

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Eleventh Legislature
11th Day

Thursday, March 2, 1950.

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

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Wednesday, March 1, 1950, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Wellbelove for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. L. L. Trippe (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned the debate yesterday afternoon I was speaking about events that had transpired during the last year and didn't get very far — I only really got up to Australia and there is considerably more to be said on that subject but for the moment I would like to speak about a few matters concerning the provincial constituency of Turtleford which I have the honor to represent in this House. This is a vast territory as most members know lying to the northwest of this province close to the Alberta boundary and the Saskatchewan River and being in the proximity of Alberta we have a chance to compare the progress on our side in certain sectors with the progress over on the other side and I am sorry to say that we seem to be considerably behind in most things as compared with the province of Alberta under similar conditions. Our young people, if they want a job up there, seem to have to go to the province of Alberta to get it when they are living anywhere near there. They call that God's country up there — I suppose for some particular reasons, you can't find any communists up in that country, that is that admit that they are and the C.C.F.'ers average, they tell me about one and one-half to a township. The Liberals are just about as thick as chinamen in Shanghai in that country and they are getting more so all the time. I can't take any credit for that, Mr. Speaker, personally — I think the government of this province is to blame for most of that and I just kind of follow along and reap the benefits. This is one of the first districts in this province in which Socialism was tried out, I hope to have something to say on those different matters in the course of the budget debate; I won't have time today. We have surely been up there mismanaged and pushed about as badly as any place in this province I believe and I hope to call the attention of the House to different things where I think that we are discriminated against.

In the matter of highways in particular, yesterday I am sure we were all very well impressed who went with the Minister of Highways and his very efficient Deputy and other members of his staff over at the Highway warehouse. We saw over there, I am sure, a vast amount of very valuable equipment; I was astounded, tremendous rows of very expensive type of tractors and they have some really good workshops over there and they are able to do an awful lot of work on their machinery; it all looked pretty good to me and it looked quite new — I wonder if any of it ever strays up into our district; I don't believe that it does, I have never seen any of it there and there is the place where it could be used to very good advantage.

Last year in this House, I did compliment the Minister of Highways for the highway programme as performed in the constituency of Turtleford during the year 1948, with the qualification, that, if it would continue on the same basis, we would have no complaint, but if it would

March 2, 1950

simply an election dodge to try and get somebody elected up there where they did not have very much chance, then we were not going to be too happy about it. I am sorry to say that is about the way it turned out, because since that we have surely been sitting high and dry for highway work. There hasn't been anything much done at all. I believe we are entitled to some special consideration in the matter of highways up there for the reason that in the whole constituency of Turtleford there is not one particle of blacktop road, and in the whole constituency there is only a total of approximately ninety miles of gravelled road altogether. Now, if there are any of the hon. members who have a situation worse than that in highways, I will submit that they should be taken care of first, and otherwise I think we should have some consideration very early.

There are two road projects up there that have been completed. As far as I can see they should be ready for gravel, but I don't know what the policy of the Government is in regard to that, and apparently I am not permitted to find out, because I have tried to find out at different times and I don't find out anything at all about it. I trust that the Minister of Highways will enlighten us during the course of this Session if he intends to gravel No. 26 to Goodsoil from Loon Lake and No. 55 on which, also, the construction is completed between Turtleford and Glaslyn. Those are very necessary roads up there, particularly the piece from Loon Lake to Goodsoil. That country has special needs for roads, Mr. Speaker, for the reason that, when you leave the town of St. Walburg, that is the finish of the railway in that direction and the town of Frenchman Butte is the terminus of the other railway. Now there is a very vast and productive territory lying to the north of that. There are tremendous herds of cattle, and grain is grown in abundance, all varieties in considerable quantities; in fact many people who have gone up there and really been on relief when they got into that country have made themselves almost independent in one year growing alfalfa seed. One fellow had a matter of \$40,000 growing alfalfa seed, the year before last, and when he came into that country he was a very poor man. Well, now, the problem is to get this stuff out, and when you get it out you also have to arrange for trucking in all supplies that are used; and if you are going to do that on dirt roads you are going to run up against some very serious consequences. Imagine, all of us who have been and are farmers, starting out with a load of cattle and getting on one of these clay roads where you have fifty miles to travel on dirt road, and I am sure it would put the wind up you before you have gone very far. If you ever tip over with that load of cattle you have something on your hands; or sliding into the ditch.

The community – perhaps I should just say, first, that it would surprise many of the hon. members to know that there are four grain elevators up in this district sitting by the side of the road to hold the farmers' grain in conditions when they can't get out with it. They fill up generally in the matter of a couple of days, and then they have to do the best they can. The community of Makwa has two elevators, and they are a little bit closer to Meadow Lake by the road, but they have no gravel road there at all. They are a matter of around thirty miles from Meadow Lake; they are around thirty-seven miles from St. Walburg, but they do have about thirty miles of gravel road and seven or eight miles of clay gumbo road, so that is the condition there. We go up to Peerless, which is four and a half miles from Goodsoil and there you have another elevator standing. These people are about sixty miles from St. Walburg, and they have thirty miles of gravel and the rest is dirt road. We go on to the

community of Pierceland, which is approximately eighty-eight miles from St. Walburg, perhaps a little less mileage from Meadow Lake; but in order to catch any gravel at all most of them go to St. Walburg where they have thirty miles of gravel. But imagine getting all that produce out and supplies in on fifty-five miles, approximately, of dirt road! It is almost a physical impossibility.

Those are the reasons that I say that these communities should have some preference for roads – not necessarily because they are in my constituency, but on account of their location and the very prosperous communities up there. I am sure that if we don't get anything much done, the Liberals are going to have an awful backlog to catch up on when they get into power in this province.

The health services are not anything to compliment; not very satisfactory and it is an awful lot of trouble to get a hospital built and maintained. Some of the hospitals there are just barely getting along. They get a little help from the municipalities – some of them that are responsible for their upkeep, or think they are – I don't know whether they really are or not, but they have to be subsidized by the municipalities. One hospital, the principal hospital of Turtleford, is in building and already they have got a debt in debentures of \$60,000.00 which amounts to three mills in taxation over the whole locality. And there were hospitals up there that existed previous to this Government on a levy of two mills and ran their whole hospital services. I know that costs have gone up, but perhaps not to that extent. I don't know whether Turtleford is going to really be able to finish building yet, costs are tremendously high and I hope they will get along.

Then in the community of St. Walburg, the people there are very ambitious people, and have gone ahead and raised, by their own contributions, a matter of between \$15,000.00 and \$20,000.00 in money and labour. They did embark on a rather ambitious hostile plan which the Planning Board down there would not have anything to do with; and when they wouldn't have anything to do with that plan, they would not have anything to do with any other one, so they just left them alone. While these people, having a resident doctor in town and being the centre of a large community, a very heavily populated community to the east that has no medical services whatsoever, went ahead and they said, "If we can't get any help we will build this hospital ourselves." They are real pioneers up there, and I admire their spirit for that. So they went ahead and finally, seeing the progress that they had made, this Government did decide to recognize the project and they are allowing them an eight-bed hospital. Well now, Mr. Speaker, just a matter of a few more beds and they could have had a little liability in there. They might have contributed \$10,000.00 to that hospital, and in doing that they should have got perhaps \$10,000.00 out of the Federal Government, and with this \$20,000.00 I am sure that this hospital would be set up very nicely. I hope that the Government will reconsider their decision and really do something substantial for these pioneer communities, and let them have a ten-bed hospital at least. Why, just the ordinary people in St. Walburg would fill this hospital of eight beds and keep it full all the time, perhaps ten too, where you have a resident doctor and quite an outlying community. From the very fact that the Government has recognized this project. I would say that they should do something a little substantial to help it out, something in line with what they have done for other hospitals in similar conditions.

