything smells. I would like to know something of this Bichan fellow. What is going on anyway? What is going on in this province? Something is not clear. First of all, the Minister says he is going to make a statement on the matter.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — On a point of privilege. I did not say I would make a statement.

Mr. Korchinski: — Then I shall withdraw that and say that when he is asked to make a statement he says he has no statement to make. The whole thing has to be clarified to satisfy me and the people that I represent. Then, of course it was radio-time again, and the hon. Minister of Natural Resources took great pleasure in discussing the McGregor report and some wheat payments and so on; but the whole trouble with the C.C.F. is that they never try to give credit to the other side. I think if you want to talk about someone, why not say some of the good things they have done sometime? Why don't you concentrate on the doughnut instead of the hole? They want to consider the hole instead of the doughnut, and I do not think the people of this province appreciate this procedure. I think they would like to know something that goes on in this province of course. They have heard everything about this McGregor report; they know the report, and they do not need the Minister of Natural Resources to remind them. But did you notice after the radio-time we cut how flat his speech fell? It was really pathetic.

I want to say something about the hon. member for Bengough (Mr. Brown) — as this is a debate we must say all we can — and the joke that he cracked was very flat. He said he was "speculating", and he also said that the C.C.F. was "on the march" (and the march should be out of the House). Then he said something about the pioneers of this country. He said they had built the Pool, the Credit Unions, and so on. Now I would like to remind my friend from Bengough that the Pool, the Credit Unions, the co-operatives existed here long before the egg was laid by Lenin, the Socialist egg that was then warmed up and hatched out at the C.C.F. So there is no sense in his accepting this pioneer movement. I marked his speech for time, and find 4½ minutes on Provincial affairs and 31 minutes and 3½ seconds on Federal affairs. I think the men on the Government side should take a lesson in civics and citizenship. They should start with the simple things, and come down to earth. They should study the good of this America, and they should learn that under the British North American Act the powers were divided between the Federal and the Provincial Governments. Then, having found what the Provincial issues are, they should come down here to Regina and debate the Provincial issues,

February 27, 1950

and if they ever get elected to the Federal Cabinet at Ottawa, let them debate the Federal issues there. I do not think there is any sense in our debating something here that is not debatable, and talking about things which they do not know anything about.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That's what the Liberals like.

Mr. Korchinski: — The Minister of Natural Resources says that is what the Liberals like. The Liberals like to debate; they like to give the people some points, and show where you are wrong on those points. You have not, so far, advanced any commercial issues and, therefore, it is difficult for us to show that you are right or wrong. You are trying to evade that issue. They are using false comparisons, etc., to evade the issues and so on. I think, too, these members should study the books dealing with debates and they will find they are out of order when they are discussing something they cannot do anything about.

The Minister of Agriculture, as I said before, spent an hour denouncing the Liberals. They like to denounce the Leader of the Opposition: — they have nothing to say so the best thing to do is denounce the Opposition; not to refute or show the arguments are wrong, but just to shout and denounce, that is all. That is their technique.

I have not started advancing the points I have to deal with. I am just summarizing what you fellows were doing for the last two or three days. I do not think that there was one point advanced about marketing of our grain that was a Provincial power at all. It was all talking about the Federal issues, and he said, "Just wait. things are going down; they have to. We'll fix you fellows when election comes around." Can you see the workings of their minds? Now they are working on this idea. They know they have had it, and they are working on this idea that things will go bad. They will go bad, and as they will be able to sneak in again. Well, let them. You say that the Liberals were conjuring fears; what was this that you tried to conjure just a while ago, saying that the markets were being lost. Isn't that fear-mongering? It is "okay" for them to fear-monger. They are those people with haloes about their heads; whatever they do is always correct, and whatever somebody else does — well, it may not be so.

Mr. Speaker, having disposed of these reactionary friends of ours: they try to call themselves progressives and call us reactionary; I call them reactionary, and I am going to prove the point. I call them reactionary because this stuff they are preaching is as old as the hills.

Having disposed of these reactionary friends of ours, I would like to discuss some of the points that I prepared as far as the Provincial issues are concerned; but seeing that it is just about 6 o'clock, Mr. Speaker, would you call 6 o'clock and we'll get back here and continue.

Mr. Speaker: — It being 6 o'clock, the House will recess until 8 o'clock.

Mr. Korchinski (continuing): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue my contribution to this debate and since the Government has not seen fit to discuss their record here, I think I shall continue to discuss their fundamental beliefs so far as economics is concerned. First, I would like to deal with Socialism. I would like to make this as simple an explanation as possible, and, to make it clear, it seems to me it is necessary

to go back in history and discuss the beginning of this movement. People who study the history of the various political movements know that Socialism began as a reaction to the Liberation of the French Revolution. This is what is known as modern Socialism, for Socialism itself is very old, but modern Socialism began as a reaction to the Liberalism of the French Revolution based on their philosophy of John Locke, Voltaire, Montesquieu and others. There are books written on politics explaining to us what was meant by human rights and so on. And then there was the French Revolution with its violence. Towards the end of the French Revolution we had writers taking a reactionary view of the movement of the Revolution, and among them, the first one and that is the father of Socialism, a man called St. Simon. I would like to quote something that there is about this particular person, and the extraordinary thing is that the same Socialism that was not only early recognized as the greatest chance to freedom but quite openly began as a reactionary movement against Liberalism of the French Revolution, gained general acceptance under the flag of liberty. It is very rarely remembered now that Socialism, in its beginning, was frankly proletarian. The French writers who laid the found of the modern Socialism had no doubt that their ideas could be put into practice only by a strong dictatorial government. To them Socialism meant an attempt to terminate the revolution by deliberate reorganization of society and by the imposition of the course of spiritual power. Where freedom was concerned the founders of Socialism made no bones about it. Freedom of thought they regarded as the root of evil of 19th Century society, and the first of modern planners, Saint Simon, even predicted that those who would not obey his proposed planning board, would be treated as cattle. Now that is the extraordinary beginning of the modern Socialism.

Of course, as you know, there was the Congress of Vienna with its reactionary decisions about the affairs of Europe. Then there were again the revolutions of 1830 and 1838, and on the impetus of the strong democratic current proceeding the revolution of 1838, this Socialism began to ally itself with the forces of freedom. It took the new "Democratic Socialism" a long time to live down the suspicions aroused by its antecedents. Nobody saw more clearly than de Tacqueville that democracy as an essential individualist institution stood opposed to and in strong conflict with Socialism. "Democracy expands the field of individual freedom," he said in 1838, "Socialism restricts it. Democracy attaches all possible value to each man; Socialism makes each man a mere agent, a mere number. Democracy and Socialism have nothing in common but one word, and that word is 'equality'. But notice the difference: while democracy seeks equality in liberty, Socialism seeks equity in restraint and servitude." Now this is what we hear of the beginning of Socialism.

German writers who were reactionary picked up this idea and elaborated on it, and this idea of Socialism was the predominant idea in German from the French Revolution on, and it is a well-known fact that Socialism as preached by the German writers had its ultimate end in what was known as Nazism. For over 200 years, English ideas had been spreading eastward. The rule of freedom which has been achieved in England since that time has spread throughout the world; but, by 1870, the reign of these ideas had probably reached its easternmost expansion. From there on it began to retreat, and a different set of ideas, not really new, but very old, began to advance from the east. England lost her intellectual leadership in the political and social field and became an importer of ideas. For the next 60 years Germany became the centre from which ideas destined to govern the world in the 20th century spread east and west. Whether it was Hegel or Marx, Liszt or Schmoeller, Sombor or Mannheim; whether it was Socialism in its melodramatical

February 27, 1950

form or merely organization of planning or planned economy, German ideas were everywhere literally imported, and German institutions imitated. Although most of the new ideas and particularly Socialism did not originate in Germany, it was in Germany that it achieved its perfect form. It is now often forgotten that what Germans have lived through we in the western democracies are now beginning to experiment with. It is very often forgotten that where Germans left off, the Russians now carry on.

Then we have Marx with his contribution to Socialism, although our friends on the other side try to disclaim any relation to Communism, although my hon. friend from Arm River has demonstrated in his contribution to the debate that there are a great many similarities between the Socialists under the C.C.F. banners and Socialists under the flag in Russia. Our friends seldom try to deny the connection. But it should be remembered now that Earl Marx, a German, is the father of the movement of Socialism. In 1847, there was a book published by him called the "Communist Manifesto", and, in 1867, at the time of the Confederation in this country, he published another book called "Das Kapital". Now these are the basic bibles of Socialism today. His belief was – and I heard the same belief expressed by our Minister of Agriculture – when he demonstrated his point by dropping the pencil to the floor – that Capitalism would gobble up wealth and that the wealth the Capitalists amassed would necessarily make the worker destitute. He could not see that human society was not a static thing, that there was expansion going on, and he mistook the trend and he wrote those books. It should be remembered that the Socialists of the world in those days called conferences to discuss their problems at certain conferences they called their manifestoes the 'First Internationale', and then there was the 'Second Internationale'.

Now as the time went there appeared on the scene a certain Russian writer by the name of Lenin. In 1903 at the conference in London of the Socialists, he split up the Socialist movement into two. Now, these other Socialists, Marx and those others before Lenin, believed that capitalism could be destroyed to inducing it to commit suicide by over-taxation. Lenin said that there was at that time in Russia a fertile ground for seizure of power, and he agreed with these other Socialists and he said that, although Russia was not a Capitalist country, although there was no capitalism in the same meaning of the word as there was in England and in German and in these other western countries, there was a possibility of having a revolution in there and it was possible to seize power by violence. And, so, from this time on we have the third, what is known as the 'Third Internationale'.

