

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Eleventh Legislature
10th Day

Wednesday, March 1, 1950.

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

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Tuesday, February 28, 1950, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Wellbelove for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. F. A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I first would like to congratulate the Mover and Seconder for the fine and excellent job they did in moving the Address-in-Reply. I think both of them gave a very good account of themselves, and I realize it is very difficult for anyone leading off in the debate to be able to find a topic as, on the other hand, it is easier for those who follow. So I think if the member for Maple Creek had been listening at all closely to what the Seconder had to say in this debate, he would have had a lot of the answers to his questions that came up, yesterday, answered in the Seconder's address.

I would like to congratulate the new members who came into this House during this last year. There is the member for Cannington, the member for The Battlefords and the member for Gull Lake. It is unfortunate that we have had to see the passing of some of the former members of this Legislature in order to make way for new members to come in, but I feel sure that the members who have come in will try and do as well as their predecessors did. Mr. Murray was well known to us on this side of the House; we all had a great deal of respect for him. I have no doubt that Mr. Prince, from that side of the House, was as highly respected by the Opposition as Mr. Murray was by us.

With Cannington it was a different situation; it was through the resignation of the former member for that constituency, to which I intend to refer a little later on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, today is St. David's Day celebrated by the sons and daughters of the Wales of whom there are about 75,000 in Canada, and I wish to pay tribute to their beautiful country, sometimes called 'Vale of Roses'. The story of St. David, patron Saint of Wales, is a fascinating one of human strength and fertility. History shows that David was a forceful and effective teacher and a great traveller, both at home and abroad. He died in 601. In 1120 he was enrolled in the calendar of saints, and from that year March 1st has been set aside by Welsh men and women at home and abroad to pay tribute to the remarkable Welshman who kept the light of religion and culture burning in his native valley in the days when Europe was submerged in the Dark Ages. Mr. Speaker, I think it is fitting that Saskatchewan's Minister of Education is of Welsh ancestry and bears one of the famous Welsh names.

Now to refer to a few of the speeches that have been made in

March 1, 1950

this House, I would just like to comment on the member for Arm River's speech in passing. He said that the Premier has made that same speech which he delivered in the House on at least ten occasions, but it is the consensus of opinion of a lot of us that the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) has not yet made a speech in this House. I think it could be summed up in very short words just to say 'heap big smoke but no fire'.

I would like to congratulate the member for Gull Lake in coming to the portfolio of Minister of Health. Mr. Bentley is a man who is highly respected by the organized movements of this province, whether they be the farmers, labour or any other movement; he is especially highly valued by the C.C.F. movement. Mr. Bentley, I am sure, before this Session is through and Sessions that are to follow, will give a very good account of himself and I think he will remove all doubt from anybody's mind as to his abilities. The Leader of the Opposition made a statement to the effect that he thought, in his little mind, that a lot of the members on this side were very dissatisfied at the coming in of Mr. Bentley to the Cabinet. I do not think that statement is correct, at least I have never heard any of the members complain to me on that account; but I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition remembers that the Liberal's patron saint, Jimmy Gardiner, was made Federal Minister of Agriculture while still holding down the portfolio as Premier of this province! Now there are numbers of other Federal cabinet ministers that I could mention and give the names of if I cared to take the time, who have been made a cabinet minister at Ottawa and have never been elected; some of them on more than one occasion have been defeated after they have been made cabinet ministers.

He also made the statement that Mr. Bentley had had no provincial experience, therefore was not fitted to be a provincial cabinet minister. I just wonder what experience the Leader of the Opposition had in provincial affairs when he became the leader of the Liberal Party. Were all the Liberals satisfied that he had enough experience to become Liberal leader of this province? I think, Mr. Speaker, by talking to some of the Liberals out in the different areas, that they often think different, and I am not so sure but that Mr. Tucker himself believes those statements himself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard in this Legislature exchanges back and forth between the Leader of the Opposition and this side of the House, mostly directed at the Premier, as to who is the 'cry baby' of the House. Well, now, I would like to give some statistics to prove who is the cry baby of the House, especially referring to the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition. I have here in my hand, Mr. Speaker, the Journal for the Session of one year ago. In this Journal is printed the speech which was made by the Leader of the Opposition on February 15, 1949, and also is printed the speech which was made by the Premier in reply. I went through these speeches, and I find out that, while the Leader of the Opposition was speaking, the Premier of this province, I guess you could say, was very rude to him: he interrupted the Leader of the Opposition fourteen times. When the Premier spoke, however, the Leader of the Opposition did not just interrupt him fourteen times, he interrupted the Premier seventy-nine times! Well, I leave that, Mr. Speaker, for the members to judge who is the cry baby. I have not worked it out on a percentage basis, but I can assure the House it is over 500 per cent more than what he was interrupted by the Premier.

I would like now to congratulate the University students for taking the time from their work to come down here to listen to this Legislature,

and I think it is a very good thing that those students should have the chance to come and listen in this Chamber. It is unfortunate though, Mr. Speaker, that they do not have the opportunity to come down and each half of the group take two days at the start of the Throne Speech debate and the other half come down for the start of the Budget debate. Then I am sure, if they had the chance to stay here for the two days and listen to the arguments both for and against, they would be in a better position, when they went back to their University campus, to discuss those topics more intelligently.

There was one thing that did strike me as most, shall I say, amazing. We heard throughout the length and breadth of this province and outside of the province, all through the 'thirties and up to 1944 and through the 1944 election campaign and for some time afterwards, that if the C.C.F. were ever elected they would take the freedom away from the people; they would take away your right to vote; there would be no more elections and a lot of the other bogey scares, and that freedom of speech would be absolutely throttled in this province for all time if a C.C.F. Government was ever elected.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it was most interesting to me to sit down there to the banquet that was tendered to those students, and hear student after student get up and say that on the University campus at Saskatoon, there was far more political freedom than on any other campus in Canada, and that some of the campuses there was practically dictatorship on the campus, absolutely no freedom. Yet everyone said that there was definitely lots of freedom on the campus at Saskatoon. So I think the people of this province are going to start and judge the Opposition's statements and actions, not only by what they are saying today but by what they have said in the few years past. They will say that the C.C.F. does believe in freedom, and we believe in helping to promote freedom. While taking to some of those students I was also told – and by the way they were on the Government side of the House at Saskatoon, which is the Liberals there; they told me that the C.C.F. there had given them notice that they were going to bring in a motion of want of confidence. The Speaker said that he had told them that they have at their disposal in their University Parliament on technicalities this want of confidence motion was out of order, so the Speaker ruled it out of order on technicalities; but they admitted to me that it is true that they are still the government there; that if they had not ruled this motion out on technicalities, they would have been defeated on the want of confidence motion.

That gives the Opposition seats a laugh, but it was one of their own; it was the Speaker of their House who told me that, and it was also a fellow by the name of Ted Nolan, from Biggar, who said he sat on the Government side of the House at Saskatoon. So they need not try to laugh and slide it off and make believe it is not true, Mr. Speaker, because they know it as well as I do.

In the 1948 campaign, we saw lots of advertisements from the Liberal Party, one, of which I have a copy here, is most typical: "Tucker or Tyranny". But I think they made a slight mistake, there should have been an "F" on front of the word "or" and it would have been more correct. On the bottom they say "Only Tucker can lead Saskatchewan back." Well, Mr. Speaker, in order to decide where we are going maybe we should turn back

March 1, 1950

and see where we came from, then we will have a better idea as to where Mr. Tucker would lead us back to, according to his advertisement. So I would like to turn back the pages of history, not like the member for Redberry did to 6,000 years B.C. and then jumbled to future times all the way back again; I would like to turn back the page of history approximately 200 years. I would like to go back into English history in the 1770's. At that time the slavery of the black people of this world was rampant throughout the country. A fellow by the name of David Hartley in 1776 moved in the House of Commons that slave trade is contrary to the laws of God and the rights of man, but the pro-slavery group argued that it would interfere with the private rights of property, the sacred rights of property, and they had no difficulty in defeating that motion. Lord Mansfield was a judge back in those days and, on June 22 in 1772 he said that the laws of England forbade slavery, and there were 15,000 slaves in England, according to the judge's ruling, who should have all been turned free immediately. On May 12, 1789, Wilberforce made his first attack on the slave trade in a speech in the Commons, and he was backed up by great orators of the day, such as, Burke, Pitt, Fox, and others. But the House of Commons turned him down, saying that the sacred rights of property were at stake. In addition they tried to besmear his personal character. They were not satisfied with just defeating his motion to do away with slavery, they tried to attack him personally.

The Bill to end the slave trade became law on March 25, 1807. However, the trade continued and, in 1824 they passed another Bill in the House of Commons in England making it piracy and a capital crime of offence to deal in the slave trade. Even after that it still went on, and the opponents thought that the slave trade was quite nice and right for the negroes. I would just like to read a quotation from the pages of history in which they express it in better words than I could, Mr. Speaker. So, with your permission, I will quote this book here, "England and Slavery" by C.M. MacInnis. I will quote the author of the book in case any of the hon. members would like to refer to the book. There was Mr. Crowe in England; he was captain of a ship. He was dealing in the slave trade, hauling slaves from Africa to the Colonies and elsewhere, and this is what Mr. Crowe said:

"Think of the miserable beings employed in our coal-pits, and in our iron, lead and copper mines – toiling under ground in unwholesome air, which is constantly liable to fatal explosions! Think of all the men, women and children, confined by hundreds in heated factories, their health rapidly wasting, and their earnings scarce sufficient to keep soul and body together! Think of other slavish employments – often under masters quite as arbitrary and unfeeling as the planters! . . . Think of the thousands that have been imprisoned – ruined – for killing a paltry hare or a partridge! . . . and do not forget to think of poor Jack, who after devoting himself to a life of toil and danger in a vocation to which his country owes much of its prosperity, is dragged by the hair of his head to shed the blood of his fellow creatures at the hazard of his own life; or, perhaps, to wear out an embittered existence in foreign stations."

Such men as Crowe were convinced that the slave trade was not only necessary, but that it resulted in a form of servitude more kindly than any which the captured negro would have encountered among his own people.

Then there was an Act put through the British Parliament forbidding the flogging of female slaves in the Colonies. They thought if they could stop them flogging the female slaves it may help to prevent the slavery trade in the Colonies. In Barbados, in 1826, they made the startling confession that to forbid by legislative amendment the flogging of female slaves would, in the judgment of the Assembly, be productive of the most injurious consequences. Indeed flogging did not diminish during these years for there was no power in the island strong enough to prevent a practice so universally supported by public opinion. Even in the four Crown Colonies, where the Colonial Office had the greatest influence and where better principles were supposed to be enforced, flogging went on as of old.

In the year 1828-1829 – that’s only a little over a century ago – there were 68,921 punishments of which 25,094 were upon women, and these were merely those that had been reported; but it was well known that high as these figures were, they did not tell the whole tale. In that one year in these same Colonies, 1,5368,000 lashing were reported and as the slavery was milder in these four than elsewhere in the Caribbean, it was difficult to imagine the extent of flogging in old-established Colonies such as Jamaica and Barbados where the system was publicly declared to be both statutory and necessary, and further on he says:

“There cry that emancipation of slaves would mean an attack on the sacred rights of private property had been repeated so often that it had lost its effect.”