March 2, 1950

Now, there is a big question up in our country where there are a lot of cattle, and I am not satisfied, and many of the people are not satisfied, with the policy of the Government with regard to grazing leases. In some cases they tell me that you have to get political contact before you can get a grazing lease, and in one place they were organizing some Board of Trade or something to put the matter before the Government with regard to the need of grazing leases for different applicants. Some fellow said: "You might just as well put me on there, because they will have to ask me anyway." So if that is the way it goes, I don't know, but that is the way it is referred to me. Well now, there are large blocks of grazing leases up there, and if you look them over the chances are that you might find a little bit of a spot, maybe a quarter-section or something like that, that could be used for agricultural purposes. I have a complaint about that. A man has a large grazing lease and some of these inspectors come in and find a little spot in the middle of that suitable for agricultural purposes. They say to this man, "If you don't lease this from us, we are going to let somebody else have it." Well, this man is generally not able to go into the centre of his grazing lease and perform farming operations. It requires a lot of fencing, and I have a case in mind just now where a man lost his grazing lease because he had to give up the middle of it, and he could not fence it. He had to disband most of his herd of cattle, and I don't think that is a very good thing either.

With regard to schools – that is our big problem up there. The situation seems to be deteriorating, as time goes on, instead of getting better. It is costing more money for surely less education. I asked this Government a question, last year, about the educational position in this province, and we have up there (I suppose you have got them all over) what are known as supervisors – we call them 'sitters' – who have no qualifications at all for teaching school. They just go there and supervise the children's work on a correspondence course. In many cases, if the mother of these children takes the same time, she could do it just about as well. It just barely keeps the school open. Considering the long distances that a lot of these children have to go to school and the very little education that they get when they get there it is just a question of judgment among the people whether there is any use in sending them to school or whether you might just as well keep them home. I do not think anyone will deny that this is not a good situation. I am sure that the Minister of Education knows perfectly well that this is not a good situation at all. On October 1, 1948, which is approximately the beginning of the school year there, last year I asked a question as to how many of these supervisors there were working. There were none – none at all; but in the matter of four months, On January 31, 1949, it was found necessary to employ 217 of them in the province. I don't know whether those schools were closed up before they got in there or not, or whether they had some other teachers, but, anyway, 217 of them were working. The Turtleford larger school unit, which is also partly within the Turtleford seat, had nine. That was enough, I am sure; but this year, to see if they are doing any better, we asked the same question again, and things have surely gone worse than ever. On the opening of the school, approximately the 1st of October, 1949, instead of the 217 they had 335 of them working the province, and the Turtleford school unit had its share again – seven; but, Mr. Speaker, the Meadow Lake school unit had thirteen. They are doing better than we are. What about four months afterwards? On January 31 of this year, just around a month ago, how were we doing then? Any improvement? No, Mr. Speaker, the number had risen to 418 in this province. We are

progressing to beat the band, but we are progressing backwards. Out of these, the Turtleford larger school unit had eight, which means that approximately one school in eight had no teacher at all, but the Meadow Lake school unit had outdone us again there, and they had twenty-four – twenty-four out of sixty-eight school districts – twenty-four schools with ‘sitters’, no qualified teacher at all. One school in three did not have a teacher, that is, one school district in three. I do not know about the rooms, but there might be a very slight variation there. But it is an astounding situation, and something that I am sure we should do something to remedy. I don’t know how you are to do it. That is up to the Government; they know the answers. But something should be done to educate these children. Sure as the world, we are paying for it, and paying for it good, and we are not getting it. That is the main thing that disturbs the people.

Now, I am not going to say anything about the larger school units. I don’t know enough about it to talk, and another thing, this issue is before the people just now where all of them have the opportunity to vote on this thing.

The Liberals do not mix politics up with education as it is done by the C.C.F. in this province. They are still using the textbook “World of Today” in the schools. I spoke about this, last year, but the books is still being used – this book that praises up Russia and seeks to ridicule our system and to make out that Russia is doing better. It also touches something that is absolutely false, as I pointed out, last year. They still continue to use it, and I will also continue to protest as long as it is used. They also still have in the schools that secret record which is kept of the children and the parents of those children, known as the “Cumulative Record”. I know that the Department is not as insistent as they used to be about the use of this record in its entirety, but with all of these unskilled teachers that are holding these schools open, some of them are very enthusiastic to do well in the Department of Education. I picked one young fellow up along the road there, and he told me that he was able to get in the houses and get a list of all the books they read, and they never knew it at all. He has them all recorded now, and I said, “Well, you are quite enthusiastic about this thing, I am sure.” I do not believe they are so insistent on keeping these records nowadays, but perhaps some of the unqualified teachers were just following rules anyway.

In regard to Social Services, I do not suppose that my constituency is much better off or worse off than anybody else as far as old age pension and those matters are concerned. I hear considerable complaints, but I was astounded, the other day, that the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) dug up something here that certainly surprised me: that this Government had been protecting themselves on \$2.50 supplemental pension allowance here ever since 1948 sometime, and I am certainly going to go back and tell these old age pensioners that they had better start putting the squeeze on the Government to get the \$2.50 that they should have. We had better repeal this Order-in-Council and give these people something and cut out that kind of letter that the Minister of Social Services sends along with the cheques telling them all about how the Federal Government did this and that, which they didn’t do at all.

I was surprised at a case, that was brought to my attention, of an unmarried mother. I did not know they treated them quite so tough; but she is an unfortunate young woman, and she didn’t have anyone who

March 2, 1950

would marry her. The man had a wife already, and we cannot committee bigamy in this country; so her greatest mistake perhaps, was that she had more faith than good sense. But anyway, she had the mother's natural love for her child and took it home and tried to keep it; so this Government made her an allowance of \$15.00 a month, and she tells me that she has got to stay home and take care of the infant, and that she cannot go out to do any work, because that is not allowed. She had a job at one time, and she had to quit it. I hope that we can do something in these cases, too, because I know that when we were examining the Public Accounts, last year, I believe that the hon. Minister told us that they paid up to as much as \$30.00 board for these children when they turned them over to the Government, and it is quite unfair that they cannot give a mother, who is willing to take care of her children, any more than \$15.00 a month to enable her to perform this duty which she thinks is correct. I believe, myself, that the children will be brought up better in the home than they would in any Government institution.

Mr. Speaker, that is about all I have to say about the constituency, and as time is getting on and the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Deshaye) has a message for this House, I will not go any further; but I must say that I find myself unable to support the Motion.

Mr. V. P. Deshaye (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I will follow the usual custom to congratulate the new members of this House. Indeed we are glad to see the results of those by-elections. In the constituency of Gull Lake, the Minister of Public Health (Hon. T. J. Bentley) was elected on the promise of that cabinet position. I would say that was a pretty dear price for the Premier to pay for that seat. He had to give up a portfolio; but then again in reviewing this, I wonder if he was not glad to get rid of that portfolio. I do not think the Premier is as spry as he used to be, he looks a little peaked at times and it is too bad that he is not in the House or in his seat, because I am making these remarks about him and . . .

Premier Douglas: — I am in my place and I am not “peaked”. I can run you around the block any day, so go ahead.

Mr. Deshaye: — Very good, I am glad to see that he is revived. I hope the Speaker will keep the Premier in his place today, because I do not think he should have any special privileges in this House.

As I said, I think he was glad to get rid of this job, because in my opinion he is having an increasingly difficult time to keep his members together. I think that members of the Government are no different from anything else that's on a sinking ship – they like to leave, and that is the impression that I get when I look across at the Government.