These Socialist ideas, as some of my friends opposite said, are not very new, in fact they are very old. Such ideas were held by people throughout history. I would like to quote from Plutarch's account about Sparta, a country which was in existence 600 years before Christ, and, if you notice carefully you will see that there is very much similarity with our planned-economy Socialists and the Spartans of those days. This is what Plutarch said:

"The discipline continued still after they were grown men. No one was allowed to live after his own fancy. But the City was a sort of a military camp, in which every man had his share of provisions and business set out. Hycurgns, the leader of the Spartans, brought up his citizens in such a way that they neither would nor

could live by themselves. They were required to make themselves as one with the public good . . . They all got carried out of themselves by their real zeal and public spirit.”

Notice that “all got carried out of themselves”; that is they have no opinions of their own. They had to follow the opinions of their leader.

Now at this particular time when Lenin was spreading his ideas of Socialism, in England there appeared a group of people who called themselves Fabians, the Fabian Socialists. Those are the kind of Socialists that we have here in Saskatchewan, because I think that they themselves confess that they derive their ideas from the Fabians of England. Now this group follow Sidney and Beatrice Webb and that old Socialist soul, George Bernard Shaw and Ramsay MacDonald. They called themselves Fabians, and this idea of calling themselves Fabians comes, as my friends opposite knows, from the Roman general, Quintus Fabians. Among its members were such eminent persons as I mentioned and this group’s idea was that if Socialism were to make any headway against the solid rock of British public opinion it would have to proceed gradually by political methods. They adopted the policy and the name of the Roman general, Quintus Fabians, who held that the only way to conquer his principal enemy was to lure him to battle in small sectors and defeat him bit by bit. That is what these gentlemen opposite are trying to do with Capitalism in Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — What are you quoting from — “The Readers’ Digest?” Can you tell us where you are quoting from?

Mr. Korchinski: — Certainly, why not? This is from a good book called, “The Road Ahead”, written by Mr. Flynn. I don’t think you heard of that book yet because it was just published and you fellows are too far behind. It is not in the Legislative Library yet. I asked for it but it is not there, but I think they will obtain it for you and you will have time to study it. I am quoting from “The Road Ahead” and also from the “Road to Serfdom”, which is Socialist by Professor Hyde. I was quoting from that book, last year, and my friends on the other side were irritated and they jumped up and they asked me if I read “The Road to Reaction” by one of the Socialist writers, and I read the “Road to Reaction” and I find that it is the denunciation of Hyde’s arguments, not refutation. It is denunciations and the same tactics as the hon. members on the other side follow. When you advance a point, they don’t discuss the point; they jump at you and call you names. That is what they have been doing for these last few days. We had arguments advanced by the hon. member from Arm River and the hon. Leader of the Opposition — sound arguments to which they could not answer. So what did they do? The hon. Minister of Agriculture stands here for a whole hour denouncing Mr. Gardiner.

Now how does this Socialism spread? That is a very interesting thing. We have its origin, and I would like to know how it is spread in the world. Well I think that they took a few pages out of the book of Lenin, who said that words present ideas and to defeat the enemy confuse the words and then you will have him at your mercy because your enemy will not know exactly what you mean. And I think that this has been the Socialist tactics in and out of this House and also throughout the province, and also in England. Confuse the words; confuse the meaning of the words.

February 27, 1950

An important thing about this whole Socialist movement was that so many writers began to praise the movement up to the sky and as they were going along there was more and more confusion in terminology, in the meaning of the words, so that today we have the spectacle of solid good people on the other side of the House getting up and voting, claiming that they are Socialists. Having not examined this thing, having not studied this thing, having misunderstood the whole thing, they get up and say that they are Socialists. I think it is a part of mass psychology, and because their leaders have promoted Socialism and because some of those other leaders did, the rest of them stood up and said, "Oh, we are behind this Socialist manifesto." They are Socialists; but I think that they will rue the day when so unwittingly they fall into this trap, because they will have to do a lot of explaining. They will have to get down now to brass tacks and find out what this Socialism is, and how it would affect all of us, and how it would affect the people of this province. They will have to get down and explain it.

So they began to confuse the public opinion and the public ideas by confusing the meaning of words. I would like to quote again. I do not think that there should be any objection because the Premier himself quoted quite a long article by some Socialist and the activities of the meetings of the United Nations. So I don't think there is any objection to reading:

"To dispel suspicions and to harness to its cart the strongest of all political motives – the craving for freedom – Socialism began increasingly to make use of the promise of a new freedom. The coming of Socialism was to be the leap from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom. It was to bring economic freedom . . ."

How often we hear this from the other side, "economic freedom".

" . . . without which the political freedom, they say is not worth having. Only Socialism was capable of effecting the consummation of the age-long struggle for freedom in which the attainment of political freedom was but the first step.

But notice the subtle change in the word 'Freedom'. This word was subjected to change in order that this argument should sound plausible and important. To the great apostles of political freedom the word had meant freedom from coercion, freedom from the arbitrary power of other men, release from the ties which left the individual no choice but obedience to the orders of a superior to whom he has attached. The new freedom promised, however, was to be freedom from necessity, release from the compulsion of the circumstances which inevitably limit the range of choice of all of us, although for some very much more than for

others. Before man could be truly free, the despotism of physical want had to be broken, the restraints of the economic system relaxed.

Freedom in this sense, is, of course, merely another name for power or wealth.”

Then they talk about democratic Socialism. We heard that word several times in this debate. There was no definition offered for this particular brand of Socialism; but there is an argument in here and I don't think that they can deny it:

“That Democratic Socialism, the only Utopia of the last few generations, is not only unachievable, but that to strive for it produces something so utterly different that few of those who now wish it would be prepared to accept the consequences, many will not believe until that connection has been laid bare in all its aspects, that there is such a thing as Democratic Socialism.”

Now what do we find in our own Government here? We find, some years back a Party appearing on the National and Provincial scene calling themselves C.C.F. and now they, of course, have confessed that they are Socialists. True to the technique of the Socialists all over, they dressed themselves up in the words Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. The people are beginning to see through these flowery words that they wear. They begin to see in C.C.F. “C.C. Falsehood”. That is what they are beginning to see. That last “F” stands for Falsehood. They did not forget to insert an alibi.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Can an hon. member get up and constantly impute false motives as this man is doing? He is saying, en effect, that the C.C.F. is made up of nothing but a bunch of falsehoods, and I think he ought to retract that statement.

Mr. Danielson: — He doesn't have to withdraw; he is talking of a Party.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member is talking in generalities.

Mr. Korchinski: — I am just talking a little part of your glory; just taking a leaf out of your own book. They did not fail to insert a word which they could use an alibi, “commonwealth”; sounds very good. “Commonwealth”. As they say we will all be having everything in common; and who would not go for such a word? That word “Commonwealth” also means Communist; it is just another word for Communist.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — British “Communist” of Nations eh?

Mr. Korchinski: — As I said it was just an alibi; it could be used in two ways, and they have conveniently inserted the name so that they would use it whenever it is suitable. To the Communist side they say, “We are Communists”; to the people opposed to Socialism they say, “We are just a commonwealth”. They come along and continue spreading confusion in the public mind.

We can get down to more particular cases. They come out with free hospitalization. They call it “free hospitalization”. Who would not want free hospitalization? Free, yes; but how about the \$30? What is free about that? And they say themselves that it costs another \$30 from the public treasury, yet they call it “free”! Well, what is that word “free”, what does it mean in here – free for \$1, free for \$30? I would give each one a free car if they gave me \$2,500, riding high and handsome. Why don’t you tell people that it’s not free? Why don’t you use the proper terminology for it? Then they come along and they say, “We’ll have free education; free education for everybody. Free – but you have to pay for it; but we’ll just call it free.”

Then they come around with some other words: “People’s Party”, “People’s Movement”. It sounds very good, but whose Party is it, anyway? I hope that they are people who are in this Party. It is not this party or that party, but “People’s Party”. If it sounds good, why not use the term? You could study this Government opposite and the people in the ranks; you could analyze them, classify them, and I think that they would not object if there are about four classifications of Socialists in the C.C.F. Party. There are those people that want something for nothing; there are those people who are hungry for power – they would like to get into power; there are idealists – those who try to believe that their system would work. There is a large group of these last people, who did not stop to think what this whole thing is about and followed that particular movement.

We hear quite often from gentlemen opposite the term “Planned Economy”. There is another classification of the phrase “planned economy”. I heard the Premier using that term. I see here the press report then he was at Saskatoon presenting the trophy to that speaker, giving a political speech to the students at the University, and he said there that every man for himself is not man’s normal way of life. He added that people did not want to get along by stepping on their friends and neighbours because they are innately decent. He said that mankind if given a chance would build a society in which group welfare and planned economy will take precedence over individual welfare.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear that I finally got a little applause from the other side. Those fellows are beginning to wake up now. They talk about planned economy. Did they ever explain this planned economy? Did they ever tell us or tell anybody else what is meant by their planned economy? Who is to make plans and for whom? that is something I would like to know, and all the people of Saskatchewan would like to know. What plans are there for our economy and for whom are they and who is going to supervise those plans?

Mr. Deshaye: — Shumiatcher.

Mr. Korchinski: — Because planned economy, if you examine and analyze this particular phrase, you will find that it is impossible to avoid economic dictatorship. Planned economy is impossible unless you have economic dictatorship. I would like to quote again from Professor Hyde, whose arguments have not been refuted so far – they have been denounced of course. This is what he has to say on planned economy:

“It is not difficult to see what must be the consequence when democracy embarks upon

a course of planning which in its execution requires more agreement than in fact exists. The people may have agreed on adopting a system of directed economy because they have been convinced that it will produce greater prosperity. In the discussions leading to the decision, the goal of planning will have been described by some such term as ‘common welfare’ which only conceals the absence of real agreement on the ends of planning. Agreement will in fact exist only on the mechanism to be used. But it is a mechanism which can be used only for a common end; and the question of the precise goal toward which all activity is to be directed will arise as soon as the executive power has to translate the demand for a single plan into a particular plan. Then it will appear that the agreement on the desirability of planning is not supported by agreement on the ends the plan is to serve. The effect of the people’s agreeing that there must be central planning, without agreeing on the ends, will be rather as if a group of people were to commit themselves to take a journey together without agreeing where they want to go.”