Mr. Speaker, that gives a summary of some of the places where we have come from, in the past.

It was less than 100 years ago since the war was fought in the States to free the slaves of the United States, and the same cry was heard throughout the States that, in order to free the negro and make them free of the slave trade, you are once again interfering with the sacred rights of private property.

Are these the conditions that the Leader of the Opposition would like to turn back to? He talks about the going back; I wish he would tell us where he wants to go back to. The Liberal Party of this province has never fought for the farmer or laboring people, and I would like them to prove how they have ever fought for the farmer or labourer of this province or any other province. If they have, then I would like them to tell us whom they fought against. We know when we are fighting against on behalf of the labourers and farmers, but they don’t know whom they are fighting against – if they are fighting for the workers or the farmers – because they are allies of the big monopolies which we know have to be fought in order to give freedom to the working people of this province. I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that it was not the Acme Dye and Chemical Company that they fought against, and I think that the members on this side of the House would like to hear some of the hon. members from the other side, who are supposed to know something of the Acme Dye situation, give their statements as to what has happened not so very long ago. We have seen throughout the last few years, the slavery that has been inflicted on the Indian people of

March 1, 1950

Canada. It has not been slavery by physical capture, but it has been a slavery of one of the worst types – an economic slavery; and those slave conditions are just as bad whether economical or physical.

We still have economic slavery. The McGregor Report which was tabled in the House of Commons and was held back for political purposes by the Government at Ottawa, shows the slave conditions of economic slavery that the people of this country, not only Saskatchewan, but people outside of Saskatchewan, have to submit to. Now, we have the situation which has just been released, which the member from Bengough spoke on – the wheat situation, where the Federal Government borrowed money to pay the farmers an extra payment on their wheat during the election campaign of 1949, so that they could buy the votes of the farmers, and now we have to pay that back and pay it back at compound interest.

Today the Transport Board Commissioners have handed down their decision on the application for increasing freight rates. Some time ago, the railroad had a 21 per cent increase in freight rates. The Transport Commission allowed them another interim 8 per cent. Now the ruling is, instead of an interim rate, they get a permanent 16 per cent. When you add the 21 per cent with the 16 per cent, and when you consider that the 16 per cent is based on the original plus the 21 per cent, it makes an increase of around 40 per cent of freight rates. Those are the things that are making the people of this country, a so-called free country, slaves, and on that Transport Commission is a member who sat in this House for a number of years. I think he has more parliamentary experience in this province than any other person – that was Mr. Patterson, the Leader of the Government for some time, the Leader of the Opposition for four years and who sat in this House for one Session afterwards. He knows very well the conditions and the situation of the West, and I think that Mr. Patterson could have put up a better fight on behalf of the West and tried to get us a square deal. He was in a position to know.

If there are any members of the Opposition who do not believe these things, I would just like to say to them to just wake up and look around them. Take some of the history books and study back and see where the human race is and what they have come through in the pages of history. We are not wanting to lead the people back as the Leader of the Opposition says, we want to lead them forward. I know that we have not gone as far forward in this province as we would like to, but, Mr. Speaker, I know that we are on the march forward and not on the retreat.

I would like to show what the Liberals did to education. I am not going to go into this field fully; I just want to make a few comparisons. They say all the time that they helped education, and that this Government has not done so. On August 23, 1941, the Secretary for the Round Plains School District wrote the Department of Education pointing out that they had difficulty in paying their teachers' salaries, that they were about one year behind all the time, and that, when a teacher left, they always had to take notes so that they would get their salary, and they were always paying the teacher that had left instead of the one that was there. They asked the Department if they would make them a loan or a grant to help them out of this predicament so that they would be in a position to pay the teacher as the salary came due. I have here in my hand, a copy of the letter which was written by the then Deputy Minister of Education Mr. J.H. MacKechnie in reply to the Secretary of the Round Plains School District. This is a copy of the letter,

Mr. Speaker, but I have the original letter in my possession to be returned to the Secretary at a later date. So if anyone wants to see this copy, it is here for inspection, and Mr. MacKechnie says:

“I have your letter of August 23rd and regret that funds are not available at the present time for carrying out your suggestion. If you are not able to pay your former teacher, you have the authority to give her an order on the district payable when the district has the funds for that purpose. Your main business at the moment is to get your school opened and operating. It is very difficult for the Municipality to give you any funds if you have not paid in your taxes. The only source of revenue for the Municipality (mark this Mr. Speaker) is the taxes from the taxpayer. We are therefore suggesting that you and other members of the Board give the lead by paying your school taxes and in this way make funds available. The Department will be very pleased to hear from you when you have engaged a teacher.”

Receiving that letter made the Board quite hot under the collar because every member of the school board had their taxes paid up, and for a Department of the Government to write in and tell them that they should pay their taxes before asking for help, without checking to see whether they had paid their taxes, was a gross insult. A lot of the school districts have records on their files which tells the opposite story to what the Opposition would give us when they are telling us what they did for education.

I would just like to give a few figures as to what we are doing on education. I want to take the Wadena Larger Unit, which I know the most about from personal experience. I am not taking one which is the highest assessment nor the lowest assessment. I am taking one that is fairly well an average.

In 1946, the amount of grants given to the Wadena Larger Unit, if that money had to be raised by the local people of that larger unit and put on a mill rate basis, would have averaged over the entire unit, urban and rural, 11 mills of taxation; in 1947, 13.8 mills of taxation; in 1948, 14½ mills of taxation; in 1949, over 12 mills of taxation.

They say in their letter that the only source of funds is from your municipality and the only way the municipality has to get any money is direct from the taxpayers. Yet here we show that we have given over 11 mills of taxation assistance to those people for school purposes alone, without mentioning any other grants or assistance to municipalities. In addition to that, we have had the Wynyard Vocational School, that is the composite high school, in receipt of a joint Federal-Provincial grant, under the Dominion-Provincial Vocational Assistance Agreement, in the sum of \$17,500. Regina Scott Collegiate, of which we see not mention any place giving us any credit, received over \$110,000. Swift Current received \$95,000; Humboldt, \$35,190; Estevan, almost \$13,500; Prince Albert, \$112,000. These are not the only ones. There are others on which grants have been computed on the same basis – 50-50 sharing under the Dominion-Provincial Vocational Assistance Agreement, including Rosthern, Shaunavon, Moosomin, Melville, Rosetown, Saskatoon, Kindersley, Eastend, Maple Creek, Assiniboia, Carlyle, Wilkie, Lloydminster, Foam Lake, Sturgis, Weyburn and numerous others. So I think that we have shown what we are trying to do, to the best of our ability, for both the labourers and the farmers, and I think that, as time goes on, they are realizing more and more what we are saying, just the same as they realize what the Liberals told them five years ago about taking away the rights of freedom of speech and everything else.

March 1, 1950

I would like to make just one recommendation to the Government before sitting down, and this is mostly to the Department of Agriculture. I would like to see them get more qualified vets in the Veterinary Division to help farmers mainly in the testing and vaccinating or inoculating for Bang's disease. It is getting to be a very large problem in this province and more assistance will have to be given to it, because, if we can stamp out Bang's disease, we will also help prevent undulant fever and other sicknesses of the human. The difficulty we have in the province is in getting veterinarians to do the work. I have it from good reliable sources that out of the first eight veterinarians that came back to this province after 1941 or 1942 after graduating from the Guelph Veterinary College, which is the only veterinary college in Canada and which has a very high standard in order to permit graduation; out of the first eight that came back to Saskatchewan to write their examinations under the Veterinary College Board of Saskatchewan, these men failed on an average of six out of eight. That is what makes those young veterinarians discouraged after passing the college in Canada and then having a bunch of people, who have never been to university or college for a long time to brush up on the later methods, tell them that they have failed, and I have it on a very good authority that one veterinarian was told before he wrote that he was going to be failed. So, if those conditions are correct, I would ask the Minister of Agriculture to check up on them and see that other steps are taken so that we can get more veterinarians back to this province to help look after the livestock needs of this province.

There are a number of other things which I would very much like to talk on, but time does not permit. It goes without saying, Mr. Speaker, that I shall support the motion.

Hon. T. J. Bentley (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to open my remarks with an expression of gratitude toward both sides of the House, and I think I do that on behalf of the other two recruits, also, for the very genuine welcome we all got when we came in here. We will undoubtedly express opinions that are at variance with each other, as recruits, nevertheless, we do appreciate the kindness shown us. I want to take the opportunity, also, of thanking the majority of the voters of Gull Lake who had the good sense to vote for the C.C.F. and honour me with their favour. I want also to express my appreciation of the honour conferred upon me in placing me in the Cabinet of the Government, and I hope that my services will at least be somewhat useful to the people of this province.

I would like to congratulate all those who have spoken before me; however, that would be presumptuous on my part. They all did well. They expressed the opinions they felt. Some expressed opinions that I am going to heartily disagree with before I sit down, but, nevertheless, they were opinions they had a right to express and they were properly done so in this House. The rest of us had a right to hear them to know what the various opinions are.

I do want to mention one thing that was brought up by the hon. member from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) who just took his seat, when he asked if the leader of the Liberal Party wanted to go back in history and where to. Well, from the actions of the Party, I assume, that to become a leader of that party, you should be willing to go back to any position in history which will give them power regardless of what the conditions are.

I had not really intended to speak in this debate. I was going to wait for those who were senior and the more able, because I thought that they should be heard; but there were several members who spoke previous to me who made statements that were so at variance with the actual facts, on some local conditions, and who expressed opinions that depicted the origin and philosophy of the C.C.F. in such a false light, that I felt it was necessary for me to take some part in this debate.

For quite a while, Mr. Speaker, I will remain within the boundaries of Saskatchewan; in fact most of my talk, this afternoon, will be on Saskatchewan or dealing with it. I may have to take the odd excursion out in order to bring back the hon. Leader of the Opposition from Czechoslovakia, or the hon. member from Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) from Greece or Alexandria or any of the other places he took us; but in the main I will stay here, and I want to start in by dealing with some of the remarks made by my good friend, the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron).

Yesterday, he made a very able attempt, but a very poor case, to convince this House and the galleries and the radio audience that the C.C.F. Government's Department of Agriculture had failed to serve the farming industry of this province. I am going to devote a few minutes to dealing with some of those things and state some facts regarding the agricultural policy and practice under the C.C.F. administration. In doing that I will naturally make some comparisons. For instance, here is a list of the personnel and services provided by the Liberals in 1943, and by the C.C.F. in 1949 and 1950.

Under the Liberals in 1943 and 1944 there were 21 Ag-Reps; in 1950, under the C.C.F. administration, there were 36. There is a service to agriculture. Of those same 21 Ag-Reps under the Liberal administration of 1943 to 1944, one of them had an office at a country point, the balance were located in cities – note a very good place, Mr. Speaker, to serve the agricultural industry. Farmers like people that live among them. In 1950, the 36 Ag-Reps under the C.C.F. administration do their work in the country and live among the farmers.