I am going to congratulate the new members from Cannington and The Battlefords. I think these gentlemen are especially entitled to congratulations because the people of Battleford and the people of Cannington voted in members to this House in opposition to the Government. That is something, Mr. Speaker, for which I think the people of those two constituencies deserve the heartiest congratulations. When our good friend from Cannington came into this House, the people of Cannington district gave up \$800,000 in highways, because I am positive that the Government will never build those highways in Cannington now, and I doubt if they intended to build them if they had elected a member to their side of the House. So I say that the people

of Cannington ought to be heartily congratulated for their electing a very able member to this House. He spoke the other evening, and he made a very good job of the bridge situation in his constituency and I think that he put the Minister of Highways to shame. I am going to try to point out to the Minister of Highways that he should be put to shame for his conduct of operating the Department of Highways. It is really a disgrace.

However, it seems that the people in The Battlefords were not promised as much. I guess the Government had spent so much money in the Gull Lake and Cannington constituencies, they did not have quite enough left to promise the people of The Battlefords constituency; but anyhow, they had been given very lucrative promises, which they, too, rejected in order to oppose this Government, and my congratulations go to the people of The Battlefords' constituency as well.

Before I get into the main topic of my speech, I want to send greetings to the people of the Melville constituency, and to start off with I want to mention the Melville Millionaires hockey team. For the third successive year, the Melville Millionaires are on the way to taking the Saskatchewan and Western Canada championship. We, of the Melville community, are rightly proud of our Melville Millionaires hockey team, and we feel that a sport with the great characteristic of this province is something that we require to keep healthy bodies and healthy minds, and we feel that we are setting an example in the Melville Millionaires. I hope that in a few days, I will be able to congratulate them as being the Saskatchewan champions.

Some members on the other side of the House have tried to make us believe that their people are better than people in other constituencies in this province. I do not want to pretend that the Melville people are any better than the people elsewhere in this province; but I do say that we have remarkably fine people in the Melville constituency, and here are the reasons why I feel that. We are not a constituency that is particularly favoured with good land. Our land is very mediocre, and it has brought our people into cattle raising, and the foresight of our people in the Melville constituency has induced those people who went into cattle raising to produce the best stock that can be found anywhere in this province. The people of the Melville district have repeatedly won first prizes at the Toronto Royal and other fairs in this country.

I also want to say that we, in the Melville constituency, are leaders in grain production and I, in particular, want to mention Louis Wendell and his son, of Neudorf, who have captured firsts in wheat and other grains at Chicago, Toronto Royal and practically every other fair in Saskatchewan and in Western Canada. Those men deserve our congratulations because they are setting a better standard of farming for all of the people, not only in Saskatchewan, but in Canada. When a man like Mr. Wendell can grow wheat, this year, weighing 68 lbs to the bushel, he deserves our congratulations.

I want to say to the Premier, that we welcome him in the Melville constituency. He has been invited to a number of functions recently, and has not come up. We were quite disappointed. We like him to come up.

March 2, 1950

We enjoy his humour, and we do not believe in his politics, so we have a lot of fun with him. I want to assure him that he is always welcome to come to Melville, providing he isn't going to talk too much politics. But he is beginning to know better, because the last few times that he has come to Melville to talk politics and try to induce Socialism into the minds of the people, he has had very small audiences, and you know as well as I do, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier does not enjoy small audiences. He is quite a 'Gallery' man, and if you do not give him big audiences he does not come to Melville, and so we will invite him to other functions and hope that he comes.

Now, it is too bad that with such progressive people in Melville they are being retarded by the functions of this Government. I refer in particular to the Department of Highways and the Minister in charge of that Department, and I say to him that it is an absolute disgrace the way he has treated the Melville constituency as far as highways are concerned. We have the most progressive people in this province, and still we are retarded from going anywhere, from developing anything, because we have no roads. I hope that he will stand up in this House and tell us why it is that so much money is being spent in Weyburn and Rosetown, the two Douglas' constituencies, and hardly anything proportionate to those amounts in the Melville constituency. We haven't had one mile of hard-top in our constituency, and I think there is more traffic on the highways of the Melville constituency than there is on any other roads in this province. No. 10 leading out of Regina through Fort Qu'Appelle and Melville and Yorkton carries four Transportation buses, every day, and traffic that is exceedingly heavy, and we have to eat dust all the way in, if we can create enough speed to raise dust. I say to you that it is a shame, Mr. Minister of Highways, the way you are neglecting the Melville constituency, just because my predecessor was a railroader and didn't happen to own a car and I happen to be a Liberal. I say to you: "Let's get down to fairness and distribute this money in a little fairer proportion than we have been receiving it."

We have not had one mile of new highway in the Melville constituency since the advent of the C.C.F. Government. Every mile of highway built in the Melville constituency has been built by a Liberal Government, and I want the Minister of Highways to answer that one.

Premier Douglas: — They're pretty bad, all right.

Mr. Deshaye: — Yes, and it is about time that you fixed them up. Naturally, highways will deteriorate after five years of C.C.F. Government. Anything will. I say that I hope the Douglasses of this Government take it down to a fair basis of distribution of the moneys that are collected in gasoline tax and in motor licences. If the moneys that are spent by the people of the Melville constituency in licences and in gas tax were spent in the Melville constituency, we would be more than happy. We have, in the Melville constituency, at this time, one snow plow — two, I believe, but one has been broken down for six weeks; it's like the Minister of Highways, it cannot get going — and I understand from the press reports, that there are eight in the Weyburn constituency. Where is the fairness of this thing, Mr. Speaker? Why should there be eight snow plows in the Weyburn constituency, and one operating snow plow in the Melville constituency? Let's get some fair distribution of this money that is raised in motor licences and in

gasoline tax.

I also would like the Minister of Highways to come up our way some time, and see if he can't do something about hard-topping some of these roads and also we are in urgent need of having 15 miles on No. 15 from Melville to No. 9 reconstructed and made so that we can travel on that road in the winter and in the summer, too. That road is very important. It is the linking road to No. 9, the only North and South road that we have into Melville, the largest town in the province of Saskatchewan. I think that 15 miles has been so neglected that it has become no better than a poor municipal road and I say to the Minister of Highways, that I hope some day he will have the courage to come out and drive over that road. I am sure that he will make an apportionment or give some instructions to have that road rebuilt so that the people from the east side of the province can come into our town.

We also require a road on No. 47 leading south so that our people can get out into the south-country and maybe visit the Premier's seat occasionally. If it is any inducement, I will go down and see him myself; but I hope that something will be done about building No. 47 highway up.

Premier Douglas: — Are you sure you will get back?

Mr. Deshaye: — Oh, I will. Mr. Speaker, I hope that you can keep a little order on the Government side of the House. If they do not like the speeches, that is their own fault. They brought it upon themselves.

The other day I received a petition from the people of Neudorf with respect to Highway No. 47. I went to the Minister of Highways' office twice and once there was nobody there and the second time his secretary said, "You can't see him." I said, "Is there anybody in with the Minister?" She said, "No, but you can't see him." I ask the Premier if that is the way that he is allowing his Ministers to conduct themselves. Are you Ministers not representatives of the people of Saskatchewan? I am the representatives of the people of the Melville constituency and if anybody comes into my office I see them. I don't care if they are C.C.F., Social Credit or Liberal, I see them all because once I am elected, I say that I am representative of all of the people of that constituency, and when I go to see the Minister of Highways I expect him to see me, but he refused to do that. Now I say that is a gross injustice, Mr. Speaker, to the people of our constituency and I . . .