Our Socialists say everything that they do (and I hope that it is true) they are doing to satisfy human needs. There are certain needs that exist, and the answer to those needs it to have a programme that would satisfy those needs. Now, in the planned economy that they propose the needs are various. You cannot answer those needs with one single plan; it is impossible. People all differ in their desires. They all differ very much and, therefore, what might be food to one person may be poison to another. And, if you try to plan for all of them, you will be faced with an impossibility in that you will force a certain section of them to accept a certain plan and, therefore, the ultimate result of planned economy is dictatorship. And that is what these gentlemen across are trying to establish. First of all they talk about planned economy, then we will have, as a result of it, dictatorship.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — That’s what you are trying to establish.

Mr. Korchinski: — We have planned economy in its full force. It is fortunate that we can observe from the side how planned economy works. We have planned economy in Great Britain and we have planned economy in Russia, and we had planned economy in Nazi German and in Fascist Italy.

Mr. Willis: — What about Spain?

Mr. Korchinski: — And in Spain. The result of planned economy in Russia is starvation of millions; the result of planned economy in Germany under Nazism was bloodshed and untold suffering of millions; the result of the Fascist planned economy in Italy was the destruction of innocent people; and the result of the planned economy in England is endless blunder. I would like now to quote from “The Road Ahead” about the planned economy in Great

Britain:

“Let us look at the back record. The Socialist Government has operated at a loss the basic industries and services which it took over. At the end of 1948 it was producing coal at the rate of 7,000,000 tons a year less than the mines under private ownership produced before the war, notwithstanding the expenditure by the Socialist Government of over \$170,000,000 on mechanization to increase output. The National Coal Board lost \$95,000,000, in 1947. By raising the price of coal it managed to cover costs in 1948, but still it is in the red about \$90,000,000, since it began operations. The miners, despite the fiction that they are now the “owners” of the mines, will not produce as much for themselves as they produced before the war for private owners. Around 84,000 miners a day fail to show up for work.

The Government owns and has operated the overseas air-transport industry in the Atlantic area at a loss of \$244 on every passenger carried. The railroads have been run at a loss . . .”

Mr. Kuziak: — What about the C.N.R.?

Mr. Korchinski: — This idea that Socialism cannot work properly and achieve the good for which it stands, right now this is a part of my argument as far as history is concerned and how this movement started.

I would like to go back and discuss something about human progress. They call themselves “Progressives”, but I would like to discuss this particular term. We know that human beings lived on this earth for the last half-million years. Recorded history has it that for the last sixty centuries people on this earth have starved, lived in ignorance, filth and destitution. For sixty centuries starvation was the rule and even today famines kill millions in China, India and Africa. In the Soviet Republic millions have been liquidated and died of starvation. In 1930, the Socialists in Russia, under their planned economy, starved six million Ukrainian people. That is a record of history, and suddenly in one place on this earth just about one hundred years ago, a burst of progress took place. People suddenly had enough to eat. No one had to starve. Great strides are made in inventions. From oil lamps, we are ushered into the era of the electric light and neon lights. From filthy homes, we find ourselves in air-conditioned homes. Diseases that have been killing millions have been abolished. Space is covered in a very short time. From the ox-cart to the steam-propelled machinery and jet-propelled machinery, great progress was made in a very short period on this continent of North America. It is true that many new ideas originated in other places on this earth, but new ideas are useless unless you put them into force, unless you do something about them. It was on this continent of North America that something was done about those new ideas, and the greatest progress in human

history was made within the last one hundred years. How did it all happen? Why were people starving for sixty centuries. Why were they dying out? Why did they live in filth, and all of a sudden on this continent there was a great abundance and great progress.

To explain this we would have to look for a reason, and I think we can find no one reason for this. We cannot say that in the United States and Canada, it was the natural resources that caused this great progress, because these natural resources existed before this progress was made and people lived here before, so it was not the natural resources. I do not think that we can say it was due to the superiority of the people in the United States and in Canada that cause this outburst of progress, because the name Anglo-Saxon people starved and lived in destitution centuries and centuries before. Perhaps they worked harder; but I do not think so. I think that there are other people in other countries that work much harder than we do. Perhaps it was the mere fact of use of human energy that caused this progress, and I think that is the answer. The more effective use of human energy is what caused this outburst of progress on this continent. Well, what was this human energy? We hear quite a bit about energy, and we know that energy is all around us. There is energy in the air, water and soil on this planet and on the sun, but this energy is quite a bit different from human energy. Human energy acts under only self-control. There is nothing that will control human energy. It is only controlled by the human being itself, and no force from outside can cause this energy to act. Throughout centuries, there were authorities who were trying to control this human energy and that was what restricted and held back human progress, but when on this continent, human energy was given full play and there was individual freedom, which is recognized as the natural heritage of this continent, then we had the great outburst of progress.

For centuries people were trying to think in terms of other animals. Our Premier, the other day, said that human beings may be considered as economic animals. Now he thinks in those terms. He thinks in terms of insects, of animals who follow changeless patterns of action. The animals, the birds and the bees and the rats and the cats, they have been the same for centuries and centuries. The bees built the same hives for centuries. The birds build the same nests; they have never thought of building their nests in a different way. But man is different. He has got the power of reason. He has the power of imagination. He has the ability to change his behaviors. He has the ability, not only to change himself, but to change his environment, and that is what makes a man different from all other animals.

As time went on, to make his use of energy more effective, man began to invent tools. For six thousand years, philosophers from Plato on, have been working what authority there should be imposed and superimposed upon human beings and the authorities they have chosen were always false and human progress was held down. Only when the individual was given his freedom, his complete freedom did we have the outburst of human progress. So all this is built on faith. The human act proceeds from certain decisions to act – you first decide to act and then you act accordingly. But your decision is based on faith. Each human being has, before it decide on any action, faith. Now this faith may be the faith in the God of Abraham, in Christ, or in Zeus, or in Isis, or in reason, or in history, or in material welfare or in astrology. But there is underlying our actions, a faith upon which we base our actions.

February 27, 1950

When your belief is false, the results you obtain will also be false and not as you expected. Since you're actions are controlled by your belief, it is very essential that your belief should be right. There are all kinds of beliefs throughout the history of the human race, but all these beliefs may be classified according to three groups.

There is the pagan view – the fatalistic view, which says that the human being is not much different from a swarm of bees. They believe in the authority that may be called the 'will of the masses', 'the will of the tribe'. Now this is a Socialist view – the will of the mass and the will of the tribe. Whatever the tribe decides, or whatever the mass decides, that is for the good of all.

There is the opposite view – the Hebrew view, the Christian view and Moslem view – that the individual is the important thing in the setup; not the mass, not the swarm, but the individual. Now we hold this view as opposed to the Socialist view, which is the view of the will of the mass. We do not believe that the mass has any extra wisdom; we believe that the individual knows what is best for him. There is our basic difference between the two views. This 'will-of-the-mass' view was in control of the world up to the time of the American Revolution, and the United States – this great Capitalist country, this neighbour of ours to which our Minister of Agriculture made some references before dinner and said that we were tied up to this Capitalist country, our neighbour south of us; I suppose he would sooner be tied to the neighbour north of us – this particular continent has made progress which cannot be equaled by anything any place on this earth. The statistics on the records proved that it happened in spite of all this claim of Socialist planning and Socialist economy and so on.

Here are the statistics. Today, the United States and Canada occupy only six per cent of the world's land area, representing less than 7 per cent of the world's population, but look what they own! – 85 per cent of all the world's automobiles; 60 per cent of life insurance policies; 54 per cent of telephones; 48 per cent of radio sets; 46 per cent of electric power capacity; 35 per cent of the world's railway mileage; 30 per cent of improved highways and 92 per cent of modern bathtubs. Now this is what we find on this continent of ours. This is what our Socialist friends continually attack: this Capitalist way of life. There is no apology to make for the Capitalist way of life.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Did you ever see the share-croppers in the United States?

Mr. Korchinski: — Why do you always concentrate on the hole and not on the doughnut? There are nothing but share-croppers in Russia, today.

This is what they are trying to run down: these great benefits brought by this Capitalist way of life, this free way of life, whereby a man can find his own way of life. This is what they are trying to destroy and I think it is true, as Mr. Flynn claims in his book, that if you are looking for the enemies of human progress, Communists are not the ones on this continent, it is the Socialists. These are the fine fellows who come to you with nice flowery words; they are the ones who are trying to destroy your system. The only difference between the Socialists and Communists is that the Communists would like to club the Capitalist system on the head and the socialists, my friends, would like to give it slow poison – and that is what they have been

saying here all along. They would like to poison this Capitalist system that has brought us freedom and progress. I think that people in this country will be interested to know that the Socialists are trying to poison the way of life that we have now.

This question of Socialism has not been debated in this House. The Government's members have not explained to us what they mean by Socialism. They are not telling us what is meant by 'planned economy' – how it would work or where it would work or what is the result of this planning, and so now we have this turn of events. Speak up and tell us what you mean! Do not confuse the public opinion any more with all these words and changes in meanings of the words; but come down and talk in simple terms!

Mr. Speaker, I think that I have dealt enough on this Socialist problem. I would like to come down to some of the particulars in our province. I have some criticisms to offer and some suggestions. I would like to talk about our schools now. There are so many things that you could talk about in this field, but it would take days and days to deal with everything and I am very sad about the whole affair and the way the Government carries on. They don't give us a chance to discuss our problems; they always run down to Ottawa and attack the Ottawa people about everything. They never come down and tell us what they are doing.

I would like to talk about our schools and I would like to take this one particular phase in schools – as to high school courses. I believe that those courses, as far as our rural high schools students are concerned, are not exactly just. I do not know whether it is the fault of the Minister or whether it is the fault of somebody else, but I think that the courses for the high school students are too heavy; there is too much in them and they cannot be covered properly. I am not expressing my own views on this particular subject; I am expressing the views of many teachers who are in charge of high schools in the country. Now I think I should know what this whole thing is about when I listen to teachers in groups discussing the whole thing and this is the way it stands. We have courses, and, as I said, I am not blaming the Minister of Education or anyone in particular; but I wonder if there is any remedy for it.