How many dollars were invested in farm equipment under the Liberals in 1943 and 1944? Very few. Under the C.C.F. administration in the past year, over \$300,000 were invested in farm machinery; and under development for feed and fodder under the Liberals, none; under the C.C.F., 20,676 acres. Irrigation land brought under the ditch by the Liberals, none; by the C.C.F., 15,315 acres. Number of earned projects where the Provincial Government assists a municipality or a local area by a work and wages programme or something of that nature, where they help themselves and are helped to help themselves by the Provincial Government – under the Liberal, in their last year, none; under the present Government, last year 144 projects. Cattle tested for Ban's disease: under the Liberals, in 1943 and 1944, none; under the C.C.F., last year, 39,074. Thirty-three year leases granted on a scientifically selected basis: under the Liberals, none, in their last year; under the C.C.F. last year, 2,730. Acres classified for re-settlement – and when we say classified, we mean scientifically classified under the direction of competent people: by my hon. friend, the Minister over her own my right (Hon. Mr. Nollet), one million acres; none, under the Liberals, The pounds of forage crop and seed distributed; under the Liberals, none; under the C.C.F., 266,562 pounds. Tons of forage moved with assistance by the Liberals, none; by the C.C.F., 29,363 tons. Carloads of grain moved with assistance: by the Liberals, none; by the C.C.F., 136 carloads.

I think, Mr. Speaker, those are some figures the hon. member for Maple Creek should carefully note and take home with him, and tell all the people of his constituency that some of the things he intimated, yesterday, were not precisely in accordance with facts.

He criticized the Provincial Government's administration and

March 1, 1950

application of The Conservation and Development Act, which was designed originally to promote and assist projects which were multi-purpose in their intent, such as the big project down on the Souris watershed. These are projects that are a partnership between the rural municipalities concerned and the Provincial Government, and these are projects that are being pressed forward by the Department of Agriculture of this Government as rapidly as possible.

There was no such Act under the Liberal rule. They never undertook any such kind of a programme at all, and yet they have the effrontery, Mr. Speaker, to come into this House and criticize a government that is doing something, that is doing a lot, which they in their wildest dreams wish they could do to get the support of the people of this province. Their total agricultural budget in 1943 and 1944 was \$557,500, and there was more than that voted for this Conservation Act, last year, 1949. They operated their Department of Agriculture mostly as a relief agency and a political instrument.

Then the hon. member insisted that there should be more technical people engaged by the Department of Agriculture to give assistance in the agricultural industry – this, in face of the fact that when his party was in power they did not employ one engineer in that Department. And what is there today? There are twelve civil and irrigation engineers. There are nine agricultural engineers with complementary staff to help them to carry on the work and they are working all the time with a full line of equipment for the necessary work to be undertaken, and their vote for that one project alone, for that division of the department, last year, was \$875,000 which was \$300,000 more than the total vote of the Department of Agriculture in 1943 and 1944.

Now let me give a little comparison between the results of the efforts of the C.C.F., Provincial Government and the results of the Federal Government's P.F.R.A. now ten-year-old programme. In the ten years' time, the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act people have placed under their 'ditch' (as it is called in those circles) 14,000 acres of land in the province of Saskatchewan, whereas in this province, with the C.C.F. Government only in office for five years, the present Minister of Agriculture in this Government has provided for the necessary kind of work to bring 15,315 acres under the 'ditch', one thousand and some odd hundred more acres than the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act has done in ten years. Now, I am not against P.F.R.A. but I do believe that it should do its work much more vigorously if it is to achieve the things that its early promoters said it was intended for. Now, of the 15,315 acres put under the ditch by the Provincial Government – I note the hon. member for Maple Creek is shaking his head; whether he is denying my statements or not, I do not know, but if he cares to, we can take him out and drive him in a horse and buggy or Model T Ford or on horseback, if he likes, over every one of these projects and show him and let him count the acres himself.

Mr. Cameron: — Would you kindly give me some location of where these 15,000 acres are which were put under the ditch in 1949 – and I mean actually irrigated?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — We are coming to that, and I shall certainly do so, and would have done so without the question. Of these 15,315 acres under the ditch by the Provincial Department of Agriculture, 13,700 acres are with Water Users' Associations, and 1,615 are with Departmental Feed Projects designed to assist in the feed shortage in the feed shortage area. And again in the feed and fodder development programme this Government has projects totaling 28,900 acres at the present time again devoted to the purpose of providing feed and fodder in order to assist the very thing my friend was complaining about yesterday – to assist the people in those areas to remain gainfully occupied in the homes they built up over the years. Also, they conduct projects of regrassing and hay harvesting. These things are carried on.

Now then, coming to the hon. member's question. He asked if I would give him some examples right close to home. I wonder if the hon. member ever took a trip to the southern end of this constituency, down in the Local Improvement District No. 926, and saw the Spangler Project in operation down there. That is his own constituency. And in that constituency, that project covers 1,125 acres. A thousand of those acres will be irrigated in 1950. Fifty thousand yards of earth have been moved in that project, and again, last year, there were some acres irrigated. In the first year of its operation and on the irrigation part, there were 35 bushels of oats to the acre and on the un-irrigated part, none. There was \$6,000 of farm produce produced there. That is one. I wonder if, when he is down in that part of the country, he would visit the Rural Municipality of Vidor, R.M. No. 51, right in the same area, and see a smaller but equally important project that has been instituted for the benefit of the farmers in that area.

Mr. Speaker, when people are going to give information in this House, to the listeners in the Gallery who are apparently interested enough to come here and sit on those most uncomfortable benches, it is well that they get the information they are entitled to – that is what they are paying for – and the information should be correct.

I can give the House some very interesting data on the irrigation work done by the provincial Department of Agriculture, again following up the question of the hon. gentleman. Some of those irrigation projects in the Waldeck, North Herbert and Duncairn area, which are in that part of the country (I grant you that they are not in his constituency, but they are in the southwest part of the province) are designed to assist in the development of fodder-raising land so that the livestock industry there can be put on as stable a basis as possible. There, this provincial Department of Agriculture has built main canals, lateral ditches, drainage ditches, dykes, border ditches, and have plane-tabled large areas. They have done a tremendous amount of work on the canal, dyke, border, roadway and lateral ditches. A total of 83.3 miles of those have been dug. An area of some 7,900 acres have been plane-tabled; that is, it has been properly surveyed so that they will know how to go at it for the next development of the work which comes along. That is down in arid country. Granted, it is not all in the hon. member's constituency, nor in my constituency, but it will affect both Maple Creek and Gull Lake as well as Swift Current, Morse, Gravelbourg and all the other parts of that southwest corner.

I would also like to go into the Souris Valley irrigation

March 1, 1950

and development project, but I haven't sufficient time because, as I said, I am going to stay strictly within Saskatchewan most of the time I speak, and a very large part of it within the southwest corner of Saskatchewan, because I want to deal with that.

Now let us have a look at some more statistical evidence to show provincial assistance to agriculture in the dry areas during the last three emergency fodder years. Now the emergency fodder assistance has been as follows, and this is important for people who have livestock as every farmer in this country knows who keeps livestock and those are the kind the Minister of Agriculture is endeavouring to have remain down there as well as other farmers. In 1949 and 1950 fiscal year, there were 123 hay crews from that area of the province assisted in the dried out areas, to go and cut hay if they could leave home and do so. And the amount of hay harvested by those hay crews was 11,963 tons, which was much better than relief, because they did it with their chests out and their chins up and they are proud and independent citizens today. They are not running around with their hats in their hands to some petty relief officer saying, "Please, Mister, can I have another half a bale of hay to keep my cow alive?" In that same year there was total fodder moved with assistance over and above all the assistance to hay crews – for there were many people who needed fodder but were unable to organize crews to go and cut it, and so the Provincial Government helped them with the movement of that hay – to the tune of 29,363 tons, and the cost of freight and machinery for those who did form hay crews was \$9,869 and the cost of freight and fodder to the Department was \$66,283, a total of over \$76,000. Is someone going to tell me that this Government has not done something to assist the farmers in the south?

I can remember, Mr. Speaker, in the year 1937 when we had to ship hay all the way from Quebec, in spite of the fact that the Minister of Agriculture of this province at that time, and the Federal Minister of Agriculture the same then as now, were told by farmers, farm organizations and municipalities and everyone who could get their word in, that they should arrange to hold every pound of feed in store or on farms for winter needs, and that every effort should be made to harvest provincial hay and to ship into the province fodder from the nearest source of supply. But what happened? Fodder was shipped from far away and too late, and doled out on relief, and people who had spent years of their lives in building up a basic herd of good cattle were compelled to liquidate them down to the number that they were permitted to have in a family if they wanted to get relief fodder.

I know the history of this province, Mr. Speaker, as well as any gentleman who sits on that side of the House; but a strange crew is over there yonder. One gentleman said he had been a Reeve of a municipality for over thirty-years, and he knew what he was talking about. I have been a citizen of the province and of this Dominion of Canada ever since I was born and that is probably about the same length of time as he has. I know something of the history of this country, too. It is written on the side of every road you drive on in the province of Saskatchewan, and in the slum areas of our cities. The history is written there, and it doesn't require any lessons from another gentleman I am going to refer to a little later on.

A Member: — They used to mark the highways with codfish.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — And cheese. You could smell the cheese and shingle your barn with the codfish. The hon. member from Maple Creek said, yesterday, he does not agree with moving farmers out of that area. I do not either. I agree with him when he said that the contribution to the national economy made by that country down there is great, and that the people are as grand as they are anywhere in this province. They can do the job. All that they need is water, and this Government is the first one that ever made a real honest scientific effort with a forward look to it, not a backward look going back to the Spartans, or going into Czechoslovakia or some other place; but with a forward look for Saskatchewan to try and develop a programme where those people themselves could join their forces in a co-operative effort, one with the other, and any part of them with the Department of the Government, to carry out a project which was going to assure them, or insure them, against a necessity for moving away. I agree that they do not want to be moved out. They have a right to go if they want to; but those that want to stay should be assisted to stay, and that is what this Government is doing at the present time. This Government is making an effort, however, to classify new lands so that those who do want to move out, that want to exercise the right that they have under a C.C.F. Government to be free to move around as they want to, may do so under reasonable assurances. This Government is assisting them by preparing and examining and classifying lands in a scientific way: not a hit and miss scheme such as my friends carried out; not such a scheme as I saw in the 'thirties when I drove the roads of this province and saw people from our southern areas moving up north with their horses and their hayracks, with their families and swing machines packed into them and driving a skinny old cow or two behind and a bunch of skinny hens probably in a coop somewhere in the outfit, and sending them up there to the Porcupine Reserve or along its fringes or all along the northern part of the province to work out their salvation the best they could, even though they were elderly citizens who had spent a lifetime down here, as described by my hon. friend from Maple Creek.

(Interruption)

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I did not hear the comment.

Govt. Member: — They were just mumbling in their whiskers.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — They haven't even got whiskers. They have to grow up to have whiskers.

Mr. Korchinski: — Oh! Oh!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I couldn't understand a lot of things that were said by the hon. gentleman when he was speaking the other day, because he mumbled in his beard. I can certainly not believe or agree with the things I did understand, but his comments when he butts in, today, are utterly unintelligible to anybody but himself, and I expect they are akin to a baby crying over strawberries when he wants bananas. The Federal Government has spoken, and other spokesmen for it, about the great resettlement programme the P.F.R.A. is carrying out. Let us have a look at that record.