Premier Douglas: — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker: the hon. member is inferring here that I refused to see him when it was possible for me to see him. I want to assure him that is not correct. Possibly he does not realize that, particularly when the House is in Session here, we have a terrific amount of business, and all he has to do — is to phone down to my office and ask for an appointment, and I can assure him that he will be given an appointment when it is possible for me to see him. The other day I saw a delegation from his own constituency which he knew was coming in, and he did not avail himself of the opportunity of coming with them.

Mr. Deshaye: — That sort of an answer, Mr. Speaker, is not satisfactory to me. When I go down there and tell his secretary that I only

March 2, 1950

want a minute of his time to present this petition to him and tell him the urgency of it, and his secretary says she has strict orders that he cannot see anybody and she won't even go in and ask him, then I say to the Minister of Highways that the people of Saskatchewan are not receiving the consideration that they are entitled to from his Department. And I can back this up. There are other members on this side of the House who have told me that they were not able to see the Minister of Highways, and my friend across the aisle here has tried to get an appointment with the Minister of Highways on different occasions and he cannot. I ask him if he is treating the people of this province as he should as the Minister of Highways and as their servant. I also want to remind him, and I hope he has not forgotten this incident, of the time that he hung up on a secretary of a municipality sending in a plea. Now, I say that is the rudest thing any man can do whether he is a Minister or not.

Premier Douglas: — Again on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker: I want to assure the House that at no time have I ever hung up on any man talking to me intelligently or civilly. Now, if a man has called up when under the influence of liquor or where they become abusive, I may have done that; but I want to assure the hon. member that at no time did I ever hang up on anyone – talking to me in a civil manner or on business. I will again . . .

Mr. Deshaye: — It is no reason for him trying to use up my air time, because he doesn't like my comment.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member was making a charge against one member of this House who rose on a point of privilege, which he has a perfect right to do.

Mr. Deshaye: — He tried to make a speech, Mr. Speaker. He can certainly justify his position, but I say to you that he has no licence to make a speech in this House until his time arrives. But I am sure that this Secretary-Treasurer, who I don't think has ever taken any amount of liquor in his life, will be very interested to know that the Minister of Highways intimates that he was intoxicated or something else.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I, at no time, insinuated that this man was intoxicated. I said that the only time that I may have done that was when a man was apparently intoxicated or who was not being civil. I was not referring to anyone.

Mr. Deshaye: — I also wish to speak for a moment or two about the Minister of Natural Resources. He is in his seat, so he can talk quite freely. The other day when he was speaking . . .

Premier Douglas: — You would talk more freely if he weren't.

Mr. Deshaye: — Oh, I don't know about that, Mr. Premier. The other day when he was talking he wandered all over the country, and said something about us having a political machine in the Melville constituency. I wonder what kind of a machine we have in the Tisdale constituency, in the Weyburn constituency, in the Rosetown constituency, and all those constituencies

in which Government members were elected? It seems that every time there is a successful candidate on this side of the House, there is a machine; but there is no machine where these fellows across the House are elected. Oh no, nothing like that! But I wonder if they ever see their Saskatchewan Government Insurance salesmen in operation, their Social Welfare workers, their Highway inspectors and all of these chaps. I wonder if they ever see them in operation! I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the best job they ever do is to canvass for C.C.F. votes, and that is what they are being paid for, it seems, the way they carry on in our constituency.

Mr. J. W. Erb: — What about your P.F.A.A. men in Gull Lake?

Mr. Deshaye: — Who is this? Identify yourself. These back-benchers you know, they kind of get under your skin. I also want to say that in his comments with respect to the member for Arm River, I think it was very uncalled for of a Minister of the Government across the way. You know, these Socialists seem to be so imbued with C.C.F.'ism that they don't know that it is right to vote for the best man who runs in a constituency. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this province need the best men that they can get in Ottawa. I worked for the best man, and I am sure proud of it too. And you are too. You were darned glad he was elected. And I say to you that when the hon. member from Arm River had enough fortitude to get out and say, "I support Mr. Diefenbaker, who I think is the best man," then he is entitled to congratulations and not to the ridicule that the Minister of Natural Resources tried to give him the other day.

I say let us have the best man represent us in this Government and in the Government at Ottawa, and we will have better legislation. That is why I say that we are going to have a lot of changes on the other side of the House at the next election.

Premier Douglas: — I regret very much that Mr. Gardiner is in Ottawa.

Mr. Deshaye: — The Premier speaks of Mr. Gardiner. I'll have the Premier know that I am very proud that Mr. Gardiner is representing us in the Melville constituency. Very proud. I am sure that the Premier, if he wants to be honest, is very happy that Mr. Gardiner is representing Saskatchewan in Ottawa. I want him to stand up and say that he denies that and if he has any honesty about him, he will say that he is glad Mr. Gardiner is representing the people of Saskatchewan in Ottawa.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, does the hon. gentleman want me to answer that question now? I say it is a great tragedy that Mr. Gardiner is representing Saskatchewan at the present time and selling the farmers of Saskatchewan and their whole marketing system down the river.

Mr. Deshaye: — The longer the Premier is in the House, the less respect we seem to have for him, because he grows more ridiculous as the years go by. He seems to have less regard for the truth. I might say to the Premier, too, while I am at it, that the people of this province are smartening up to him. They are smartening up to this man that plays Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, the man who will stand in this House and say things and be contradicted by members that he calls immature, such as my friend from Moosomin,

March 2, 1950

and brings out absolute untruths that the Premier spoke in this House, and the records show that. The man quotes on Sunday, in his "Fireside Chats," biblical verses and then all week afterwards tells suggestive stories.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the statement that I have ever told suggestive stories. The hon. gentleman is either going to withdraw that or I will personally see that he does.

Mr. Speaker: — I think that the hon. gentleman who was speaking will have to withdraw that statement.

Mr. Deshaye: — Well, on your instructions, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the remark. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said, we must have some machine in these other constituencies too; if we have a political machine in the Melville constituency because we happened to elect Liberal members, I say that we also have machines in these other constituencies as well, and it seems to me, from the way the Government has returned men here, these machines are pretty well oiled – and that brings up the subject of oil.

There is a lot of mystery about the oil situation in Saskatchewan just at the moment, and I want to ask the Minister of Natural Resources and the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer a few questions about this oil business. I am not accusing them of anything, but I read in the press certain statements – in fact on June 25th, it was reported in the 'Leader-Post' that the Department of Natural Resources had awarded to one Fred Rhubbra, of Montreal, 10,500,000 acres of potential oil and gas lands in the province of Saskatchewan. On July 6th, the "Commonwealth" reported that this option had been increased to 17,000,000 acres. Then I read a report here, and I do not see Mr. Rhubbra's name at all. I want the Government to explain to the people of Saskatchewan who this man Rhubbra is, how much he paid for these 17,000,00 acres of oil rights, and what Rhubbra did with these oil rights. Did he sell them to Tidewater, Husky, Lampson Company, Sohio, Shell and all these other companies? If so, how much money did Rhubbra make out of this transaction? I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that we must get these answers before this House adjourns, because the people of my constituency, as I am sure the people all over the province, are wanting the answers to this mysterious oil business and I hope that before this House adjourns that we will have these answers.