Mr. Kuziak: — Suggest one.

Mr. Korchinski: — I will suggest one. I do not know if it is a good remedy, it may not be good; but maybe someone has a better suggestion. I notice by the reports of the Department of Education that there are 21,162 students in our rural areas, and there are some 6,000 going to school in the cities, (that is high school students), and there are some 3,000 taking technical high school work. It seems to me that our courses are more designed for the city students where they have more attention from the teachers and where there are a greater number of teachers looking after a smaller number of students. I believe that is unfair to expect this same results in the country schools as you would in the city schools; I believe it is unfair for the high school students.

Now this is the situation we are faced with: take the Grade 12 students. As a rule they do not come to school until perhaps the end of October; they are boys and girls who have to help at home with harvesting; they come to school late; they have a poor start because of this, and then

on top of that they have to travel great distances to school. And then, when they get back home they have to do chores; they have to milk cows and look after other chores on the farm. They have not got much time to use to do their homework. Then when they get back to school there are four or five grades in the room; the teacher can devote only one-quarter of her time to them. They do not get all the necessary attention, and so they continue to work at a disadvantage and they have to be quite brilliant and hard workers to pass that grade in a year; there is no question about that. Now great numbers of them are passing, but they have to work very hard.

I believe that the courses should be simplified. It is impossible to cover all these subjects in a year, and I think that they should be simplified and those boys and girls out in the country should be given the same chance as those in the city because, although those in the city get more attention and perhaps they know more from the books, the experiences of country children should perhaps count for something, too. There is the experiences of driving a tractor; there is the experience of looking after the chores at home that the city children do not have. And although we perhaps would lose something if we simplified our courses, we may lose something in the book knowledge, but I think it would perhaps balance itself as far as over-all knowledge is concerned.

There is the matter of books. I believe that I am voicing the opinion of students and teachers when I say that there is too much change in the text-books. It seems to me that those who are in charge of this think that every change is progress, and this is not always so: for example, the history texts, the social study texts. We had quite a discussion here about the Grade 9 Social Study texts and the Minister of Education got up in defense and deplored that the Leader of the Opposition had said that was not a fit book to be used in the schools and was a Socialist book. There is no question but that it is a Socialist book. The Minister of Education said, "We are not going to be reactionaries and we are not going to burn books as they did the middle ages". It is a very peculiar argument to use. I suppose if we had prescribed some kind of a book that contained, say, some kind of cowboy story to be used as social study text-book, and we said that they should throw it out, we would be reactionaries! I look at it this way. It is called the Social Studies in Grade 9. It is very difficult to cover and very difficult to follow; the facts are poor; the course is too long, and not only that but it is difficult to know what they are going to ask on the examination. From year to year it is very difficult to follow them, and actually to most of the schools (and this is what I find from teachers) have to go back to the old texts to get any information. They have to use "World Progress" which is still found in some of the libraries to have that information, and I cannot see why this book "World Progress" was discarded. Perhaps it was getting outmoded. There is no question about that; but there has not been something better put in its place; I don't think anybody will say there is anything better prescribed for Grade 9. The same thing applies to Grade 10 and all through the social courses in the high school – Grades 9, 10, 11 and 12. Grade 11 book is a very poor text-book.

Mr. Willis: — You are absolutely wrong.

Mr. Korchinski: — Well, maybe that is your opinion, and we are entitled to differ because the students still have to go to "World Progress" to get the facts, because they are all disorganized and there is no order in the new text.

Now, we come to mathematics, and again I say I am not blaming the Minister of Education; but especially in Grade 9, the text is very poor and this continued changing of texts in mathematics – why? There has not been anything new discovered in mathematics recently. No one has failed to admit that two and two is four, and there is no new way of proving that, say the serial number two is not what it says. It is a pure science and, outside of relativity advanced by Einstein, there has been very little that I can see that has been added to mathematics. Yet we have these changes in books, and I think we have had too many changes.

High school girls and boys often tell me that it is a hardship to be buying these new books all the time. In Grade 10 mathematics this year, there was one text and all of a sudden another text; this first text was discarded for the new one. Now, in all fairness to these boys and girls – and in our part of the country we did not have any crops for many years, money is rather scarce – I think they should simplify the whole thing and refrain from changing the course so often, especially in mathematics, and let these children use the old text-books. They should be more uniform, and they would satisfy our high school students much better and achieve better results.

There is another point that I would like to bring up, and that is a matter of very great concern to me. I think that this would perhaps be on the activities of the Department of Social Welfare. There are, throughout our district (and I suppose there are, too, in many other districts) cripples – people who cannot help themselves, and there is no provision to help these people.

I know of one case, at Radisson, there is a lady there who has two children who were born cripples; they are absolutely helpless. She is a widow; she has one girl who is a school teacher. Now this girl also supports the family. These two children, as I said before, are absolutely helpless; they have to be carried, they have to be fed, they cannot speak or say anything, and there should be something done to help these poor people. They tried to get help, and it is very difficult. You have to apply to Social Aid and you know how it works; you have to go back to your own municipality, to find they have no finances; the buck is passed from one place to the other and yet these people suffer.

I think there should either be a place for them or some aid for them.

With these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to complete my contribution to this debate.

February 27, 1950

Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I do so with quite a bit of nervousness. After listening to the fine orators we have here I feel a little nervous about it. I am not an orator, I am just a farmer, and I would like to bring some things before this House. I hope I will be able to get them over as I say them.

First I would like to say ‘Welcome’ to my seatmate here with me. We are both green, which reminds me of a story that was told quite a few years ago when we all had horses on the farms. A farmer went into town, one night, and picked up a young chap to help him with the work on the farm. Next morning they got up, had breakfast, and the farmer said to the young chap, “Can you ride horseback?” The kid said, “I don’t know, I never tried.” “Well, “the farmer said, “did you see that four-year-old out in the yard?” The kid said, “Yes”, so the farmer said, “Well, you’d better go out; he has never been ridden either, so you go out and get on him and you can both learn together.”

I think my friend from The Battlefords and I are in just about that position; I don’t know which one is going to fall first, but we’ll be there together anyway.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation for the very fine welcome I have received into this Assembly from both sides of the House and I hope that, whether my stay here will be long or short, those happy relations will continue to exist.

As you all know I came here as the representative of that very fine historic constituency of Cannington. It is historic because it takes its name from that fine old settlement of Cannington Manor, one of the oldest settlements in the province of Saskatchewan. It is a fine constituency because of the fine people who live there. It is in a park area, and the people engage in mixed farming and they live on their farms mostly – and after all, I think that is the type of a farmer we should have.

We have, in that constituency, some of the finest farm homes that are to be found in this province. We also have some of the finest herds of livestock that annually compete at both the Royal and Chicago fairs.

Another thing that we in Cannington are very proud of is the fact that for 28 years that constituency was represented by that very fine and able gentleman, W.J. Patterson. Mr. Patterson started in politics as a young man, and through his ability and personality worked himself up to the highest positions which it is possible for this House to

bestow upon him. He filled those positions in such a way, through very difficult and trying times, that he won the respect of all the people of the province, and I am sure that when the history of this province is written, 'Billy' Patterson will go down as one of the finest Premiers Saskatchewan has ever had.

Mr. Speaker, in following Mr. Patterson as a representative of Cannington I realize that I am attempting a large-size job. I don't hope or expect to rise to the heights that Mr. Patterson did in his political life, but I do hope to the best of my ability to carry out those fine traditions that he did set in public life, and I think we would all do well to follow his example in that respect. In that regard I would just like to say, that in my opinion, some of the things that were said and done in the recent Cannington by-election by the Ministers of this Government, did not add anything to the dignity of the public life of this province.

Another thing that we in Cannington are very proud of is our Moose Mountain with its provincial park, game reserve, its two lakes, golf, fishing, dance pavilion, hotel and cottages. It is one of the finest resorts in western Canada, and I would like to extend to the members of this Assembly an invitation to visit that resort next summer. I think you will be well repaid for your trip there.

While we are justly proud of our mountain and its lakes and streams, it also brings its problems. People from all over the prairie and the United States gather at that resort in the summertime, especially on weekends, and there is a very heavy traffic; it is also dangerous. The seven-mile stretch of road that connects the two lakes, Carlyle and Kenosee, is a highway winding through the bush and, on a summer evening, when the traffic is heavy, the dust is so bad that at times you can only see a few car-lengths; it is very dangerous. I am glad that the Government has at last recognized this, and has promised to blacktop this stretch. I hope they won't go back on that promise, because it is really necessary.

With respect to the rest of the roads in the constituency, they have been badly neglected and are worn out. Here, again, I am glad the Government recognized the need and has promised to spend \$800,000.00 on these roads. The people of Cannington will expect them to keep their promise in that regard.

Speaking at the C.C.F. nominating convention just before the by-election, the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. C.M. Fines) is reported to have said that the reason we did not get our share of highway work in Cannington was that Mr. Patterson did not ask for it. I do not believe that is the real reason why we have had very little work done on the highways of Cannington in recent years; but be that as it may, I can assure the Provincial Treasurer that he will have no complaint from me in that respect. I will go up and see him every morning, if that will do any good, and every night too; but I do not believe that should be necessary, nor do I think it is the proper way to allot high money. Ever since I have been elected I have been trying to find out just how the Minister of Highways (Hon. J.T. Douglas) did allot that money, but up to the present time I have not been very successful. I hope, when the Minister of Highways makes his speech, that he will tell us just how he does allot those moneys and how it comes about that a constituency like Cannington and other constituencies that happen to be represented by Liberal members, receive very little or no

February 27, 1950

highway money, while constituencies represented by themselves receive thousands of dollars. The people of my constituency would like to know why this is.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think I should have too much difficulty convincing this Government that they should do something about those worn out roads down in Cannington, for most of the Government were down there last Fall. They drove all over there on those roads; they know what they are like. I am going to ask the members who were down there trying to defeat me – and remember – I don't hold any personal grudge about that – but I am going to ask them to cooperate with me now, and try to get me some money for highways. That would be cooperation in the true sense of the word.