March 1, 1950

For Manitoba, they have spent \$30,000 on a dollar-for-dollar basis with the Province; for Saskatchewan, \$549,000 on a dollar-for-dollar basis; for Alberta, \$72,000 on a dollar-for-dollar basis, so that the total for the P.F.R.A. is \$325,886, and on top of that to the tune of \$154,000. this Province has spent \$2,500,000 assisting farmers to find new locations. Then on top of that, Mr. Speaker – I will deal with this more extensively later on; but I just want to mention, at this time, that we have the greatest resettlement programme ever proposed in this country, the greatest gerrymander, by the Federal Liberal Member of Parliament for Maple Creek, Mr. Studer, as reported in the ‘Leader-Post’ yesterday, where they are going to split Saskatchewan up in the middle and give one half to Manitoba and the other half to Alberta. I will deal with that later on in this speech.

My hon. friends can laugh; then they had better laugh at their own paper, the ‘Leader-Post’. Nobody is more subservient to the ‘Leader-Post’ than they, and no newspaper is more subservient to a political party than the ‘Leader-Post’ is to the Liberals. They are one and the same thing. This was a Liberal member for Parliament whose speech in parliament was reported in the ‘Leader-Post’. I did not hear him say it, but I read the paper and I suppose they would not print anything like that about one of their own members If they had not read his Hansard Speech before they did, and agreed with it. I am going to deal with the implications of it a little later, Mr. Speaker.

Again in the Department of Agriculture – I am still replying to some of the remarks made by the very insular-minded gentleman who spoke yesterday, the hon. member for Maple Creek. This Government has provided, for municipalities that requested the provision, over fifty storage bins whereby municipalities would be able to store and have on hand a year’s supply for seed to be assured that they could continue their farming operations for that year. It is unfortunate that, in many of these places, they have not been lucky enough to have a crop to fill them up, but the Province has made its contribution to assist them and when the weather makes its contribution, the farmers will make theirs and those bins will be utilized as partial insurance against the future.

I want to deal with one other thing that has a very serious effect on this province, although it is not only applicable to this area, but more applicable there than in most places in Saskatchewan, and that is the Prairie Farm Assistance Act, and I hope that everybody who may be listening gets the distinction. Under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act one per cent of the price of cereal products sold by the farmers is deducted and placed in the fund from which P.F.A.A. is paid. True, the balance and the greater part of it has to be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund from Ottawa, but the fact remains it was supposed to be something contributed to by the farmers and yet the government at Ottawa had the nerve at the start, and continues, to call it Prairie Farm Assistance Act and it was brought about, Mr. Speaker, not because of any of my friends opposite or their counterparts in the Dominion of Canada wanted to do it, but it was brought about because

of the pressure of the organized farmers and other similar organizations in Western Canada. They forced the Federal Government at Ottawa to introduce this Act by their demands for a crop insurance scheme. I know the history of the Act very well, Mr. Speaker. I am very much for it, but I want it improved and the Liberal Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa has consistently refused to make a major improvement or amendment in that Act ever since it was started.

Mr. Speaker, that Act was brought into force in a year when the dollar was worth about twice as much as it is today, and yet, in spite of the fact that the rising costs of production and living brought about determination to provide profits for its friends, refused to keep any price control in existence in the days after the war, and the farmer who gets a P.F.A.A. cheque, this year, because of loss of crops, cannot buy much more than half of the goods he required with it as compared to what he could have bought in 1939. But will the Liberal Government do anything about it at Ottawa? No, my Liberal friends can interrupt and have all the fun they like. They can grunt and groan but their shoulders are down on the floor.

Now let us go to another field of activity in which the C.C.F. Government assists the people out in that area of the province. I want to deal only in a very minor way with my own Department. Later on, I expect to deal extensively with it and its whole operations; but, today, I want to point out the amount of help through my Department, not because of any credit coming to me, but because the Minister before me was the kind of a guy he appears to be on Sunday afternoon on "Fireside Chats", because he is a human individual and believes in human beings and the right of human beings to have the services that human science is able to develop for human use. Under the Department of Health there has been tremendous assistance, by the way of grants to hospitals out in that area. I have a list of them here. I do not want to take up time, but if anyone doubts my word, I will take the time, if it takes till tomorrow morning, to prove my point, because it is here in the record that in grants committed and grants paid, up to the present, over \$175,000 have gone out there to assist hospitals, on top of which was a \$3,500 grant to one of their hospitals for an X-ray to improve their laboratory facilities. That has gone to serve the people in Health Region No. 1 comprising ninety municipalities in the southwest corner of this province. Anyone who says they are not getting assistance to out there does not know the facts or else does not want to present the facts to the people he is talking to, and he has no excuse for ignorance and less excuse for trying to mislead. Besides that, to the Health Region itself there are very substantial grants. Up until the end of the 1948 fiscal year, there were \$154,000 in grants of one kind or another. There was the grant for a hospitalization deficit they had there, a medical-care grant, dental programme, radiology programme, out-patient services and statistical grants. I want anyone who may be listening now to remember that I am talking about Health Region No. 1, where the people did get together under the sponsorship and assistance of this Government and worded out a programme, the like of which does not exist on the North American continent. By the end of March, this year, that \$154,000 will have another \$65,000 added to it, bringing it to something over \$220,000 going into that area of the province. But the hon. member for Maple Creek says that area received no consideration from

March 1, 1950

this Government. He should read the record.

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I do not recall having said it received no consideration from this Government. My words were, when the Minister interjected something into my address, that the record in regard to Region No. 1 was not as creditable as it might have been in regard to Health Region No. 1

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Well, if that was a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I will reply to it, on privilege, and say that if the hon. member or anybody else in Health Region No. 1 thinks that the management has not been creditable (and I am not agreeing with him; he said it, not I), they have it in their own hands to change their Board of Directors and management any time they want to.

Mr. Cameron: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I said nothing reflecting on the Larger Health Region Board. I said that the record of this Government was not so creditable.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member who is now speaking has suggested that the member from Maple Creek cast reflection on the Board of that Health Region. Now the member says he said no such thing and he said that the Government's contribution was not a creditable one. He has raised a proper point of privilege and must accept the hon. member's statement and withdraw the inference that he has made.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Maple Creek says that he made no such implication against the Board of Health Region No. 1, I will accept his statement. He makes it in good faith, but again I want to dispute his statement when he says that the record of the Government is not creditable. I have just given him two instances here, and I have another one, to show him what this Government has done.

In the Public Health field in the area which comprises Health Region No. 1 this Government has made grants amounting to two-thirds of \$223,000. The region share of the levy for public health there is \$74,000 at the end of 1949-1950. The Government share of that grant is \$148,959. Those three items I have given, Mr. Speaker, are simply an indication that the record of this Government is creditable, and bears out the statement that I have made.

What has the former Government done in that line? They have talked for as long as I can remember almost, about some day having a health programme in Saskatchewan, but they never arrived anywhere. We had to go out and fight for little municipal doctor schemes when we were starting to organize them back in the 'twenties. This Government, in power at the present time, under the former Minister of Health who was Premier then and is today, did a job in this province that gave great assistance to those people in that area in, and I said before, developing medical services the like of which, in value to the people, is nowhere else in existence on the North-American continent.

Now a little more about C.C.F. work there. The hon. member

made a few remarks regarding highways.

Mr. J. G. Egnatoff: — I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Health if he could reveal to the House what the approximate indebtedness of Health Region No. 1 is at the end of December, 1949.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — The figures have not been submitted officially to me and that is their business, not mine until they are brought to my attention by the Region, and I would no more give that here than I would give information on the personal business of some individual that I happen to know something about. That is an excuse, Mr. Speaker, that they would not understand. They are a strange crew yonder.

Now then, let us look at the highway expenditures there. One would think, to hear some members from across the House and opponents of this Government talk, that there was nothing out there except prairie trails, sheep trails, cow trails and coulees. There are good roads out there. There are not enough good roads, Mr. Speaker, anywhere that I know of in the world. Certainly there are not enough in Canada. But so far as the ability of this province is concerned, the roads that we have in this province compare with any other area in this western country, and I have driven over a lot of them, in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and my friends across there – at least some of them – I know I am telling the truth. Down in that area we have had as large a share of appropriations as the Minister of Highways could spare for us in that country based on our area, our population and the resources at his command, and they have not been inconsiderable. In 1944-1949, the total amount spent in the Gull Lake constituency was \$832,000; in the Maple Creek constituency, \$790,000; and in the Swift Current constituency \$829,000; making a total of \$2,352,228 spent on highways and roads in that area.

I shall now give the House a breakdown of how it was spent. There were 336 miles of road constructed and reconstructed in those three constituencies. There were 314 miles gravelled or regravelled. There were over 15 miles of bituminous surface built. There were grants made to the municipalities in Gull Lake constituency amounting to \$72,500 in Maple Creek, \$125,800; and in Swift Current, \$35,426. There were bridges reconstructed or constructed down there to the tune of over \$170,000; \$44,000 in Gull Lake; \$42,800 in Maple Creek, and \$82,000 in Swift Current. Anyone who says this Government has not treated that end of the province as well as it was humanly possible to do with the resources available, is not telling things that are based on fact.

I said when I started, Mr. Speaker, that I would stay in Saskatchewan, and mostly in that corner of Saskatchewan for a while. I said I would have to make the odd excursion out. One or two of the members opposite took little trips over to Europe, down into the Middle East and places like that, with a history book in their hands. They said that the gentlemen who wrote the history knew what he was talking about; but in the quotations from it, and by the remarks of the gentlemen who did quote from it, I doubt very much if either of them knew a great deal about anything. I refer to the hon. member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) – I wish he were in his seat.

Govt. Member: — Oh, he couldn't take it.

March 1, 1950

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I don't know why he couldn't take it; I am being very gentle in what I am handing out. However, Mr. Speaker, after chiding the C.C.F. members for leaving Saskatchewan, they gallop all over the country both, as I say, in history and in the book. They took us to Thermopolae and had a little visit with the Spartans and told us how they resembled the C.C.F. here. All he proved to me when he was doing that was to prove conclusively that he knew just a little of the history of progressive movements as he knows about the Province of Saskatchewan, and it was clear to everybody that he knows very little of either.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he had a purpose in doing it. His purpose was to create the idea in the minds of his listeners that the C.C.F. was something to be feared. He made this statement and everybody in this House will remember it: he said that "Commonwealth" and "Communism" are synonymous. So, according to his interpretation of the English language, we can now refer to the British Communism of Nations. I suggest the hon. gentleman find a climate to live in, a political climate more in keeping with his desires, and I will say to him that it is within the range of possibilities he may live long enough to see the C.C.F. defeated, but he will never live long enough to see the end of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Then he had the unadulterated nerve to criticize a government of Britain because of their handling of their various Crown industries and Government-owned corporations; but he carefully as all other speakers over there do, refrained from any mention of the Crown industries operated by the Federal Government of Canada. The Canadian National Railways is one, and before I sit down I am going to deal with them, as I dealt with them in the House of Commons, and as Henry Thornton dealt with them, and he met with defeat every time he met a Liberal Cabinet to deal with the things he knew had to be done to make that railroad possible. However, in case someone thinks I am biased, I will refer them to an editorial in the 'Toronto Star Weekly', a paper favourable to my friends opposite, headed "The C.N.R. deserves a Chance"; and they point out there, as I and others have done in the House of Commons, that the Canadian National Railway is so overloaded with watered stock, with capital that does not have any value whatsoever in capital equipment, and has to pay the interest on that, that only during the war years has it ever paid its way. Do my friends over there propose to have us in a war all the time to make their Federal Crown industries or Government-owned corporations pay? Will they eventually some day squeeze the water out of the stock of the C.N.R. and allow it to function as it should? I might as well go on right now and point out that because the C.P.R. does now, and always has since it was built, dominate the whole transportation policy of Canada, and because they own and control so many of the people in the Liberal Party who have power there, that the Liberal Government doesn't dare give the C.N.R. the opportunity to compete on the efficient basis it should, if it were allowed to do so. I have never heard a statement or a dissertation from one of these gentlemen or any of their ilk to disprove that, but the records in the library at Ottawa show it, the records written by Sir Henry Thornton, who tried himself to get the C.N.R. in that position. The railroad was taken over after it had been filled up with useless dollar capital by corruption, bribery, inefficiency, Mr. Speaker, which I know about as well as anyone in this House anyway, because I was along on the building of it, or

a great part of it, and know how it happened.