I think, also, that we should have the answer as to the resignation of Mr. Bichan. It seems to be a timely resignation. I wonder if Mr. Bichan will be in the committee during questioning of the Minister of Natural Resources to answer any questions he knows, or will Mr. Bichan have disappeared? We should have those answers for the people of our province. After all, the Government is dealing with millions of dollars of potential wealth in this province, which belongs to the people of Saskatchewan, and the people of Saskatchewan are entitled to know the answer; and if the Government has given Mr. Rhubbra 17,000,000 acres of Crown lands and he has disposed of them, than I say that the people of Saskatchewan have been 'rhubarbed' by the Government and I think that the people of Saskatchewan are entitled to an answer. My Leader, the other day, questioned the Minister of Natural Resources about Mr. Bichan's resignation and all the Minister of Natural

Resources did was throw up his hands and say, “What would you have done?” I say to you, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is not in charge of the Department of Natural Resources.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I would just like, on a question of privilege, to correct the hon. member and say that I did not throw up my hands. I did not say, “What would you have done?” I said I had no statement to make.

Mr. Deshaye: — Well, I saw his hands and I thought I heard that, ‘What would you do?’; but at least he never gave us an intelligent answer, that is for sure. He still has the chance. (interruption) Mr. Speaker, the Premier should have no more privilege than anybody else in this House. If he wants to make a remark he should stand on his feet.

Mr. Speaker: — Are you casting reflections upon my handling of this House?

Mr. Deshaye: — I am just making the observation, Mr. Speaker. At your instructions I will withdraw the remark. Well, Mr. Premier, here is a question directly for you. I was wondering if there is any connection at the moment with Dr. Schumiatcher, your ex-secretary and legal adviser. I see that he was at lunch, today, with five members of the Government, and I would appreciate it if the Premier would answer, for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan, if it is true that Dr. Schumiatcher, his ex-legal adviser and secretary, now has acquired 2,000 shares in a newly-formed company called “Search Corporation”, as it is reported in the press. Will the Premier also tell us if Schumiatcher is a solicitor for Search Corporation and another newly-formed company called “Barkly Oils Limited”, and if he is also the legal agent for still another company dealing in oils in Saskatchewan, namely, “Albercan Operating Company”, and if Dr. Schumiatcher’s office, at 308 Westman Chambers, is also the registered office of Freeholders Oil Company Limited. It seems to me to be very strange. I wonder if the Premier of Saskatchewan will give the people of Saskatchewan an answer because, as I said before, here are billions of dollars of potential wealth that seems to have flowed into the hands of a few civil servants and, if that is the case, the people of Saskatchewan have been deprived of the opportunity of themselves investing in this potential wealth. I think that the Government should answer those questions for the benefit of the people of this province.

Mr. A. J. Kuziak (Canora): — (Interruption)

Mr. Deshaye: — Now, there is another thing too – even the back-bencher from Canora is worried. In my district the farmers were canvassed by oil companies to give a ten-year lease on the oil rights on their land at 10 cents an acre. It seems to me that these companies must have had permits from this Government to go out and canvass these farmers, and if they had permits, the amount that they were to pay the farmers surely was stipulated in the permit. Now, I would like the Government to answer for the people of my constituency why they received only 10 cents an acre and the farmers of Manitoba are supposed to have received \$1.50 per acre. I ask the Government: were the farmers of Saskatchewan sold down the river for a measly ten cents an acre and, if so, who got the other \$1.40?

March 2, 1950

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The Imperial Oil.

Mr. Deshaye: — He says the Imperial Oil got it. Well, I say to the hon. Minister that, if the Government of Manitoba could persuade oil companies in that province to pay \$1.50 for leases, then he has shirked his duty in allowing the farmers of Saskatchewan to get only 10 cents an acre. Well, tell us. You made a speech and never told us a thing in it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — You can't answer every fool in the country in one speech.

Mr. Deshaye: — Mr. Speaker, I am also wondering what faith the Government has in its own Crown Corporations. In Melville, the Government rebuilt the liquor store there, put a new front on it, rebuilt the chimney. Not one brick came from the Estevan Clay Products plant, which is a Crown Corporation.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Weren't you told that the demand for Saskatchewan Clay Products' brick was so great that we could not meet it?

Mr. Deshaye: — I might answer the Provincial Treasurer that I know as a matter of fact that, at the time (and this will surely disrupt his explanation) this store was rebuilt, their agent in Melville had ample Estevan brick to rebuild this store, but apparently the Government has no faith in its own products. It's like the shoe manufacturer who will wear somebody else's shoes; and that applies to the Government.

There has also been considerable construction in Melville in the two larger school units. Thousands of lumber feet have been used to reconstruct these schools, and I have reliable information that not one foot of Saskatchewan spruce was used to reconstruct these schools, that all the spruce that was used came from Alberta. I wonder if that is following the preachings of this Government that we should patronize home industry! We have plenty of spruce in this country. I hear there are millions of feet in stockpiles in northern Saskatchewan, and still the Government in its own industries will use Alberta spruce! Has the Government lost confidence in this province, in the products we have here, in our people?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Will the hon. member inform the House who does the purchasing for the building of the schools in the larger school units?

Mr. Deshaye: — The Minister of Education is asking me a question that I was just going to ask him. He says can I inform him, the Minister of Education, who does the purchasing for these larger school units. He is the Minister of Education. He should know the answer.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — My question was, would he inform the House?

Mr. Deshaye: — How does the Government award these contracts? That is what we would like to know in the Melville constituency. Are these contracts to rebuild schools open to competitive bids? Will the Minister of Education answer a question for me? Are these contracts open to competitive

bids, or are they handed out to Government people?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — The hon. member should know that the Government has nothing whatsoever to do with the construction of schools.

Mr. Deshaye: — Well, I am glad to get the answer. This is a good place to find out a lot of things. At least, I am not like some members on the other side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier, just as he did last year, always tries to substitute a joke for an answer. Well, I must tell him that the people of Saskatchewan are no longer satisfied with accepting jokes for answers that are critical to their welfare. Last year, I made the suggestion to this Government that something had to be done to relieve the hospital congestion, and I am glad to see that the suggestion that I made, last year, that an old folks' home should be constructed to put the people in that can no longer be assisted with hospital treatment and leave room for those that can be assisted with hospital treatment and reduce the long waiting list, has been proposed as well by the Saskatchewan Provincial Health Survey Committee. I know a lot of people from my constituency that have come into the city of Regina to receive hospital treatment, and have had to wait in boarding houses for as long as two weeks. I hope that this Government will, as soon as possible set up old folks' nursing homes for incurables who can no longer benefit from hospital care and so reduce the long waiting lists that we have of people wanting to get into hospitals. This recommendation has recently been made by the Provincial Health Survey Committee and I hope that the Minister of Public Health will take this recommendation seriously and, as soon as possible, establish these old folks' homes so that our people can get hospital space.

Also last year, when I was in this House, I recommended that something be done to relieve the lot of farmers who have not electrical power and who will never receive the electrical power from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. At that time the Premier agreed with me that he also felt that there were many people in Saskatchewan that could never receive power from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. At that time I suggested that something should be done to give these people electrical power, and I suggested that some unit be supplied to the farmers of Saskatchewan so that they could have electrical equipment on their farm. Nothing as yet has been done, but I hope, for the benefit of the people on the land whom we must keep there for the progress of our country, that this recommendation will be taken up.

I also hope that the Government will see fit to abolish the tax on farm fertilizers and on farm accessories and farm machinery attachments. Those are things that our rural people are entitled to, and I hope the Government will see fit to pass these amendments.

The Minister of Social Welfare has seemed very impatient there. I am coming to him now, and will give him a chance to answer for the conduct of his Department.