Mr. Speaker, in order that my criticism may be constructive – and I believe that all criticism should be constructive insofar as it is possible – I am going to suggest to the Minister of Highways that he might be able to follow some reasonable plan in respect to allotting these grants, taking into consideration such things as population, number of miles of highway, stone, bush coverage and a number of other things, and, on a constituency basis, make provincial highways; and you should add such things as density of traffic and amount of money collected from gas revenue and licenses. After all, they have a great bearing on the traffic, and the traffic has a direct bearing on what sort of a road you have, and certainly the Minister should take into consideration the amount of money that has been spent in these constituencies, say in the last ten years. Now, Mr. Speaker, that may not be workable plan, but some plan should be devised along these lines; and I am sure that members on both sides of the House will agree with me that the way in which highway money has been allotted by this Government leaves a lot to be desired. It leaves a lot to be desired on both sides of the House, I'm sure of it; and a lot more thought should be given to this very important matter – and it is an important matter.

Now to get back to the constituency of Cannington. Another problem there, in addition to roads, is bridges. As I told you, this mountain rises up in the centre of our constituency and, consequently, we have streams flowing out of it from all directions and there is a lot of water comes out of there in the spring of the year, and in wet seasons; of course it comes out all the time. In addition to that, we have the Moose Creek, which starts up halfway between my home and Regina. It, too, carries a lot of water. In order that there will be no mistake about what I am referring to, I want to talk about these bridges that occur on our main market roads, that were built by the Government, and my remarks have nothing to do with the bridges that occur on the provincial highway; I refer to the bridges that occur on main market roads. They are bridges that have been built by Governments, from time to time, on those creeks where the volume of water and the current was so swift that the culvert would not take it and a pile-driven bridge was required. They have always been constructed by the different Governments of this province, ever since the province was formed in 1905.

I would like to give you just a short history of these bridges; some of the members may not be familiar with just what the setup is, and the setup is this – and it has been this way every since the province was formed – that is the way they were originally put in there. The Rural Municipal Council applied to the Department for a bridge, and the Department sent down an inspector who looked over the situation and if, in his opinion, a bridge was necessary, he recommended to the Department

the size and kind of a structure that should be built there. In due course the Department sent its own bridge-building gang down there, and they built the bridge. There was no cost to the municipality; the municipality had a duty after the bridge was built and that duty was to fill in the dirt at the end of the bridge, making the dirt fill. It was also their duty to keep the bridge in repair as long as it was repairable.

The life of these bridges, I might say, is about twenty or twenty-five years. Some of them are older than that. I think there are some down there that were built in 1905 – I'm not quite sure of that, but they look as though they had been. Anyway, when the bridges became unrepairable, the municipality again (and remember it is the responsibility of the municipality to keep the bridge in repair) applied to the Government and they sent down an inspector. I have driven with these inspectors all over the place, in the last number of years, as my duty in the council, and they looked at them. Sometimes they would say, "Well, that old baby is done; we'll write her off." At other times they would say, "We'd better try and fix that one up for a year or two. There might be another year or two of use in it." But eventually, if the bridge could not be repaired, the inspector sent in a report to the Department of Highways and they, in turn, sent their gang down and built the bridge without expense to the municipality, the municipality again assuming responsibility for the repairs.

Now that is the situation that is, or has, existed in this province since 1905 – for forty-five years; and I think it is pretty reasonable and workable. But right now there is a lot of confusion in the matter; a lot of confusion. In a letter to the Leader-Post over the signature of the Minister of Highways, dated November 7, — by the way, that was just three days before the by-election – and I had been talking about these bridges during the by-election – he made this statement:

"May I point out to you that under legislation brought down by a Liberal Government, all bridges not on a provincial highway are the responsibility of the rural municipality and not of the Provincial Government."

Now that is a very remarkable statement. I would like to ask the Minister of Highways if that is his opinion today.

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Rosetown): — Yes, that is absolutely correct and I sent to the hon. member the exact chapter and verse in the Act which sets that up.

Mr. McCarthy: — I didn't get it; I haven't received it yet.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — It was sent to you.

Mr. McCarthy: — Well, I still haven't received it; but, all right, as far as I am concerned it doesn't matter; but I would suggest that the Minister of Highways go up to Saskatoon next month and tell the reeves and councillors assembled there, from the platform, that that is his considered opinion, and stay with.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — I have done it for years.

Mr. McCarthy: — Now, I would like to say to you (I haven't my notes) that I did write the Minister of Highways, and I never received the reply he referred to; but perhaps that wasn't his fault, the mail may have gone astray. In any event I didn't get that letter; but it doesn't make any difference anyway whether it's there or whether it isn't there. If it has been there, it has been there for years and nobody ever paid any attention to it.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — Oh, yes they did.

Mr. McCarthy: — Well, all right, I have had just as much, or perhaps a little more experience than you have in municipal business, and I know they didn't. I am going to repeat that — if it was there, no one ever paid any attention to it.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman said that no one has ever paid any attention to this section of the Act. Well, of course, that is not correct. We have been administering that Act for some time and attention has been paid to it across this province. That is correct, and that is how the thing has been administered, not by this Government alone, but by the Government that preceded us.

Mr. McCarthy: — Well, Mr. Speaker, all I can say in refuting that argument is that I have been in the municipal business for thirty years. I have had a lot of experience with bridges in my own municipality and adjoining municipalities. I have driven these inspectors — I knew them well, both from this Government and from the other Government — and my personal experience is that they were always replaced by the Government without any expense to the municipality. I am going to leave it at that.

I was going to say that ever since this province was formed those bridges have always been built by the Government and repaired, when necessary, by the municipality. That is the custom, and I don't think it can be done otherwise. If it is necessary to change the law to carry on the way it has been done, then I would suggest that the law should be changed. I asked some questions about these bridges the other day, and I have got the return here, and there are some remarkable things in that return. The first question I asked was, "How many bridges were constructed by the Government in Cannington constituency as at November 31, 1949, exclusive of those on provincial highways?" The answer given is: "During the period 1905 to 1949 inclusive, a total of 122 bridges were constructed by the Government on municipal roads in the area now forming Cannington constituency."

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — And we are still paying for them.

Mr. McCarthy: — This is the one with a more remarkable answer — and I want you to pay very strict attention to it. I want the rural members on the other side of the House to pay strict attention to it, and if you think I am not giving you the truth, go and ask your own reeve or council about it, I don't care what political stripe he is, and he will back up what I am saying: "How many of these bridges have been declared unfit for traffic by the Department of Highways?" Here is the answer: "Bridges on municipal roads are under the direction and control of the rural council in the district in which such bridges

are situated, consequently, the municipal council is responsible for declaring certain bridges unfit for traffic.” We will leave that for a moment; I am going to come back to that section.

Now Number 3: “How many of these bridges were rebuilt or replaced in 1949?” The answer is – “One” – one out of 122 bridges! Under the ordinary law of averages, with 122 bridges (and I think the Minister of Highways will agree with me in this), there should have been five replaced to keep up with the normal depreciation. Well, it is not normal depreciation. We have a backlog of ten to fifteen years, and we should have a lot more bridges. Now, I want to read this and I want you to keep it in mind and Section 2, which I read a minute ago – this is not out of the ‘Regina Leader.’ – it is the Annual report of the Department of Highways and Transportation of the Province of Saskatchewan for the years 1946-47, and this is what it says:

“There are in service 2,535 timber bridges built by this Department; 1,700 pile bridges are fifteen years old, 1,086 were erected over twenty years ago and should be immediately replaced. The report at the beginning of the year shows that we erected only 65 pile bridges during the year, consequently, replacement work does not nearly keep pace with the bridge depreciation. During the past two years it has been difficult to secure timber for bridge construction work but just as soon as material and necessary funds are available an effort should be made to improve the bridge situation. The bridge engineers estimated that 300 bridges should be replaced annually during a period of five years and thereafter an annual replacement of 125 bridges would be adequate.”

That is a report to this House two years ago. Is there any suggestion in that report that they are a municipal responsibility? I did not finish reading this return and here is what I want to read. It said there was one bridge built, but there is a ‘Note’ here –

“The funds available for timber bridge construction during the fiscal year 1949-50 were only sufficient to enable the Government to erect 50 new timber bridges in the entire province.”

Three years ago they said they should be erecting 300 of them; this year, three years later, they just told us that they had only money enough to build 50. I think it is very poor business administration. Any private individual who runs his business on that basis, would be ‘broke’ a long time ago.

A few years ago I, in company with one of my councillors, visited the Minister of Highways, and this was just shortly after this Government came into office. We were interviewing him about these bridges, and I had one councillor and the secretary with me at the time, and we asked him about these bridges and he said to me, just the same as he said in that book: “We know these bridges are in bad shape, and as soon as men

and material are available we will do something about it.” No word that they were not his responsibility. No! He was going to do something about them! That might have been three or it might have been four years ago, but there was no suggestion that they were a municipal responsibility at that time. He must have dug this musty old statute up since then.

My friend from Arm River (Mr. G.H. Danielson) said, the other day, that the farmers in this province cannot expect any consideration from this Government. I believe he is right, he is absolutely right. I say if you attempt to unload this ‘bridge’ situation on the municipalities, it just simply means that you are going to make us tax the land to do it; and after all I think anybody that has given this thing any consideration whatever, I don’t care what political stripe they are (a lot of my good C.C.F. friends have told me this too, so I am not saying it because I am a Liberal) will agree that the farm lands of this province today, are carrying all the taxes they can carry. I estimate that, in my own municipality, it would take nearly all the revenue that we spend on roads for four years to replace the necessary bridges in that municipality and I don’t think anybody would suggest that that should be done.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — The Liberal Government did.

Mr. McCarthy: — No, they didn’t. They did not!

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — Read the Act.