The hon. member for Redberry did not criticize Trans-Canada Airlines. Strangely enough, neither do we, because it provides a service that makes it worthwhile to pay the deficit. It will probably lose money for another few years – I don't know how many; but even if it does, I don't think you will find any member on this side of the House criticizing T.C.A. We know it was a development that should have been brought about. If we have any criticism to offer it is that we had a promise at one time from the Minister in charge that Canadian Pacific Airways would not be allowed to extend the area of operations, and then they were allowed to do so in the face of that promise. T.C.A. should have had much of the area given over to the privately-owned Canadian Pacific Airways by the Liberal Government to swell the profits of the C.P.R.

Then he took a jibe at our Saskatchewan Hospitalization plan and he said it wasn't free.

Mr. G. H. Danielson: — Why doesn't the gentleman grow up, or does he think we are children? Certainly, it's not free. There is nothing free in this world, not even speech.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Mr. Speaker, it is a generally accepted term that any public service is free to each person who requires it when he wants it.

Member: — Is it?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Oh, yes, oh, yes! If one of you gentlemen are attacked on the streets of Regina tonight, and there is a policeman around, you will get protection and it is free in the general acceptance of the term "Free". It is free to you when you need it. But if anyone had to pay the full cost of that policeman's salary and upkeep so he would be there when needed, very few citizens could enjoy police protection.

Mr. J. G. Egnatoff: — Are you trying suggest that is possible in this province to obtain hospitalization care without first having paid for your hospitalization tax?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Certainly there are taxes to be paid. Just a minute, Mr. Speaker, I will tell them when they simmer down. They haven't got out of the kindergarten stage yet, but they can't help it and I am a patient fellow.

Mr. Speaker, when this hospitalization scheme was first visualized nobody expected it to be free. What we did expect was, and what has happened is, that, knowing that in the past a great many people did not have the wherewithal in their pocketbooks or their bank accounts or in the old sock at home to pay for anything that might happen to them out of the ordinary in the way of sickness or need for hospitalization, and that because those people did not have any freedom hospitals under those conditions, this method was devised to provide them with it and, provided they pay a comparatively small tax, when sickness strikes they have, without

March 1, 1950

further requirements whatsoever, the right to enter into a hospital and receive hospital treatment. Every member on the opposite side knows that to be true – that is, those who know anything, and the ones that don't know anything are not worth talking to.

Mr. James Gibson: — Are there not certain large groups in this province who can obtain hospitalization without paying the tax?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — That is correct. There are certain large groups in the province who do get it free. So far as they are concerned the service is free; but the rest must pay for it, and so they should. My hon. friend from Morse (Mr. Gibson) is quite correct. There are certain groups like old age pensioners, receivers of mothers' allowance and blind pensioners, and so on, who receive the service free.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to a few remarks made by the hon. member from Arm River, "my friend Irma". During the course of his two-hour-and-a-half speech he gave the House some information.

Mr. Danielson: — Why not make it three?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Did someone mention three hours? Well, I didn't time him, but I was sure it was two hours and a half, and it seemed longer. However, Mr. Speaker, he made a remark that I think was uncalled for in this House or anywhere in this country. He was dealing with what he had a perfect right to do; I don't blame him if he feels that way but I am sorry he does. But if he feels that we have political ideas that he cannot subscribe to, that is certainly his very right to do so. But he made the remark during the course of his speech, and if I heard him correctly – and I am willing to stand corrected if I am wrong, and I would like to find out if I was wrong – he made the remark that we in Canada had imported political ideologies from Central Europe which are undesirable. Now if he made that remark . . .

Mr. Danielson: — On a point of privilege: I said that the creed of Socialism was an old moth-eaten creed imported from eastern and central Europe. That is what I said and I repeat it.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Well, I am glad the hon. member made that explanation. I have too much respect for him personally to want to quote him in anything that was not correct. But I want to point out to the hon. gentleman that we have imported many things from many countries in this province of Saskatchewan, and Canada. That is what we are made up of. We have imported some grand cultures and some grand ideas from Central Europe. We have also developed in this country some ideas of our own. We have not imported everything in this country that somebody takes exception to. So far as I am concerned personally, I wasn't imported into this country nor were many generations of my ancestors before me. For two hundred years we have been in Canada, and I learned what I believe of Socialism right here in Canada associating with people like myself in the days before we had any great importation of people from any part of Europe whatsoever. I want to point out that those of us who are on this side of the House arrived at these ideas by a process of thought. As has often been said by my friend

the Attorney General, the Honourable Mr. Corman: "If you want to get into this Party, you have to think your way in". We have thought our way into it.

One other thing I want to point out to my friends is that there are people in the North American Continent that are just as concerned about the welfare of people as our friends on the opposite side, that neither subscribe to Liberal political philosophy nor to ours. I refer especially to my friends opposite and to everybody else a reading of the book called "Some Quakers' Proposals for Peace". I am going to quote one of their statements here, because it is important. It is important in municipal affairs. It is even important in family affairs; important in provincial affairs; in all other kinds of affairs. And this is what they say:

"Only as conflicts are dealt with as problems to be solved rather than political combats to be won or lost, is there a firm basis for a lasting order."

We, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House subscribe to that and do our utmost to meet people on grounds where those solutions can be found and where we don't have to depend on victories to have our way. Albeit, if anyone wants to challenge us to a political battle we will meet them on the hustings at the appointed time.

The hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), again I think, could not have really meant what he said in another place. He mentioned in his speech, and I remember this very distinctly, that of the thirteen C.C.F. Members of Parliament in Ottawa, today, only two are farmers. Now, I suppose he means the two from Saskatchewan.

Mr. Danielson: — I would like to correct the hon. gentleman there. I said only two representing farming constituencies.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Mr. Speaker, Rosetown-Biggan is a farm constituency, much more rural than urban and it is represented by a C.C.F. Member of Parliament, M.J. Coldwell. Melfort is much more rural than urban. "Scotty" Bryce has a rural constituency, and Scotty is a farmer of the first water, a cow milker, an agricultural representative on the dairy council of the National War Services Board during the war, a member of the advisory board of the Dominion Beef Committee during the war, a director of the Winnipeg Milk Producers' Board, and a member of the Manitoba Honey Co-op. If that isn't farm stuff I don't know what is, Mr. Speaker. And Mr. "Bert" Horridge should not be forgotten — Mr. Horridge from Kootenay West is an associate member of the Agricultural Institute of Canada of the Ontario Department of Agriculture, a fruit grower and vice-president of the Kootenay Co-operative Association. Those men are certainly farmers.

Mr. W. A. Tucker: — You once kicked him out of your Party.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Mr. Speaker, our hon. friends over here have lost them from their party and gained them back. The present leader of their Party here in Saskatchewan (Mr. Tucker) was at one time an

March 1, 1950

ardent supporter of the old Progressive Party.

Then the hon. member from Arm River talked a long time of the shortage of industries in Saskatchewan. On the one hand they criticize the Crown industries that have been started by this Government or have been resurrected by this Government. They criticize them because they have not always produced great profits. But they never criticize the shortage of industry in this province on the basis where it should be criticized. During the war, when industry was needed all over this country and where it should have been diversified, a Liberal Government sat in this House and Liberal Government sat at Ottawa, and not one effort was made, no productive effort anyway was made, by this Liberal Government in this House, in Regina, to prevail on the Federal Liberal Government to bring war industries here and get them started; and there were none gained. Every other province except Prince Edward Island got some of them. If I remember correctly even Prince Edward Island got a little consideration in the way of wharves or loading places or something of that nature.

Then he attacked the Crown Corporations on the basis of their not being profit-making. Mr. Speaker, let me deal with that just for a moment. I will take just one as an illustration, because they are all the same. There was a plant down at Estevan, where there was natural clay that could be made into a building material, lying idle under private enterprise. Private enterprise did not have the courage or ability to keep it making bricks. This Government did have the guts to do it and did it, and made a lot of bricks, and there are lot of buildings standing in Western Canada, today, that were built in a period of housing and building material shortages that would not have been there had that plant not been put into operation by this Government. On those grounds alone that plant is justified. If private enterprise is so enterprising why doesn't it undertake some of these things?

Mr. A. J. Kuziak: — They want handouts.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — That's right, they want handouts like they got down at Bienfait. None of my friends over here ever mentioned Bienfait and the briquetting plant. \$250,000 of Saskatchewan taxpayers' money, \$250,000 of Manitoba taxpayers' money, and half a million dollars of the Canadian taxpayers' money from the Federal Treasury, a total of a million dollars, went into building the plant, and they sold it to Mr. Taylor for \$1.00. That is exactly what they would like us to do with the Brick plant. They would like us to do that with the Sodium Sulphate plant. They would like us to do that with every Crown Industry in this province — sell it to one of their friends, who can deliver a nice big block of votes, for \$1.00 or maybe \$5.00.

Mr. Tucker: — On a question of privilege: the hon. gentleman has no right to suggest that we want to dispose of these plants on the same terms. He has no right to attribute intentions to us which we have not got, Mr. Speaker. I say that we have no such intentions whatever, and the hon. gentleman cannot prove his statement by any remarks made by any responsible Leader of the Liberal Party.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I will not accuse the hon. gentleman of intending to do that but I will produce some evidence to support the suggestion I made that it might happen. First, I will point out again what I already pointed out, the evidence of what did happen in connection with the briquetting plant at Bienfait. Then I will come a little more up to date, and I assume the hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Culliton) is a responsible member of the Party over there; he sits in the front bench. On February 27 of this year, in this debate, when the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) was speaking and dealing with some of those things, he said:

“I suggest that my hon. friends, “meaning our weird friends across the way” tell us what they would do with the Crown Corporations if they got into office.”

And the interjection by the hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Culliton) was: “Sell them for \$1.00”. Now, that is on the record, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. E. M. Culliton (Gravelbourg): — I would just like to ask this question. I wasn’t paying particular attention to the occasion. Would you just tell me when I made that suggestion?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I will accept the hon. member’s remark that he wasn’t paying attention. It is on the record, Mr. Speaker, and speaks for itself. Maybe the hon. member wasn’t paying attention, but I suggest that from now on he pay attention. It might be worthwhile.