My friend from Turtleford spoke of an unmarried mother from this constituency receiving \$15.00 a month. Well, he was very fortunate because I will tell him of a case in our constituency which will go down as a

March 2, 1950

record of shame to this Government. This is just in 1949, so I do not know whose administration you want to call it; but here is the case of a fifteen-year-old girl who gave birth to a child last July 15th, and the alleged father escaped into Manitoba. There is nothing for this girl to live on. Her father owns a half-section of land with 185 acres under cultivation, which is mortgaged in the sum of \$740. He is a cripple, and he has this land rented to his son. This chap is 60 years of age, and he has eight children to keep and, last year, the land did not average two bushels to the acre. Shortly after the child was born an application was made to this Government for mother's allowance for this child and after considerable correspondence, I received from the Department of Social Welfare, on November 25th, this letter:

“May we assure you that assistance to Miss . . . which can only be granted to her in the form of mother's allowance, does not now depend on whether or not the putative father complies with the order of affiliation, and that the question of granting a mother's allowance to Miss . . . will be dealt with as speedily as possible.”

That was on November 25, 1949. Then there was no action, so I wrote to the Minister himself.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the hon. gentleman that he is on the radio and if he is going to quote these letters, I would suggest that the names be left out; I would suggest that in all fairness to my friend and to the party whose name he is calling over the radio.

Mr. Deshaye: — Then again, as I said, I have a letter here dated November 30th, from the Minister of Social Welfare, and he says that:

“Immediately after the order of affiliation was made it might well be argued that the application for mother's allowance should have been dealt with immediately, and I regret the delay.

However, I might explain that it has been occasions by pressure of other work of an urgent nature and lack of experienced staff in the field. We hope to be able to deal with this application for mother's allowance in the immediate future.”

That was on November 30, 1949. Then on December 19th, there was still no action in this case, and I wrote to the Minister himself to which letter, Mr. Speaker, I have not had the courtesy of a reply. It seems almost the same conduct as we had in the Department of Highways. You write a letter to the Minister, and no reply. In other words, everybody is left out in the cold.

Hon. J. H. Sturdy: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has read to this House

certain replies that I have made to his correspondence. No one who has written in to my office has gone very long without a reply.

Mr. Deshaye: — Mr. Minister of Social Welfare, this letter is dated December 19, 1949, and to date I have not had a reply to that letter, and if you can bring one in here and show it to me, I will be glad to have you do so; but I have not received a reply to that letter as yet. Then again on January 28th . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege here, the hon. gentleman has referred to me as not answering correspondence. Now, I want to assure him that one thing I pride myself on doing is keeping my correspondence up, and I will have to ask the hon. gentleman to retract it.

Mr. Deshaye: — I am glad you pride yourself on doing one thing well. And then on January 28th, I received a letter from this fifteen-year-old girl with this child, saying, “I am dropping you a few lines about the letters I wrote you. I have not received any reply, and I am in bad need of help for my child.” There is the conduct of the Department of Social Welfare of this province. That is one case. What has happened to the Government that elected itself on the slogan “Humanity First?”

There is another case, Mr. Speaker, a lady of the Melville constituency had her old age pension cut off, and in this letter dated December 21, 1949, the reason for the pension being cut off is given that this woman received \$575.76 in revenue from her farm. Unfortunately, however, the Department of Social Welfare is not operated too efficiently, because they omitted to note that this woman only had a one-third interest in this farm, which would leave here one-third of that amount.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker: this farm was rented to her son and her son, instead of paying the usual one-third rental which is customary and which is required by the Federal pension authorities, pays her, in order to escape, one-ninth. He paid her one-ninth of the rent.

Mr. Deshaye: — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the Minister of Social Welfare should try to mislead the House as he has. He knows very well, and I have a letter here verifying it, that this woman was only entitled to one-third of this farm; two-thirds belonged to the son. The woman had one-third equity in it. She rented to her son, who received two-thirds of one-third which leaves her two-ninths – and he says to this House that she gets one-third. In fact I have a letter here which reads:

“We have not calculated the income available to this pensioner in accordance with the provisions of the Last Will and Testament of the deceased. Apparently our pensioner only has an undivided one-third interest of the real estate and would be entitled to less income than one-third share of the proceeds thereof, and the actual amount is one-ninth.”

March 2, 1950

Apparently, the Minister does not know what is going on in his Department.

This letter goes on to say:

“Before giving consideration to the reinstatement of pension payments at this time, I am wondering if the son would be prepared to accept the transfer of the land from our pensioner on the understanding that he would keep her without the benefit of the pension provided we removed our security therefrom.”

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this Government is wielding coercion upon the people of this province. Here the lady who has a \$1,000 equity in this farm, and Government speakers have gone through the province saying, “If you have an equity under \$2,000, we will not encumber your land.” They said that in my town, and I was under that impression until I dealt with this. Apparently that is not the case. The Government will put on a caveat against a pensioner’s land regardless of the equity in the land. This is proof of it.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — May I say something, Mr. Speaker? Her equity in that land is \$1,000? Have you anything to substantiate that statement, because I believe it to be wrong?

Mr. Deshaye: — The assessed value of the land is \$3,000. That is the actual value of the land, and she has a one-third interest, and, by simple deduction, one-third of \$3,000 is \$1,000. This Government has put a caveat on that land, and I say to the people of this province that, regardless of the value of their land, this Government will put a caveat on it when they take the old age pension.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — This Government has not placed a caveat against that land. That statement is utterly false.

Mr. Deshaye: — Mr. Minister, I am going to get an abstract and produce it in this House, to show that your statement is incorrect, showing that the Old Age Pension Branch has a caveat against this property, and possibly this correspondence will show it. Here. I have it right here, Mr. Speaker, here is the letter written from his Department dated February 15, 1950 (not very long ago), and it says here. You see in the previous letter it said that if the son would keep his mother, they would withdraw their notice of caveat. That was right in the letter I read to you, Mr. Minister. And now I have a letter saying:

“The pension authority will arrange to remove the notice that they have filed against this property, and will discontinue the investigation regarding the previous request for re-instatement of pension payment.”

I class a notice against property as a caveat. Look in the dictionary and you will get the meaning.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, a notice filed in the Land Titles Office is certainly not a caveat, and this legal light of this province should know the difference.

Mr. Deshaye: — I do not know if the Minister can get away with that explanation anywhere else, but he certainly cannot in this House. I asked him to look in a dictionary and see what a caveat means. It is an encumbrance, and a notice is certainly an encumbrance on the title, and that is what his Department has put on this title and they coerced this young man into keeping his mother if he wanted the land. They said, “We won’t reinstate the pension. We won’t remove the caveat unless you keep your mother.” Now he has to keep his mother in order to have this notice or caveat discharged. Now I ask, what protection has an Old Age Pensioner of Saskatchewan in a Government that will operate and coerce people in that respect.

I also want you to tell me about this case. Here is a man, Mr. Speaker, who has been declared blind by the Institute for the Blind, a man who has held the following positions in this province, and who has been an ardent farm organizer for over thirty years, a man who has been the Reeve of the Saskatchewan Grain Growers’ Association, a man who was elected on the Board of Directors of the Municipal Hail Association in 1916, and vice-president in 1919 and 1922, a man who was elected president of the Saskatchewan Grain Growers’ Association in 1924, which position he held until amalgamation with the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool in 1927, and he was on the provisional Board of Directors of the Wheat Pool, he was chairman on boards that organized a livestock pool, and the chairman of the board that organized the poultry pool, he was elected vice-president of the United Farmers in 1927, and was director of research of that organization until 1929. Here is what this man is forced to write about the Department of Social Welfare of the Government of Saskatchewan, a man who lost his sight in the service of this country, and a man as so many men in the service of Saskatchewan and Canada are, when they reach old age, in poverty, and here is what this man is forced to write with respect to the treatment he received in that Department. He says:

“I am enclosing a letter which I received from Mr. Sturdy in reply to the one I wrote of which I sent you a copy. It would appear that your surmise about having been written by Mr. Chalmers was correct, for Mr. Sturdy states that he has not gone over the files before, but it was signed by him. It is about nine months since I first applied and it has taken all that time for them to get their muddled minds made up that I was entitled to the full pension. Mr. Chalmers wrote that I was not entitled to any pension and he informed me that I was a sponger, and now at long last, after nine months’ battle, they have given me the full pension and the Minister says they are desirous of giving the maximum pension to those who apply for it.”