Mr. McCarthy: — Look! I was in the council before you were, and I know something of what I am talking about. I know what I am doing, but if you have anything to refute, get up in your proper time. I was going to say that in our municipality we have bridges on the Moose Creek with a 60-foot span – a 60-foot span on our municipal road, crossing that Moose Creek. I don’t think anybody that gives the matter any thought would suggest that a municipality should have to build a 60-foot span bridge; it is out of the question. In the first place, we have not the revenue, and in the next place we have not the material. This thing is very confused. The Minister gets up here and says it is our responsibility. He said in his letter that it is our responsibility; but he has never come right out, as far as I know, and told a municipality that it was their responsibility; although he may have done it, I have never heard him. It is out of the question, and you can ask any of your good men on that side who have had municipal experience, and I think they will all agree with me that it is out of the question to suggest that a municipality can put 60-foot span bridges over creeks of that kind and it is a very confusing situation today. I know of a bridge right down near home which was condemned by a Department inspector. I was there at the time. I believe that was five years ago. It is not in my municipality; it is in an adjoining municipality, and it just so happens that where this particular bridge is situated there is a settlement of people out there who, in order to get to town, or get their stuff out, have to go four miles over and four miles back. They don’t have a bridge at every mile on that creek, because bridges are expensive; they are about three or four miles apart. That bridge has been unfit for heavy traffic for four years, and for the last two years it has not been fit for traffic at all. The Minister of Highways has not told that municipality that it is their responsibility to replace that bridge. He is still kidding them along that he is going to do it for them; in fact he was supposed to have done it this Fall.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I hate to interrupt this gentleman in his first speech in this House, but I cannot allow him to get up here and make statements that I am supposed to have made. At no time did I ever intimate to that municipality or to any other that we were assuming all the responsibility for their bridges. True, we have helped to build bridges and have taken full responsibility for building them, yet I have never, at any time admitted full responsibility. I will have to ask the hon. member to retract that statement.

Mr. McCarthy: — The Minister is putting words in my mouth. I did not say that.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — Oh, yes you did.

Mr. McCarthy: — What I said was, that the people down there are still expecting it, and he promised to build that bridge.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — Yes, he said I promised.

Mr. McCarthy: — He promised to build that bridge, and I am not going to take that back.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, that is not right.

Mr. McCarthy: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the procedure is in this House, but if he wants me to bring the reeve or councillor down in a couple of days I could prove that.

Mr. Speaker: — I understand the hon. member who is speaking to say that he was told that the Minister had made that promise, and by a privilege the Minister has denied it, and the hon. member must take it back.

Mr. McCarthy: — All right, you know I have a good Irish friend in that municipality – it's a good job he was not here today; if he was, I am afraid we would have a 'Donnybrook'.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say any more about it. I have tried to present this thing the best way I could. It is a very serious affair in my constituency, and something has got to be done about it. These bridges were built originally by the Government in this province when they had a revenue of less than ten million dollars, and I don't think that this Government, today, with its revenue of between fifty and sixty million dollars, can very fairly claim that they cannot replace those bridges.

I am not going to say anything more about the bridges. I hope I have presented it in a fair way. I have tried to, and I just want to make a few remarks now about some of the things that happened in the House here. I was rather amused the other day to hear some of the speakers on the opposite side get up and eulogize this Government for the wonderful things they have done for the municipalities. Some of them have had some municipal experience, but I am sure one or two of them, from the things they said, have not. The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that ever since this Government has taken power, they have increased taxes on rural municipalities, upon schools, hospitals and unpaid seed grain and others. They now are attempting to load these bridges on municipalities. A couple of years ago they gave an equalization grant, not out of revenue, but out of a fund

February 27, 1950

built up by previous Governments. Last year, they reduced it. They paid the R.M.'s, in 1949, less than they did in 1948. Does anybody want to deny that? In our own Rural Municipality No. 95, in 1948 they paid us \$1,740 grant; in 1949, they paid us \$1,300, the reduction on that one being \$400. In the adjoining municipality, in 1948, they paid that municipality a grant of \$1,810, and, in 1949, they paid that same municipality \$1,350, a reduction of \$460. Now, that gentleman over there who was talking about all they had done, can put that down. In as far as I can find out (interruption) –

Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier): — We are paying more grants than any previous Government.

Mr. McCarthy: — There is one thing I would like to say, not that he has mentioned it. I would just like to say that ever since I have been in here and before I was in here, I have heard the members on the other side of the House comparing now with the 'thirties. I was here in the 'thirties, and you all were, and its is a very unfair comparison. We who lived in this province tried to feed our people, and the Government of that day did a very good job, in spite of all the criticism. If you were in the same position today you would bog down. But I hope that we are not going back to the 'thirties. He made that comparison the other day here, in connection with the power. I was in here in the 'thirties, and I know what happened. The power line came through a little town and the town was 'broke' – they cut the power off because they didn't pay the power bill. Certainly it went broke. We all went broke, but we didn't know enough to say we were 'broke' – we stuck to it and came out! I say it is an unfair comparison to compare (as my friend tried to do) the grants that were given in the 'thirties with those of today.

Last year, they added \$2.00 of a Government charge on every rural phone in this province. Now, that was a tax. If I pay anything to a Government I consider it a tax – I don't know what you fellows call it; I don't think you call it a tax, but anyway to me it is a tax because it cost me that much more. It could not be said that it was necessary from the revenue point of view, because we had over a million dollars surplus in our Telephone Department. I believe I am right on that – I don't know the exact figure – but I understand it was over a million dollars. Now then, what was this \$2.00 but another way of levying taxes that this House had nothing to say about. Nobody in this House knew it was coming, and they had nothing to say about it when they levied it.

The member from Arm River states that we, as farmers, can expect no consideration from this Government, and I don't think some of the things I have brought up here have justified that statement.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that in the recent by-election I was not able to offer \$800,000.00 for roads and a number of other things that my opposition candidate was able to offer on behalf of this Government. I was nominated Liberal candidate and ran as a Liberal candidate on a Liberal platform. I believe the people voted for me, not so much because it was me, but because they wanted to tell this Government in no uncertain terms that they preferred the Liberal policy to that of the Socialistic unbusinesslike administration of this Government.

I thank you.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I think that we are meeting here in rather serious times. We have listened to the Address of the member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) and he has said something of the things which are being said out in the country by people who are ill-informed, shall I say, and he has brought those arguments to this Chamber. I do not want to be hard on the member for Redberry. He made some allusions to our Minister of Agriculture wandering round in his subject for discussion there this afternoon. For my part, I say that if there is any danger of the Minister of Agriculture wandering away from Saskatchewan and not getting back, it will be a sad day for this House, and it will be a sad day for the farmers of Saskatchewan. I hope that we can keep him in Saskatchewan and keep him in his present job for a good long time yet.

I was rather astonished when the member for Redberry mentioned as a sort of basis to all he said – and I am not going to quote him exactly, because I was so astonished I did not recover enough to get it down – that all that we do is motivated primarily by a desire for profit. I have a much better opinion of the hon. member for Redberry than he has for himself. I doubt very much if he is motivated in his choice of profession by the desire for profit. I certainly know that, when he feeds his family and provides for them, he isn't expecting to get a profit out of that. I think that, perhaps, if the member will look around him, he will find that some of the noblest things that have been done for mankind have been done by selfless men without any expectation of profit whatever.

I rather suspect that some of the conclusions to which he came are undoubtedly put away by this notion that he has that the profit motive accounts for everything. However, I was reassured here when a member sitting beside me said there was some hope for the hon. member because he did say that two and two equaled four, so that I have not abandoned hope.

I want to commence my remarks tonight, Mr. Speaker, by making some reference to this philosophy which we call Socialism in Saskatchewan.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we should all have a fairly exact understating of what is meant by Socialism. Certainly we would be amiss if we were to accept some of the definitions of the member for Redberry.

I cannot help looking at it this way: In the beginning men and women lived, as my hon. friend said, in conditions of hunger and poverty and that they lived as individuals – rugged individualists, if you like. They lived a hand-to-mouth existence, eating today what they caught this morning. They did not hesitate to steal and plunder from their neighbours, or the weaker members of the community. After all, they were the most

cunning of the animals that haunted the jungles. The hon. member is well enough acquainted with history to know that the story of mankind has been a story of a knitting-together of people to accomplish a common purpose. First of all came the institution of the family and in a family, there is no question about it, you have pure Socialism. You have the ideal kind of practice: "From each, according to his abilities, and to each according to his needs". The unit of society continued to grow. It grew up through the stage of the tribe, the city and the nation. Now, what was the purpose of this development of society? It was simply because people could do more things working together as groups of individuals than by their individual efforts. We have had a good deal of Socialism come into existence, not by people who profess to be Socialists, but all community-conscious people are to a greater or lesser extent believers in Socialism.

Perhaps the central problem, today, in this development of a community life is to rationalize the freedom of the individual with the well-being of society. In the early days when governments were mainly political, the first form to develop was tyranny – the state dominating the individual. As time went on, the individual wrested from the state, the right to have his voice in the political affairs of the community. Today, our society is becoming, not altogether political, but more and more economic in its character. Today, we have large groups of people, all engaged together in a single industry, in a single economic enterprise; and so, since society is becoming more and more economic in its character, it becomes imperative that we have more and more democracy in our economic affairs to match the growing democracy in our political life. The issue, today, is the issue of whether the individual shall attain economic democracy.

People of Saskatchewan came to this province when it was nothing but a wilderness, fifty years ago, to escape from the tyranny and the oppression of European dictatorships. They came here because they wanted to breathe the clear, fresh air of our western climate. They wanted to be free from political oppression, from the old aristocratic feudal ideas, and they staked out for themselves 160 acres more or less. They hoped to stake out for themselves a deed upon a new and a free and independent way of life. I have here a book which I read, first, many years ago, from a schoolhouse library, by Morehouse, in 1919, and I want to quote just about a dozen lines from it, Mr. Speaker. I am willing to table it if anyone requests me to do so:

"One of the very first things that the pioneer learned was to stand on his own two feet, to do things by himself. His isolation, the obstacles he had overcome by his own planning, the hardships he had endured and survived, these were the excuses for his assertiveness, his individualism, his hostility to the restrictions of organization. He has a horse for work, but it was an effort for him to do team work because he was not used to it. This was the big barrier which would have to be surmounted in the beginning if battle were to be waged successfully against present oppressive conditions. The right kind of organization was the key which would unlock a happier future."