Mr. Culliton: — Mr. Speaker, I made no interjections while the hon. member for Hanley was speaking, or any other member; I don’t usually make interjections. I think probably, in the transcription, they may have got the wrong name and some other member may have said that, but I didn’t.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I want to give you some more evidence along the same line, Mr. Speaker, before I finish with the hon. member from Arm River. You will remember during the war, Mr. Speaker, that Research Enterprises was set up by the Federal Government down in southern Ontario. The reason it was set up was to provide for the manufacture of lenses for a variety of things needed by the public, and particularly in war industry because the destruction of world-wide cartel which was centred in Germany when the war broke out, prevented the rapid development of those things over here unless a Government manufacturing enterprise was established because previous to that the private enterprises engaged in the manufacture of those very essential materials were tied up internationally in a German-dominated world-wide cartel. When the war was over Research Enterprises was sold to private enterprise, with the controlling interest in the U.S.A.; and I will bring to your attention three other plants, one in Trail, B.C., one at Calgary, and one at Welland, which are capable of manufacturing fertilizer for the farmers of this country. We tried to persuade the Minister in charge of those plants in the Federal Government in the early Sessions of the first Parliament after he war, not to sell those plants to private enterprise, but he did, and at a much lower price than their actual value or cost in public funds to build, and when private enterprise got those plants, almost immediately the prices of fertilizer to the farmers went up very materially

March 1, 1950

and have stayed up ever since. That is the way they handle private enterprise, so I won't accuse them of selling any of these plants for a dollar; but I do say, on the basis of the experience we have had, they make it very easy for private enterprise to acquire them if private enterprise thinks it can make a profit out of them.

Now I want to come to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker). He made a few remarks, too, that caused me to want to rise to my feet, and he chided us, scolded us in fact, very much for getting outside the bounds of Saskatchewan and he had no sooner finished scolding us than he took a flea-hop from here to Czechoslovakia. He then told us how closely we were connected with the people over there. I never was in Czechoslovakia, I only knew it since World War I when it became a State on its own. Before that it was Bohemia and some other place. But he told us all about Czechoslovakia, and what an influence it was going to have on us. Then, when he got finished with that, he spoke loud and long, because the radio was on at that time and the galleries were listening to the Leader of the Opposition, damning the Government and telling what he was going to do. He spoke loud and long to the radio-listening public (if there were any there) about how he is opposed to any change in the Crow's Nest rates agreement. All right, Mr. Speaker. It is all right for him to speak and to speak for his Party and say, "We are opposed to any change in the Crow's Nest rate agreement", but I am going to predict – and it is not often I make a prophecy, Mr. Speaker, – that if the Board of Transport Commissioners gives way to the C.P.R., they will get the backing of the Federal Liberal Government, and the Liberal Party of Saskatchewan will fail to offer any criticism or opposition if that happens. I predict that, Mr. Speaker, and I want the people who can hear me now to remember: if for any reason the Crow's Nest rates are going to be disregarded by the Board of Transport Commissioners, the Federal Liberal Government will back up the Board of Transport Commissioners and the Liberal Party of Saskatchewan will back the Liberal Party at Ottawa in doing it.

Mr. Tucker: — Does the Minister not know that the only way in which the Crow's Nest rates can be brought to the Board of Transport Commissioners is by an Act of the Canadian Parliament?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — That is exactly what I said, Mr. Speaker. If the Board of Transport Commissioners recommend it, and the Federal Government at Ottawa will do it, this Party here, the Opposition in this House, will back them up in doing it and make excuses – just the same as they did, Mr. Speaker, in the taxation of Co-ops; just the same as they did, Mr. Speaker, in the refusal to grant free titles to the few old soldier settlers on the farms of this country, and a number of other things I could mention. They take a lot of credit, these Liberals do, here and all over the country, and goodness knows the Tories had mismanaged it! – I assume their "half-a-Tory" over there, (Mr. McDonald) will help with some of the mismanagement of their own Party, but the other balance of that member and all the other Liberal members there won't improve it very much; the only reason we had any slight improvement in the economy of this country from 1935 to 1939, was, as everybody knew, that industry was being geared for war production. Then we had 'war prosperity', as people called it, and then we have had the aftermath while the savings of the people, ten billion dollars in Victory Bonds,

War Savings Certificates not even War Savings Stamps, were still in the hands of the people to sell, and the veterans were coming back and getting their gratuities, their training credits and the various other things to which they were entitled. All that spending power was in the pockets of the people, so that while that lasted industries had a glorious and a gold time extracting it out of us and they have most of it out of us now. Yes, preparation for war improved our position some. War provided unlimited markets and a hectic type of prosperity, followed by a false prosperity made possibly by the demands of consumers backed by their war savings, which will continue until the last drop of savings are extracted from the Canadian working people. This will soon be accomplished. Workers and farmers will soon be trying to live on current income – you see it happening to most people now. Things you couldn't buy a few years ago are on the market and radio advertises are imploring you to come and buy everything from a fur coat to a new brand of soap.

I mentioned a while ago the matter of the C.N.R. and like ones. I won't go over them again. But I do want again to remind my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, that he was at one time a Progressive, and then later on in his career, he espoused the Liberal cause, and spoke loud and long advocating great dreams of money reform, along with Jerry McGeer, Mr. Slaught and others of that ilk. I used to have quite a regard for the hon. gentleman's beliefs in something along those lines. I thought, "Here is a fellow that doesn't go the distance I think he ought to go, but at least he sees some of the flaws in the present system; he is going to try and do something about it". But he was, eventually, promoted to Parliamentary Assistance to the Minister of Veterans' Affairs, and we never heard any more about monetary reform from that day to this from the hon. gentleman. I expect now he is in full agreement with his successor to that very important post, Mr. Mutch, M.P. for Winnipeg South.

Mr. Tucker: — I assure you I am not, if you refer to his last speech.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I am going to quote what Mr. Les. Mutch says. The headline of the paper here says: "Vote Les. Mutch and Get Much Less". I am going to read this, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition or any of his followers can tell if they agree with this. Now this is Mr. Mutch, according to the C.P.A. dateline at Ottawa:

"We Liberals, in our platform, distinguish between social security and social justice. I confess that some Liberals have failed to note the differences". Leslie Mutch, Liberal M.P. for South Winnipeg and Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Veterans' Affairs said on February 14th to the Toronto Liberal Businessmens' Club, "Social security is indefinable, immeasurable and dishonest. Millions of Canadians today are making a creed of security. The universal demand for security, in some form, is because we Canadians are afraid; this fear is born, in part, of the hungry mismanaged 'thirties."

I agree with him – "they hungry mismanaged 'thirties", by both Tories and Liberals, some of which, a little of each they have on that side; more of one

March 1, 1950

than the other. You can hardly tell them apart by looking at them.

“in part the ravages of two world wars make evidence of softening of our moral fibre . . .”

This is by Mr. Mutch, a representative of the voters in a democratic country, and he is telling us we are afraid, we have no courage, we have lost our moral fibre and if we look for social security that is proof of it. I bet he looks for it! Mr. Mutch goes on:

“Security in this sense is the antidote to terror, the excuse of the lazy, the narcotic for the weak-willed, and the refuge of the coward . . .”

So – the mother of a sick child who wants some security so the baby will be able to eat and wear clothes and have shelter and fuel to keep warm, is, according to Mr. Mutch, lazy, weak-willed and a coward, for wanting that kind of security for her children. Mr. Mutch went on – and listen to this please, everybody can hear – it is important, and my hon. friends want to pay attention to this, don’t miss it my friend from Gravelbourg:

“Next to labour the best-organized group of fear-ridden Canadians are the farmers . . .”

This is what this gentleman, who occupies an important post in the Federal Parliament of Canada has to say about our farmers. Then he says:

“I propose to ask you to agree with me that even at some risk of the dislocation of the farm economy, we should seek to put a ceiling on the degree of government interference, which even the national interest could hope to justify.”

In other words, stop the orderly marketing of agricultural products, remove every obstacle from a free play of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange and similar speculative markets that deal in agricultural products, the products of a farmer’s labour, Mr. Speaker, and the food of the working people of this country. Apparently the Leader of the Opposition doesn’t agree with this for he shakes his head. I hope he makes his position clear with this other recommendation because yesterday’s ‘Leader-Post’ carried a very full account of a statement by another Liberal member of Parliament, and this time the member of Parliament comes from Saskatchewan and, I am sorry to say, from my corner of Saskatchewan. But he is there, Mr. Studer; and Mr. Studer is reported here to have made a speech in the House of Commons in which he recommends the splitting of Saskatchewan from north to south at a point somewhere between Regina and Moose Jaw, and turning the west-half of the province over to the province of Alberta and the east-half over to the province of Manitoba. This is what would happen: the part that went into the province of Alberta would immediately get every part of it organized into a larger unit of administration of schools, without a

vote. Does my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition agree with Mr. Studer?

Mr. Tucker: — Of course not.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Maybe he and Mr. Studer had better get together. My hon. friend from Gravelbourg and the hon. member of Parliament for Maple Creek in the Federal House are close friends; they know each other. And now, Mr. Speaker, within the province of Alberta they have a law there that permits the sterilization of the mentally weak. Do my hon. friends who sit on the opposite side of the House and live on the west side of Saskatchewan want to subscribe to that? They are not that weak-minded, are they? There may be danger for them in a programme of that kind? Alberta has no publicly-owned rural electrification programme. Does the Leader of the Opposition and those with him on that side of the House want the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to pass into the hands of private owners in Alberta? Are they in favour of that? And what of those who must go into Manitoba; what would happen to them? They wouldn't get any help so far as hospitals are concerned. I have a report here with a Brandon dateline, February 21, Canadian Press, and it says here the Brandon General Hospital will have to close its public wards or close completely if a new source of revenue cannot be found. That was the statement made by the President of the Board of Directors, and they get no help from the Manitoba Government. The hospitals in Saskatchewan that eventually find their way into Manitoba, if Mr. Studer has his way about this big gerrymander he is talking about, if that ever takes place, that is what the people on the east side of Saskatchewan have to look forward to.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether these gentlemen on the other side want to agree with Mr. Studer or not, but I do say that I am going to give them a little friendly advice that might be useful for them in the future: Take one leaf out of our book — they think we are bad, I will tell them one thing I think they should subscribe to because they call themselves democrats — have a convention at least once a year, learn what you are thinking about, one with the other, then come up with something you men agree with and not have people in important positions scaring the life out of innocent people on the west and east side of Saskatchewan by recommending . . . (Interruption)

Mr. Tucker: — They are not so easily scared as that!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — They laugh, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friends over there laugh. I think a lot of them have a kind of sneaking regard for Mr. Studer's statements, because it is one of the things I have heard Liberals say every once in a while, recommending things like this that have this effect; if you can't defeat your opponents in democratic debate, eliminate them by some process and this is one way — gerrymander them out of existence.

Mr. Tucker: — We don't need that. Bring on the election!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Mr. Speaker, we are not putting an election off. Our hon. friends proceeded in one stage for six years and now, because we are here two years, they want us to go to the country. Mr. Speaker, is there no logic in those people at all? No, not any!