March 2, 1950

He says in another letter:

“I was certainly made to feel by Mr. Chalmers that the pension was charity and not a right to be enjoyed by those who qualified under the Act.”

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, are the people of this province entitled to be treated in this manner, and are men who served this province well in their day, to be treated as this man claims he was?

Then again, here is another case of a widow with two children (they have had a crop failure) to whom this Government is paying \$7.16 a month for their maintenance. ‘Humanity First’ as my friend says, and here is what a friend writes regarding this – I think it is a brother. He says:

“The following is a matter I would like to bring to your attention. It deals with the matter of Mother’s allowance granted to my sister who resides on section 36-21-8 in Saskatchewan and who has resided here for over forty years. She lost her husband two years ago, leaving her with two children, a boy who is now 17 years of age and a girl 15 years of age who is still getting her education. There has been a lot of illness in her family through the years, the cost of which kept them poor. Her husband was in very poor health with a bad heart condition for some years before his death, and their eldest son, who is now married, served overseas and baled out of a plane over Holland, fracturing his ankle; he was a navigator in the R.C.A.F. and is trying to get established on a farm of his own.

My sister carried on bravely and never asked for the Government’s assistance until last fall, and only did so because the crop they had planted was nearly a complete failure owing to the drouth last year; they only threshed 260 bushels of wheat, 380 bushels of oats and 60 bushels of barley. This did not pay for the expense, and they have to keep their seed for another year. Owing to the failure of their crop they even had to purchase fodder to keep their few livestock alive. They decided to ask the Government for a mother’s allowance to assist in keeping the home going, and they made application to the proper authorities, last October. In due course a Government official came along and did not give them very sympathetic attention and in fact, she said, he was very arrogant and difficult

in his investigation of her case. However, she was granted the large sum of \$7.16 a month and has now received three payments. We and the neighbours consider this a disgrace to the Government that is supposed to be so concerned of the welfare of those unfortunate widows and orphans and whose slogan is 'Humanity First'."

There is an example, Mr. Speaker, of the treatment that our people are receiving.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — What the hon. gentleman has not pointed out is that that woman received \$680.82 in Canadian Wheat Board payments, during the year — no mention is made of that. Now, we try to grant social aid on the basis of need, but you evidently have no record of that; you come in here with these cock-and-bull stories with half the information, and try to influence the House.

Mr. Deshaye: — I am not asking to accept my statement, I am asking him to accept a letter written by a constituent of this province. I am not giving him any falsehoods. Is he charging this person with lying? I have read a letter here and I am not putting anything before the House that isn't in that letter and I will report to this person what the Minister said. You can rest assured, Mr. Premier, that I will do that.

Premier Douglas: — Oh yes, I 'm sure you will — but how?

Mr. W. A. Tucker (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I think the Premier should be made to withdraw the suggestion that my hon. friend will make a distorted report of what has been said. I suggest that that is a reflection on the hon. member, and the hon. Premier has no right to make that aspersion.

Premier Douglas: — If he gives the report he gave just now it will be a distorted version, because the Minister cast no reflection whatsoever on the person who wrote the letter. The Minister simply said that the hon. member came in here and told only part of the story, and he did not tell of over \$600 of other income. If my hon. friend does tell the story as he purports to tell it just now, it will be a distorted version.

Mr. Deshaye: — It will be well known, Mr. Speaker, that I read an actual letter, and as I said before, I have not made any misrepresentation to this House, and he knows that, too. He just thinks that he is going to put it over. The thing is: here is the actual letter, and if he says that this is a wrong statement, then the writer of the letter is responsible. I have not misrepresented anything in this House.

Premier Douglas: — On a point of privilege: I don't want to cast any reflection on the hon. member or on the person who wrote the letter. I am simply saying that when an hon. member comes into this House and quotes a letter, he does so on his own responsibility, and it is his responsibility, before he quotes a letter, to investigate the facts and to give the

March 2, 1950

House all the facts and not merely some of the facts as this letter apparently does.

Mr. Deshaye: — I am going to inquire into that information, Mr. Speaker, and see if it is correct.

Now, I wonder what the hon. Minister of Social Welfare is going to state about his dismal failure at Lestock, last year. He had twenty-three families moved out of that district, twenty-three needy families, and after they had gone, something which, to me, occurs only in Russia occurred there. The people were loaded on a train and moved out to Green Lake and no sooner had the train left the village of Lestock when these home were burned to the ground. Now I hope he can satisfactorily explain that one.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of that and I would ask the hon. member as to who burned them to the ground; was it the municipality, or did you, or who did burn these buildings to the ground?

Mr. Deshaye: — The Minister is in charge of his Department, not me.

Mr. Speaker: — Since the hon. member is referring to an incident in my constituency I think I am within my rights to vacate the chair and answer him. I would ask the Deputy Speaker to take the chair.

(Mr. J. Wellbelove took the Chair.)

Mr. Speaker (continuing): — I would just point out, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Melville accused the Minister of Social Welfare of being responsible for the burning of those buildings. I asked the privilege of the House to answer. I have the rights of any other member at this stage.

The Deputy Speaker: — Mr. Speaker has the rights of any other member and may take his proper place in the debate.

Mr. Deshaye: — This is not the first time that Mr. Speaker and I have locked horns, so I am quite at home. I think we got the best of him last time too; we had open territory then.

Now, as I said, the Saskatchewan Government, through its Department of Social Welfare, moved twenty-three families from Lestock to Green Lake, and after they were gone a number of the homes were burned. Now, to correct the Minister of Social Welfare, and I think the record will prove that, I have not said who burned the homes; but the fact remains, Mr. Premier with your big smile, that these homes were burned, and you can answer that one if you like. The fact remains that the homes were burned, and when these people did not like Green Lake and all but seven families came back, they had no homes to go to. Now I ask you has that been done in any other country except Russia? It reminds me — you know, when an animal walks like a duck and quacks like a duck and does everything a duck does, I don't care what you

call it, to me it's a duck; and when a government talks about Communism, acts like Communists and does everything else a Communist government does, I don't care whether they want to call themselves Democratic Socialists or what. To me that government is Communistic in its nature, and they have proven it so often that I am beginning to wonder what this Democratic Socialism really means.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I wonder if the hon. member from Melville would permit a question. Would you mind telling the House, if you have the information, where these homes were located — on private land, Crown land or road allowances, or all three?

Mr. Deshaye: — I don't care where they were located. These people were moved away, and I haven't finished my story and I'll tell you why it was particularly regretful that their homes were burned. They were moved away and the member from Touchwood will tell us where these homes were. He seems to know all about it; it is in his constituency. These homes were burned after these people had been moved up to Green Lake and they were made to live in tents, and as winter came on there was nothing then for these people at Green Lake, no housing accommodation, and these people had to move out or live in tents for the winter.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — On a point of privilege. That statement is absolutely wrong. The hon. member from Melville was not there, I don't suppose, or he might inform the House if he was; but I am telling the House that that statement which he has made is wrong.

Mr. Deshaye: — This is the report that was brought to me and I have it here as I wrote it, as one of these chaps that was up there brought it to me; and I believe that this man should know what he is talking about. Now, that is the type of Government that we have. They move a bunch of people out; their homes are burned, and these people cannot live where they have been moved to, and have no place to come back to, and they become municipal responsibilities all through the province.