So you see, there was this struggle to attain greater economic democracy by organization. That is essentially the struggle for economic Socialism.

We had the beginning of Socialism when the system of free elementary education became compulsory, many years ago. My hon. friend objects to the use of the word "free". I suppose we could describe it by saying that it is free to the child who benefits from it. Of course, you have to pay taxes – there is no

Santa Claus – in order to maintain that kind of educational system; but it means that there is no price tag put on it for the little child who seeks to use its facilities. It is free to him, but his father may pay \$10.00 a year to school taxes, or \$200.00 a year in school taxes. You have a community accepting responsibility for unlocking a door to freedom for those little children. That, unquestionably, was a step in the direction of Socialism. And it is true that, wherever you take such a step, you do restrict a certain amount of freedom on the part of some small group of individuals. My hon. friends like to talk a great deal about freedom. Well, freedom is licence; there is no such thing as unrestricted and unrestrained freedom. My hon. friends talk a lot about it. When they instituted free educational system in Saskatchewan, they took away freedom from some people because there are people who think that children should not go to school. They say, “Why should I pay taxes, when I don’t approve of educating my children?” But they were compelled and required to pay taxes, whether they had children or not, and so it was a curtailment and an infringement upon those people’s freedom, but it opened up a whole new scope of freedom for the next generation, and on balance greater freedom was achieved. I suppose that people of the mental turn of thought of my hon. friends at that time would have resisted it most strenuously, because it was an infringement upon some persons freedom.

We have, in Saskatchewan, a Bill of Rights and by the way, we on this side are very proud of that Bill of Rights, because we in this province can claim the authorship of the only Bill of Rights that has been put upon the Statute Books of any jurisdiction in Canada. But even a Bill of Rights, though it guarantees a wide measure of freedom to all people from oppression and from discrimination, does deny come freedom to the bigot or the person who would go out and discriminate against a man because of his race, religion or creed. It denies that man his freedom; but is that the kind of man my hon. friends are championing, the people who resist this Bill of Rights? Are they championing the people who are opposed to the Automobile Accident Insurance Act? That is another extension of freedom in Saskatchewan. I wish my hon. friend from Arm River was here; he would undoubtedly heckle that.

We had people in Saskatchewan who were helpless in the face of financial catastrophe resulting from automobile accidents. Those people were denied the very elementals of freedom. They were denied the right to live when the breadwinner was snatched away from them by a motor accident, and that was becoming a more and more frequent occurrence. So we said, “There is a class of people who are entitled to a greater measure of freedom.” We could have done what other provinces did, just turn the motorists of Saskatchewan over to the tender mercies of the insurance monopoly. We could have done that. But that would have been an infringement on the freedom of all the people of Saskatchewan. They would have had to pay something like \$35.00 or \$50.00 or \$60.00 for a minimum of insurance protection, and we would not have heard the insurance agents’ association complaining about loss of freedom. As it is, we weighted the thing in favour of the general public. We gave them a better deal – a minimum of insurance protection for a nominal figure. Of course, that curtailed the action of the insurance monopoly a little bit, and so they come to my friends opposite and cry on their bosoms, and they my friends get up in the House and champion that group of people. And so you see, this word “freedom” is not something absolute. It is always relative. The question is, can you give more freedom to more people by doing a certain thing!

I could speak about our expanded health services and the more generous social aid that is now being provided to unfortunate people. It just amounts to this, Mr. Speaker, as someone said this afternoon: “There can be no freedom that is worth having unless the person or individual has some

It is true that Abraham Lincoln emancipated the slaves of the southern States. How many of them, today, would you say are free? Would the hon. member for Redberry trade his freedom for theirs? I say, Mr. Speaker, and I think everyone on this side of the House, and I hope, some on the other side, will agree with me, that there can be no real freedom without a measure of economic equality. Of course, the traditional kind of freedom that the laissez-faire Liberal advocates is, in economic matters: 'No restraints – Let every man seek for himself'. And they say – 'We will not pass laws against anything that results in the production of more wealth, it does not matter what happens'. It is the kind of freedom which the mouse would have if he were free to trample the elephant to death. It is not freedom at all to underprivileged people of low income.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, it is not possible for us to have a fair measure of freedom for all people merely by dividing, as equitably as possible, those things we have, unless we, at the same time, seek by all means that are at our disposal to expand the amount of wealth available. That, this Government is doing. This Government is having remarkable and singular success in that direction. We have, first, the example of our Crown Corporations. How many of those Crown Corporations would be operating today, if we had a Liberal Government in operation? I venture to say that none of them would be, and those Crown Corporations are, today, producing a fair return from the capital invested, and they are producing a large quantity of wealth which adds to the total production of this province.

My hon. friends like to make 'snide' remarks about Crown Corporations and they are a little freer when they get out in a by-election campaign with their documents, where there is nobody to check up on them, as we saw evidence of, this afternoon. I suggest that my hon. Friends tell us what they would with the Crown Corporations if they get into office!

Govt. Member: — Sell them for \$1.00

Mr. Walker: — What would they do? Which ones would they get rid of? Well, I think that is one thing the people of Saskatchewan would like to know. I think that the people of Saskatchewan realize that, if the Liberal Party were elected to power, they would get rid of our Crown Corporations. These people are entitled to know what the Liberal policy is in this regard.

We have, too, the provincial Department of Agriculture doing a great deal to expand and develop agricultural production. In the Speech from the Throne, we have a reference to the grasshopper control programme. I remember just a couple of years ago, when Mr. Eric McKay, M.P. for Weyburn, suggested in the House of Commons to the Federal Minister of Agriculture, that he might assist Saskatchewan in its grasshopper campaign, and Mr. Gardiner replied that Saskatchewan had a very excellent campaign and so far did not show that they were in need of assistance. I think that is true. I think that in Saskatchewan we have done a remarkable job of coping with that natural menace to our farm crops.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, income is not altogether determined by the physical volume of our production. There is another very important

factor, and that is the price of our production. When I start talking about Federal affairs, I hope that some hon. member will check me up. It is my intention and desire to stick strictly to the affairs and problems of Saskatchewan, just as other members on this side have. I believe that the prices we receive for our farm products is an equally important factor with this physical volume. And what are we faced with? We have this situation: our agricultural industry is gearing itself to reduced annual income. We have, for the last year the estimate of a reduction of \$125,000,000.00 in gross agricultural income. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is a very serious problem, and it is a problem which vitally concerns the Government of Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan, and I think that we in this House would be very remiss if we did not talk about it and consider it.

The member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) made some reference, this evening, to the fact that Government revenues were at their highest. Well, let us not forget that we had a Liberal Government in Saskatchewan until the middle of 1944. We had some three years of good crops with good prices, and the net income of our wheat farmers in those years was higher than it has been since. Those are facts. The wheat farmer is not more prosperous today than he was five or six years ago. The cost of production has grown apace, they have squeezed these increased costs out of the price of the wheat – the return which the farmer ought to have had for the benefit of himself and his family. Last year, on another occasion I referred to the reason for those increased in the cost of the production, and today I am more and more convinced that the reason for those increases in the costs of production are not warranted in the face of things. The reasons for those increases are largely due to the spiral of inflation which is but a reflection of the increased greed of monopoly profiteers. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Party must accept responsibility for that fact. They must also accept responsibility for the loss of our markets. Does the Leader of the Opposition suggest for one moment, that the matter of agriculture is not properly within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Government? The British North America Act recognizes that the welfare of agriculture is a proper subject for provincial jurisdiction.

We have declining farm prices, increased costs of production and the threatened loss of farm markets to a large extent, already lost. The Leader of the Opposition recognized that situation as he spoke, on Tuesday last, about the difficulties which Canada was having in retaining the British market. He said that it was difficulty for Britain to export goods into Canada's market. I think that that is probably a true statement. He pointed out that one of the reasons for our loss of the British market was that Britain no longer had the dollars with which to purchase Canadian farm commodities. That is true. He left the matter substantially at that point and said, of course, that he was in favour of free trade in encouraging wider markets and freer trade – but what did he say about facilitating that trade? I suggest that that problem is properly within the scope of this House.

What does agriculture ask for? Agriculture asks that in some way the community, the nation, should guarantee to agriculture, its fair share of our national income. Is there anything so strange about that idea? The community has long since guaranteed a fixed minimum standard of income to the people in receipt of old age pensions, for instance. The

community has already recognized that dependents, much as orphans and widows, should be entitled to a fixed minimum standard of income. The community has recognized the right of teachers to a minimum salary and of wage earners to a minimum wage. These have been done largely by provincial law. What do we see in the national field? Well, is there anything strange about the Federal Government protecting industry in Canada? We have the Federal Government protecting the home market for eastern Canadian industries. When we see everyone around us being subsidized and protected by Canadian fiscal policy, is it strange that agriculture should ask for consideration in this matter? Is it strange that agriculture should say, "We don't want to be the forgotten child of Canada. We don't want to have our income determined by the lowest value of agricultural commodities anywhere in the world." Canadian agriculture demands that it be accepted into the Canadian community.