March 1, 1950

Now, Mr. Speaker, I haven't had time to deal with everything I would like to. There will be future times in this House when again I will have an opportunity to explain the things that this Government is doing on behalf of and for the people they represent; but I want to make one final comment before I sit down and it is this: this group that I associate myself with have never been afraid to accept a new idea and to try to put it into effect, and we are not afraid, when we do try and find them unworkable, impractical or not in the public good, to lay them down and try some other. That is a scientific way of going at it. Our friends over there don't seem to feel that way; there have been frequent periods of history that show us how they act. Let me give just a little illustration. There were Liberals one time in Britain; they are almost extinct today. I suppose the rest of them will die out as the political climate gets impossible for them to live in. At one time, however, they were quite prevalent, in fact they were the great spokesmen for the common man. They were the guys who were going to have a fair field and no favours; Adam Smith theory, the devil take the hindmost and all that kind of thing; but always they talked about reform, like my hon. friend talked about monetary reform with his friend Jerry and Mr. Slaught and Charlie Dunning. They were all going to have great reforms. Away back, Mr. Speaker, in the early part of the nineteenth century, the British passed what is called the second Reform Act. The idea was to extend the franchise, and the Act was passed and then was prevented from coming into actual operation – by whom? Not only the Tories, but by the resistance of the Liberals of that day, great Liberals, and I will read you some of their names, and you can read them in history. I would recommend it to my friend from Redberry; he likes history, and open up your minds from the confines of your restricted areas of thinking: Palmerstone, John Russell, Henry Hall, John Stuart Mill and Gladstone, all resisted the bringing in of the ballot to the working people of Britain. They had assistance, of course, from Tories – so have you; you have half-a-Tory helping you; they had more than that at that time. They all resisted it, some all their lives, a few of them changed later on, but it took a long while before the franchise was extended to the people of the Old Country. Now what was their excuse? The same excuses that are presented, today, for everything the C.C.F. tries to do, by our reactionary friends, our 'standpatters'; and I am going to give them a model for standpadding before I sit down. They will like it, too, because it fits them. They said it wouldn't be a good thing to introduce the secret ballot; that was a bad principle which sapped the courage of the individual, which sapped the courage of the poor little workman down in the textile mill, who was terrified every time he saw his boss anyway. He was supposed to get up and hold up his hand in opposition to things his boss wanted, to show his courage and get fired for doing it; but a secret ballot was going to sap his moral courage, just the same as Mr. Mutch says when he says that looking for security is sapping ours.

Mr. Tucker: — What Party did give them the secret ballot?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — They eventually forced it out of your Party and then they defeated your Party because it took them so long to do it. The Liberals of that day said the secret ballot would lead to irresponsible agitation and, so far as their Party is concerned, possibly the prediction came true – I don't know. At that time, in 1871, there was a little paper

printed called the “Beehive”, and I was just fortunate enough to get an extract from it the other day. I am going to read this motto from the “Beehive”, a labour paper printed in 1871 (the date was February 18, 1871), and this is it, and I commend it as a motto for my friends across the House, and for those who subscribe to the theories that they have that you must not do anything that hasn’t been done before:

“I pledge myself, though much bereft
Of ways and means of doing ill,
To make the most of what are left,
And stick to all that’s rotten still.”

Mr. F.M. Dundas (Qu’Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I do not have to be introduced to the Assembly as I have been a member for twelve years. I was born in 1885, and I am 65 years old on the 26th of March. I would like to pay tribute to some of the pioneers of our province, such men as R.S. Lake, former member from the North West Territories, and the former Lieutenant-Governor, John Miller, who is nearly ninety years, who was a member of the House of Commons and is still alive; the late Mr. Perley who represented the constituency for many years and pioneered the farmers’ requests, and Anthon Huck, a former member who is still living at Vibank.

I would also like to congratulate the two new members, particularly the one from Cannington. The hon. Mr. Fines said that if Mr. McCullough were elected the Government would contribute \$800,000 for roads and bridges. If the C.C.F. candidate is worth \$800,000 I would say Mr. McCarthy is worth twice as much as that.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that statement, it is not a statement of fact.

Mr. Dundas: — Mr. Speaker, that came out in the Press. For The Battlefords I might say that that was quite a campaign. You know we have not done too badly. In 1949 we had two by-elections and we won one and you won one. We have had one in 1950, and we have won it. We are doing pretty well with two members to your one, and I might say that the Press of our province and our country, I think, is a credit to any country. They give their versions of what happens and so on. I might say that I come from the part of the country that was settled first I think in our great province, and I want to mention a great deal of the pioneers that came to this country in 1882. My father and mother came from Scotland in 1882, coming to Qu’Appelle in April of that year. I was born at Qu’Appelle, in my constituency, in the year of 1885, the year of the rebellion. The Indians came along when they were moving and when I was born they called me the ‘Rebellion Papoose’, and I think that is quite an honour.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that we have had, in that part of the country, some great men who have given a great deal to this country. I think the pioneers did a wonderful job and probably we are not worthy of what they did and the trials and tribulations that they went through. There was a member of outstanding ability whom I mentioned before, Mr. R.S. Lake. He came from that part of the country and is still living and is in his ninetieth year. Mr. Perley was also from that part of the country and his contribution, especially to agriculture, was very great.

March 1, 1950

I might say that we have a great deal in common with the old-timers and I think that the pioneers of our country have done a great deal to make our province and our country what it is today. I think we have a great deal to be proud of in that part of the country because I think that most of the people in the southern part of this province migrated to Qu'Appelle and McLean and Indian Head and went out there to homestead and make their homes. I might say that from the town of Indian Head they have the record of having shipped more wheat in 1901 than any one point in the world, and we have a great deal of pride in that. I might also add that we have an experimental farm and forestry farm close to Indian Head. We are also proud of the fact that from my home town came Mr. E.A. Partridge, whom a great many will remember, who was the instigator of and started the United Grain Growers Grain Company. It is one of the largest companies in the elevator business in our country. I was one of the first ones to subscribe stock to that organization, and I still hold it at the present time. That was started in our part of the country.

I want to remind this House and the C.C.F.: you know we had a Federal election in 1949, and when I was going to Fort Qu'Appelle to speak to Mr. Gardiner, the C.C.F. man was sweeping the street and he asked me to give him what I thought would be results of the Federal elections. I said, well put this down: Mr. St. Laurent will have 175 followers, Mr. Drew will get the biggest surprise he ever got in his life; I said we will take 12 to 15 seats from the C.C.F. in Saskatchewan and, I said, we will trim Mrs. Strum. We did all that. Then I said, also, that Mr. Gardiner would have the biggest number of votes that he ever had in his career, and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have a great admiration for Mr. Gardiner. I think he is one of the best Ministers of Agriculture that has been sent from any province.

I might say that I listened to the hon. Premier in the 1944 election, and he made a great many statements. He said that the Liberals don't keep their promises. Now I would like to say that I am Liberal and I always keep my promises, and the Liberals do just as well as the C.C.F. but they make more promises. In 1944, Mr. Douglas and all his Cabinet Ministers said that the Federal Government and the Liberals don't keep their promises. I remember very well that Mr. Douglas made certain statements in regard to what would happen if he was elected. One of the those statements was that no one would walk the highways as long as he was Premier. Well I have seen many of them walking the highways this last two or three years, and they tell me that the highway down our way is a little too rough – it is hard on their boots. I think that the Premier and his cabinet say that taxes have not gone up. Well, I disagree with that because they have gone up by leaps and bounds; they put three cents on the gasoline tax, and their motor licence is up on cars and trucks; public revenue on lands is up, and the farmers are taxed to the limit.

I might say that I represent a rural constituency and that I am very proud of that. However, I would like to say that we have a great deal in common with those fellows that walk the highway, in that the highways and bridges in our part of the country are not very good. I want to tell the Minister of Highways that we have, I think, one of the worst roads there is in the province, on No. 1. the Hon. Minister always tells of the horrible condition in which the roads were left by the former Minister and administration in 1944. I might remind him that when we came back into office in 1934 we had a depression, the biggest depression that this country has ever experienced; then a war came on in 1939 and that was a cause for great concern, and they

could not get machinery and so on and the highways, I will admit, were left til after the war. The revenues of this Government have been increased in leaps and bounds. In our time we had all those things that went to keep us from giving what we though we should, and doing what we thought should be done. Some of the highways of our province are in terrible condition yet, and may I say that the member for Gull Lake said that so many thousands of dollars had been put in those constituencies with bridges and roadwork. Well, I might say that I was in to the Department the other day and the Minister said that he could not promise me even one bridge.

I listened to many of the members on the opposite side and I listened to the member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) the other day. There was an Indian came to see me and was in the gallery when he was speaking, and what statement do you think he made in regard to the hon. Member for Canora? He said, 'heap big voice'. That is what he told me, and I think he was just about right.

When we were campaigning in 1944, there was a great deal said about dividing up – you know: if you have one or two cows, you give me one and the C.C.F. takes the other. In that election they said that they were going to divide things like this, so one of our fellows down there said, "Well, I think if they got in, they would want half of what the other fellow has but we would not get half of what they have"; and may I say that I think they are the worst capitalists of the whole bunch. They are worse than we are over here. They sure love money, because they sure get it out of us; they sure take it out of the people.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — You are thinking of the Dominion Income Tax people.

Mr. Dundas: — Oh, not I am thinking about you; you take lots of taxes out of us. Then I might say that we have had a great deal to do with the old age pension and other things that have been put into effect by a Liberal Government. We put into effect the old age pension, the mother's allowance, the cancer clinic and the sanitorium; that was long before there was any C.C.F., and I think that it will be in when the C.C.F. are extinct and out of existence. Sure they will be through in the next provincial election. Mark my words!

In 1948, and the 1949 Federal election, we had a great deal of talk in regard to the old age pension and so on by the C.C.F. candidates, and I might say that I have always been of the opinion that the pension should be contributory, that we should all contribute to our superannuation and that the old age pension should be at 65 and the means test eliminated. I will soon be 65, and that is why I am advocating that the old age pension be cut to 65; and if this Government stays in power very long I will need it because I'll be broke. They take more money out of me than any other member, I think, because I run a garage and they get big taxes on cars and they get taxes on what I sell.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Oh, that's Dominion taxation.

Mr. Dundas: — No. The Education Tax, which is called the 'nuisance tax'; and they were going to eliminate that in 1944. They said they were going to take it off, but they never have. Again, I say, a great many of these services that this Government is giving were put in by the Liberal Government.

March 1, 1950

I might say that these speakers – all go into the Federal field; they don't talk about Provincial at all; they all talk Federal. I looked at the resolutions, the other day, that are on the Order Paper and every one of them says, "We want the Federal Government to do this and we want the Federal Government to do that." In 1944, Mr. Douglas and his campaigners said that education was a Provincial responsibility; now they want the Federal Government to give so much for education. I might say that I would not care if they got some money out of the Government in regard to some of those things because they have a better way probably of collecting – say for the Trans-Canada highway. I think that the Federal Government should give a little more than 50 per cent and I will advocate that to them, and I think I have some authority down there. Yes, they take my word for a little bit; and I will advise the Federal Government and my good friend that always comes to see me when he comes to Saskatchewan, Mr. Gardiner (his constituency and mine border one another) we meet with each other and talk things over. A great many of these people – the Minister of Agriculture here and all of them, are condemning Mr. Gardiner. Well, do you know what I think you have against Mr. Gardiner? Well, do you know what I think you have against Mr. Gardiner? He is too smart for you. Yes, he'll sure put you in the doghouse; he did that up in The Battlefords, didn't he? You know what a C.C.F. member told me after the election was over? He said, "Mr. Douglas and his Cabinet talked themselves out of that election; they talk too much." Yes, they were shooting off and they didn't know what they were talking about. Sure they were talking Federal politics.

In our part of the country where I come from we have a lot in common. I live in the town of Sintaluta and I am proud of it. I have been there since 1906, and I might say that the hon. member for Gull Lake who said that he was thirty-five years in Saskatchewan, has a lot of years to go to catch me up – and when he catches me up he won't be there. We have had a great deal in common, and I am proud to be associated with this side to your left, Mr. Speaker, because I have never gone away from the Liberal Party. I never voted Progressive or Tory, I voted Liberal all the time because I believe in the Liberal principles. I am no turncoat just because the C.C.F. have the sway to get in. I stay by my guns. I have principles and I stay with them, and I might say that I have a right to my opinion and you have a right to yours, but your opinions are camouflaged and my opinion is pretty good. I am not one of those that talk about Socialism because I don't believe in it anyway. There was a great deal of talk about Socialism but I don't subscribe to that animal either, because I think it is a party that was put into effect when hard times were on in the 'thirties and I predict – and I am a good predictor, too; that after the next provincial election, there will be none there, they will be all out the back door. You know, Mr. Provincial Treasurer, what is coming.

May I say, in closing, that in the campaign for the next provincial election I will be on the hustings again; whether I am a candidate or whether I am not, I will be helping the capitalists (as you call them) out, and I admit that I am a capitalist. I want to get paid for what work I do; yes, I want pay for the work I do. You fellows are Socialists. You are supposed to give me half of what you are worth; but we capitalists, we don't have to give you fellows anything. And I say again that you are the biggest capitalists in the House; you love money, you would not give anything to me if I was broke. Oh, yes, it's as sure as you are sitting there that you are going to take my farm away from me some of these days. Oh, yes, they are going to take it because it's a good farm, it's down there where we do good farming and where we have good land. We have had practically no failures in

the northern part of my district, and I think that you people should come down there some time and have a look at my home town. If you are every through there call in. The honourable Speaker, has been down there.

Mr. J. Benson: — Will you give us some free gas?

Mr. Dundas: — Oh, yes, free gas. Every time I sell ten gallons of gas I have to give a dollar to the Government. That is pretty good; I am working for the Government. But, you know, I pay a lot of taxes to the Government, too. I have my private car, I have my jeep and I have my dealer's licence. I pay insurance on the whole three and am only protected on one. You know this insurance is quite all right. I am not complaining about that, but I think that one person with three vehicles which I drive myself, having to pay three insurances and only protected on one, is not fair. I can't get killed twice, and I think that when a fellow buys one policy that that should be enough for the three.

However, I might say that it has been a pleasure for me to be back on this side of the House. I was out for four years, and in that time they had enough Socialism to do them for many, many years. Now in the Federal election, Mrs. Strum was in since 1945. We sure knocked her out in 1949, and she won't be back for four years in the Federal was enough for Socialism. I want to say that I am not supporting the motion, and that I will contribute something next time probably better than I have today.

Mr. L. L. Trippe (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I am not going to be able to entertain this House as it has been for the last while and I am sure that we are all very much enthused with the speech that my colleague has made here and just finished. I am pleased to have the opportunity to address this Assembly again, and after a period of ten months' absence in our constituency, to see all the members here in such good health and voice, as they seem to be.

At this time, Sir, permit me to congratulate the Mover of the Address (Mr. Wellbelove) and I do not think I need to elaborate on that very much because it has been pretty well done before. He spoke mostly, as is customary over there, on Federal matters, and perhaps there are some Federal matters that interest us these days; but that district is represented pretty well in the Federal House by a very good and popular young man, Mr. Fred Larson, and I am sure that if we hand these matters over to him, together with the half a bushel of C.C.F. propaganda resolutions that are before the House, we might get some action from that quarter, better than the way they are being handled at the present time.

Permit me also, Sir, to congratulate the Seconder, the hon. member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Buchanan). We notice that he speaks of "We Socialists" and the "Welfare State", and we are glad over here to get them located and find out just where they stand with regard to these matters. If we do not do anything more in this Session than to get the Socialists fairly well lined up as to what they consider to be Socialism and what they are going to stand for, and one thing and another like that, then I think we will have them pretty well out in the open.

He has the same problem that I had in my constituency — that the cattle starved to death through lack of the policy of the Minister of Agriculture; but they did not bat him down quite as well as they did me, last year, when I mentioned it. He has, in his constituency, what I do not

March 1, 1950

think very many of us have, and he mentions the friendly undertaker down there that he works with. He should really have some roads, I am sure, better than he has got. That seemed to be the pleas, because this man is efficient and he works with the prospects, it seems, as soon as they get sick. If he had been up around Regina, the last few days after that British Election after some members of the Government had made some false prophecies on one thing and another, I am sure he might have picked up a few customers right there.

There have been very many political events since the last session of this House, and the thing that we notice most particularly is that of Liberalism, that is the forces similar to Liberalism, contrary to Socialism or anything of that nature, are gaining ground wherever the people are permitted to have a free election. That has been true in almost every case where they have had elections. The policy of Liberalism, of course, is generally accepted after the people have tried other different things, and they almost always come back to this idea because, for one thing, the basic policy is to give all people a fair chance and we in the Liberal Party, as I know it, will not make any special laws for people who will patronize us by way of votes or money for the political chest, as is done in some other cases.

The first consideration of the Liberal Party in this province, I would say, should be the farmers who are a much neglected group at this time, since they do not seem to have any very effective organization or anyone to speak up for them. I do know that, just now, they are getting an organization, and they are going to call it the Farmers' Union, and I hope that they do good, because surely the old U.F.C. did not do them very much good. They burned their fingers allying themselves to a political party, and the first thing we knew, there wasn't any organization left at all. During the course of that alliance, they took a great amount of money from the municipalities through what I consider to be preferential legislation, and from people who were not very much in favour of it; so, as a natural consequence, when that played out, they folded up. I hope that this new farmers' organization, if it succeeds, will be wise enough and know enough to keep their fingers out of politics, and they probably will get along a little better.

The other thing that we notice is that Socialism is definitely on the decline. In all of the free lands where Socialism or other theories closely allied to it have had a chance to be put to the test, the people have voted, in varying degrees, to turn it down. Something has caused them to lose prestige, and in some cases they have been put to an entire rout. There are some cases of that which I will show a little later on, but the thing that I would like to say is, and it seems to be that, when the people find out, in Socialism, that they have got to pay for the experiment, they soon abandon it.

I have a little question here which summarized that quite nicely, taken from "Life" magazine editorial of the July 3, 1949, issue, in which they say:

"There is a dominant philosophy of our age which lives in the hope of getting a lot out of the other fellow's energy. We cannot have abundance by merely saying 'gimme' to the next person. We must forgo the subsidy, a monopolized market when

everybody wants to live off the next persons' energy, the net result will likely be no energy at all. Let us beware of creating something that might be known in history as the depression that was caused by everyone saying 'gimme' at one."

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Would the hon. member tell the House if he subscribes to that particular article in "Life" magazine?

Mr. Trippe: — Yes, in a general way, I do. I was interested in article as it appeared in the Prince Albert Herald of February 15, 1950. Mr. Winston Churchill was speaking in the House of Commons on a Bill which was before the House to nationalize the steel industry. He said, in part;

"For our part we are sure that the future expansion of the steel industry in its relation to our general economic life can be better carried out by the industry itself, and we have no doubt that it could get all of the money it wants once the Socialist meddlers and muddlers stand out of the sunlight."

Someone apparently laughed across the floor at that time, as is sometimes the custom in this House, and Mr. Churchill went on to say:

"The right hon. gentleman laughs, but he lives on the exertions of 80 per cent of the industries still free and all his hopes are founded on their activities. Those industries constitute practically the whole of our export trade. They are already hampered by having to bear the weight and extra charges of the nationalized services and the weight of enormous taxation. They are already cramped by a vast network of regulations, interferences and restrictions, but still they are carrying the whole burden of our life and represent our only solvent economic earning power."

Now true of the Socialist experiment that where it is tried they need 80 per cent of free industries not under their control to keep the other 20 per cent functioning! The Government Leader in this House sent Mr. Attlee a telegram, a few days ago, congratulating him on this apparent success, at that time. This was somewhat premature, and since we cannot take it back now or cancel it, we might at least send Mr. Churchill a wire at this time something along this wording: "Congratulations on your wonderful showing. You have licked Socialism in less time than it took you to win the war."

The people of Great Britain seem to find out in four years what it takes most of the colonies around eight years to discover in Socialism.

They have set up numerous Commissions over there and they found out quite a few things. Last year, we found from one of their Commissions how to measure an onion, and this year they have got another one. They set up a Commission on water, and they made some quite striking discoveries. I do not know what it cost the Government, but here is a quotation from the Edmonton Bulletin of February 1, 1950:

March 1, 1950

“There has arrived in this country, a copy of a report made by a certain committee on water softening which has been sitting in solemn conclave to discover ways and means whereby young England may better scrub its grubby neck, or more efficaciously, cleanse its grimy paws. Ponderously and pontifically the committee concludes this report with this momentous statement: ‘within wide limits, washing is a desirable habit’. this is probably the greatest discovery made by any scientific body since the apple hit Newton on the head. Then the committee got down to practical details in this report and commenced this dissertation on water softening with this remarkable disclosure: ‘in order to wash an article, it must first be thoroughly wetted’.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, they had an election over in New Zealand . . . (interruption)

Mr. Gibson: — Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question? No, I do not want any water; I do not need any. I think that speech needs a little. The hon. member has referred to the Labour Government as being responsible. My question is: Does the hon. member know that the Silkins’ Bill was put in by the Conservative Government? I ask him if he knew that that Bill bringing that into effect was put in by the Conservative Government which preceded the Labour Government?

Mr. Trippe: — It is hard to figure a question out of that one, Mr. Speaker. We found out that they told them how to measure an onion anyway, by taking the diameter at the greatest point of circumference and it should be only so-and-so much, and it seems to have a been a Socialist board that figured this thing out.

We heard that they had an election down in New Zealand, and we know how that came out. This place used to be held up to us as a model of the best thing that could be found in Socialism. It was not quite complete, but they had everything pretty well nationalized down there. They had been fourteen years in office and they served as a model for most of the Socialists in this country, and they were very often quoted. They had subsidies and state monopolies, marketing boards, minimum wages, union which was made compulsory in industry, and elaborate social services. The Bank of New Zealand was nationalized, and the coal deposits were nationalized, and they had control of prices and real estate, so the thing was pretty well complete. But the people of New Zealand stood for it for about thirteen years, and then they found out they did not want any more of it, and we have not heard anything much more about it in this House, this year. We used to get quite a bit about New Zealand.

Then they had an election in Australia with much the same results, and I will stop at that point, Mr. Speaker, and move to adjourn the debate.

The Assembly adjourned at 6:00 p.m.