The Federal Government has adopted certain policies in the face of this need. I am going to analyse those policies briefly. First of all, we have the Agricultural Prices Support Act. This is an Act which was passed some years ago. The Agricultural Prices Support Act involved the setting aside of some two hundred million dollars to stabilize farm prices. But we have the situation that the first time the poultry producers sought to have the Act invoked, the Canadian Minister of Agriculture said, "Oh, but I am not going into the egg business. I was voted this two hundred million dollars, but if I used it up to support poultry prices or to support farm prices in general, I would not get another nickel if I went back to Parliament." When the poultry producers decide they want assistance – if they can provide him with a satisfactory proposition; if they can show him where they will handle eggs through the usual cold storage facilities, where they will market those eggs, where they will keep a price up to a certain agreed level – then, at the end of the year, if they are stuck with some eggs, well, maybe he will buy them from them, or give them away to some foreign country. He prays and hopes that there won't be any surplus. Well, it's a simple fact, Mr. Speaker, that if you are going to peg the price of any commodity above its ordinary market value, you are either going to have a surplus or you are going to have to put quotas on production. It is quite obvious that there is a "joker" in the Agricultural Prices Support Act and that is that the Minister of Agriculture is going to be extremely wary about applying its provisions for the real benefit of the Saskatchewan farmer.

Then we come to the Agricultural Products Marketing Act. The Provincial Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) has, to some extent, reviewed the history of marketing Acts in this province and in this country. He pointed out that the Dominion Government passed such legislation in 1935 and that, at that time, it was held that control over property and civil rights, property within the province, was not a matter that the Federal Government had jurisdiction over. It was referred to the Supreme Court by the Liberal Government of that day and it was found to be unconstitutional. It is pretty well recognized that the problem of marketing and assembling and purchasing farm products within a province is a provincial function. It is also well established that when it comes to moving those commodities into inter-provincial markets and into export markets the Province does not have any jurisdiction, and so, if you are going to have an effective marketing board, you have to have the situation where they are jointly constituted by the Dominion and the Province.

Canadian Agriculture has been demanding for years that we should have a Natural Products Marketing Act to legally constitute such marketing schemes as could go into the province, assemble the goods, purchase them, and make arrangements for their export. For many years that has been advocated. The Federal Government looked, in 1946, as though they might consider such a proposition, and word came out to the Provinces, that if they would pass the complementary legislation, something might come of it. This Province passed, in 1945, its Natural Products Marketing Act, and then there was no further action taken in the matter by the Federal Government with respect to farm commodities other than wheat and coarse grains until the spring of 1949. Then you had the Federal portion of the legal constitution for these boards passed in the spring of this year. It is a very short Act called the 'Agricultural Products Marketing Act'. It has only four sections. Section No. 2 is the only one that describes the powers of these boards, and I am going to read this:

"The Governor-in-Council may, by order, grant authority to any Board or Agency, authorized under the law of any province to exercise powers of regulation in relation to the marketing of any agricultural product locally within the province to regulate the marketing of such agricultural products outside the province in inter-provincial and export trade and for such purposes, to exercise all, or any powers, like the powers exercisable by such Board or Agency in relation to the marketing of such agricultural products locally within the province."

By that Act, the Dominion Parliament constituted the Provincial Marketing Boards as sole authority for dealing with Canadian farm products. But you will notice that the first line of the Act says:

"The Governor-in-Council may, by order, grant authority to any Board."

Well, the Leader of the Opposition took a great deal of satisfaction in this House, last Tuesday, when he said that here we had a provincial Act for five years, but we had not appointed a board yet. The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that if that kind of criticism is valid, I would draw his attention to the fact that the Dominion Government has not yet passed the Order-in-Council bringing this Act into effect with respect to the Saskatchewan Farm Marketing Board.

Mr. Speaker, why are we so insistent that that these boards be set up? Why do we insist that those boards should be national boards, with provincial authority rather than Provincial boards with national authority? For this reason: If we are going to have a group of provincial boards, you are going to have to have a joint selling agency to handle those products that must go into export markets. In addition to that, in this province, no marketing board can go abroad to England or to France or Germany or Italy and make a contract to sell Canadian farm products unless the board also has some liaison with the Federal Government to provide for the exchange of other commodities for those farm products. So we believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is useless and futile to set up a board which has only the power which a private commercial organization would have when it comes to dealing in

international trade. Such an organization must be in the position that the Wheat Board is in. It must be in a position of a national board, a board which has a direct liaison with the Dominion Cabinet, so that they can come back to Canada and say, 'Now we can negotiate the sale of 70,000,00 bushels of wheat, providing Canada will take certain imports', and then you can deal on that basis.

Now, I am not unmindful of the fact that we have the Geneva Trade Agreement; but I say that there are provisions in the Geneva Trade Agreements for some such negotiations and every advantage must be taken of those provisions. The Geneva Trade Agreement is a fine thing if it will succeed in its objective in developing and expanding the principles of multilateral trade between the nations of the world. We know it was pointed out quite correctly by the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. I.C. Nollet) this afternoon, that no two nations can, permanently, successfully balance their trade. The balancing of trade must be done by the exchange of international multilateral trade; but, Mr. Speaker – this is the point that I am coming to – Canada signed that Convention provisionally in 1947. In introducing this in the Canadian Parliament Mr. MacKenzie King, who was then Prime Minister, went on at great length to explain how his Party was the father of the British preferential scheme; how that, in 1897, Sir Wilfred Laurier had pioneered in the development of the British preferential trade system, how he had founded it and expanded it all through the years. And then, by some old process of reasoning, he came to the conclusion that these Geneva Trade Agreements were a fine thing because they did away with the preferential system. No longer, under this Agreement, can one party, one signatory to the international agreement, go to another signatory and say, 'If you will reduce your tariff against this commodity, I will reduce my tariff against that commodity'. And so by that token Canada has lost this advantage in retaining the British market. I am sorry that the Leader of the Opposition did not go that far and show us why we lost part of our ability to retain the British market. If he had done that he would have come to the conclusion that the Canadian Government has sacrificed the permanent prosperity of Western agriculture in order for the advancement and the betterment of the Western World.

Now, I say that that gives agriculture some claim to consideration, especially when it is pointed out that we have now guaranteed to most other groups in the nation a certain minimum share of the national income. But agriculture must remain, it seems, at the mercy of the lowest cost agricultural producer anywhere in the world, and it is no use for us in Saskatchewan to talk about maintaining a high standard of living, to abolish poverty and provide security for our people, so long as we do not pay attention to this very vital question of protecting farm markets. I want to just point out, Mr. Speaker, before I finish, that we have these well established trade precedents, establishing the method of protecting the various manufacturing industries in the country from unfair world competition.

Mr. Speaker, while I pointed out a while ago that farm income had dropped some hundred and twenty-five million dollars, last year, from the year before, I think it probably occurred to the minds of all of you that here in Canada there was growing unemployment. I suggest that that is not a mere matter of coincidence. I suggest that a loss of farm income, one hundred and twenty-five million dollars, is a loss in purchasing power to Canadian industry that cannot but be reflected in increasing unemployment.

I say that if we are going to maintain prosperity in Canada we are going to have to do it by maintaining agricultural income in this country. I believe that it is absolutely necessary that this Province should use a National Marketing Board, and I am glad to see that the Speech from the Throne makes reference to this idea.

“Farm commodities should be handled through National Marketing boards and the Government – this Government – is prepared, upon request from the Federal authorities to submit for your approval the necessary provincial enabling legislation.”

This is a problem of extreme urgency. I say that, first, the National Government should establish National Marketing boards; secondly, that food prices should be stabilized insofar as the Canadian food market is concerned; and thirdly, I say those boards must be empowered to deal in the foreign markets of the world to the best advantage of the agricultural producer. And I say, Sir, the people of Canada must, if necessary, be prepared to pay subsidies to maintain our agricultural price levels.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that ten years ago it was felt important to keep the price of farm production down in order to prevent inflation, and the farmers did not complain very vigorously because that policy was followed. We believed in preventing inflation, holding down the cost of living. Agricultural prices were kept down, and the farmers did not complain. It was realized by everybody that a sudden upsurge of farm prices would blow the lid off our price control system. Now, Mr. Speaker, if you can ‘stabilize things down’, by holding agricultural prices, down, then I think the time has come when we must ‘stabilize things up’ to prevent a collapse in our internal economy; we must stabilize agricultural price levels by keeping them up.

The Minister of Agriculture (Hon. I.C. Nollet) mentioned this afternoon – and I think the figures are true – that Canadian agricultural income was still only about thirteen percent of the total national income for about forty percent of the people. It certainly was ten years ago. But, it won’t do, Mr. Speaker, for the Federal Minister of Agriculture to say, “Well, you’ve had a great time; now, boys, prepare to pull in your belts!” That won’t do. It won’t do for Canadian Agriculture and it won’t do for the Canadian economy in general, and if it was worth while to pay a subsidy on Canadian agricultural products to keep the price down during the war, then I think that subsidies are sound today. I think that they could well afford to pay a subsidy on Canadian farm production, today, to keep farm income up and thus protect the Canadian economy from drastic shrinkage in the future.

We have pressed in the Federal Parliament time and again for the restoration of the milk subsidy. That is a very important commodity. The chief victims of this reduction in farm income are the dairy farmers in Canada, and the dairy farmers in Canada make up a very important part of our agricultural economy, It is an important industry for many reasons. It is important, first, because it is producing a commodity – an agricultural commodity – of prime importance to the health and good nutrition of the people of this country. It is an important industry, too, because to an extremely large extent its production is consumed in the domestic market. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this House will welcome the decision of the Provincial Government to urge that immediate steps should be taken in this country to establish a sound farm policy.

Now, I am not going to go on at any greater length this evening, Mr. Speaker, but I want to say that I am well acquainted with the record of

February 27, 1950

this Government, as well as any member of this House. I dare say that we on this side know as much about what the Government is doing as, and probably a little more, than do the members on the opposite side, and I have no hesitation at all in saying that I commend this Government to the people of Saskatchewan and to this Legislature, as being one of the most businesslike and competent governments we have ever had in the history of Saskatchewan. I could not take my seat, Mr. Speaker, without also declaring my unswerving allegiance to the principles set forth in the Regina Manifesto. I believe that is a matter of some importance to the Leader of the Opposition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to conclude with just this: For the reasons which have already been advanced in this House, I am going to support the motion of the hon. member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Wellbelove) and the hon. member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Buchanan).

Mr. McDonald: — I wish to move the adjournment of this debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:45 o'clock p.m.