Premier Douglas: — Whose responsibility were they before they went?

Mr. Deshaye: — Well, let the Minister answer that. He knows. I don't know whose responsibility they were, but I do know, Mr. Speaker, that it was this Government that moved them up there, and once they moved them there they should assume responsibility for them and now they have come back. A man who is a veteran of two wars has come back from Green Lake; he cannot live there with his family, and he has come back, and this Government has refused him assistance. If the Minister or the Premier wants his name, I have it here for them. It is too bad, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Public Health is not here. I guess he is recuperating from the Hyde Park speech he gave yesterday, in which he talked about agricultural problems all afternoon. I don't know what is wrong with the Minister of Agriculture; he should be the one to talk about agriculture. It is very strange that the Minister of Health should take over the agricultural department and when he is asked a very simple question about his own Department he can't answer it. I hope you fellows aren't in a hurry because I am going to be here for a while yet.

March 2, 1950

Now, we have the Department of Health here. You know this 'Humanity First' Government. They were preaching, yesterday, about hospitalization, and then the Minister of Health tried to tell this House that it was not free, but, you know it's a funny thing because all over the country you see big posters, "Free Hospitalization". I would like the Government to make up its mind whether or not this hospitalization is free, because the Minister, yesterday, said it wasn't free, and then they'll go out and they will try and put over the hoax with these signs "Free Hospitalization" – but that isn't what I started out to say. Last year, I told the House and I told the Premier in particular, because he was Minister then – he thought he could handle all these jobs, but he can't any more; I told him about an old man who had been brought thirty miles in the dead of winter and prosecuted for not paying his hospital tax.

Mr. A. G. Kuziak: — Fairy tale!

Mr. Deshaye: — You ask the Premier. He got the name later on – ask him if it's a fairy tale. I told the Premier about this case, last winter, and he assured me that these things were accidents, and they shouldn't happen, but it's funny that these strange accidents . . .

Premier Douglas: — I am sorry to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but I made no such statement that it was an accident. I gave my hon. friend the facts with reference to that case. I did not say it was an accident and it shouldn't happen.

Mr. Deshaye: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know, if it wasn't an accident, was it deliberate? Was it deliberate that they bring an old man over sixty years of age thirty miles in the dead of winter and prosecute him – do you say that was deliberate? Well, if that is what he wants to go on record, I hope the press takes it up and tells the people of this province that the Government does these things deliberately; they are not accidents. Well I don't know whether this one was deliberate or an accident but here is a man with a large family working on practically the minimum wage in Melville in a box factory and has his wages, which he needs so badly for the maintenance of his family, garnished by this 'Humanity First' Government – garnished to pay the hospital tax. This fellow comes running up to me, "Thank God, we have a representative in Melville that can at least bring these things to the attention of the Government!" So I wrote to the Premier, but he is pretty busy. I don't mind that. He is busy, and he turns this over to the Executive Director of the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan, and here is an admission by the Government that they have garnisheed a man that they should not have garnisheed for payment of the hospital tax. It says:

"The Premier has asked me to reply to your letter of August 26th written on behalf of . . . This gentleman has been interviewed by our field representative regarding his unpaid hospitalization tax on April 7th, 1948, and due to his poor circumstances no action was taken to collect the amount owing. On July 29, 1949, a representative again called on the family and at that time a recommendation was made to place a demand for \$15.00 on his

wages. The man owes an amount of \$33.00 for 1947; \$30.00 for 1948; and \$30.00 for 1949. When the demand was issued it was then thought that a small start could be made in having the account paid. We have today asked the employer of this gentleman to disregard our demand and our field representative has been instructed to take this up with the town of Melville with a view to having them pay the tax.”

There is Humanity First! A Government that sponsors Humanity First – a man that can barely keep his family alive is garnished by the Saskatchewan Government.

We heard the Minister of Natural Resources, the other day, talking about conservation. Here is a letter written to me from Montreal taken by a very reliable man and a very fine gentleman that I happened to meet on the train, you probably know him.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Was that the Rev. Mr. Waite?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, and this is very important: I would beg the indulgence of the press not to mention the name of that fifteen-year-old unmarried mother that was mentioned by the hon. member for Melville, this afternoon. That is contrary to The Child Welfare Act. We are humanitarian enough on this side of the House not to divulge that sort of information for cheap political purposes.

Mr. Deshaye: — That is pretty weak, very very weak, and I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, that this girl has been in my office so often that she is not afraid of publicity. Everybody knows the situation of her plight. The thing that she is worried about is to get something to maintain this child which that Government has failed to do; she is not afraid of a little bit of newspaper publicity, because she has a child that she is the mother of, and she is not ashamed of the child, but she and everybody else is ashamed of the conduct of this Government is not supplying her, after seven months, with something to keep that child in food and clothing and maintenance. That is the sin. The sin isn't publication of her name. She has accepted that. She made a mistake and she admits it. The thing is, is that child going to be deprived of sufficient nourishment so that it will group up and not be . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Again on a point of privilege: that girl is a minor; she is fifteen years of age. She was living with her parents before this thing happened, and she continued to live with them afterwards. There was also an affiliation order. I don't know the amount of that affiliation order, but it was certainly something that the father was required to pay.

Mr. Deshaye: — I will go on to this letter that I have received from the Anglican minister that the hon. Minister of Natural Resources knows, and in this letter he tells us about the north. I am sure that we will hear more of this from the members from the north, but I thought the House would

March 2, 1950

be interested in hearing what this man has to say, and it will give the Minister an opportunity to say whether or not the fur department operates this way. He says:

“The fur buyers usually have three grades of muskrats, but the Saskatchewan Government agency has eleven grades. How they get them no one knows. A strong complaint is that the grease burnt muskrats are tied all together in one bundle which creates rots on the adjoining rats. Private buyers are entitled to return these furs to the trapper who will clean them and save all of the furs.”

There is one thing that the Minister may be able to have corrected in his Department. Then worst of all – and I think this Anglican minister is inclined to be worried about this – he says, as a result of this setup of this Government, when the cheques come out at a certain time: “I told Mr. McIntosh that the Government had made the north a bootlegger’s paradise, because they know when the fur sales are judged and turn up when the cheques arrive and then they come from P.A. with all the liquor the Indians can buy.” Now, that apparently was not the setup before, and I say to the Minister, if he can do anything to correct that situation, it is his responsibility to do so. This minister also comments . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I wonder if the hon. member is objecting because those people are getting enough money now for their furs so that they have some to spend on liquor if they want – I am not in favour of it.

Mr. Deshaye: — The situation is this, if the hon. Minister will permit me to explain. Previously, when these chaps that caught the fur could sell them a few skins at a time as they caught them, they would buy groceries with them; but here they get one big cheque, they buy a few groceries and they spend the rest on liquor. If the Minister knows what Indians are like, he knows that is exactly what they would do. Then for the next six months, their children are starving. That is the situation and the way it works. The thing is wrong. When you are dealing with Indian people you have to give them dabbles of money to spend and not one big cheque at once. That is the situation, and I think the Minister knows it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I wonder if the hon. member knows that on these furs we make what is often said to be small advance payment, sometimes an interim payment, and sometimes a final payment. They don’t get it all at once, and I have heard my hon. friend speak about that. Now which way to they want it?

Mr. J. Benson (Last Mountain): — Mr. Waite told me the same story you are telling, personally.

Mr. Deshaye: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to get finished here before six o’clock, but with all these interruptions I am making a one-hour speech to about three; but I don’t mind, I have lots of time and lots more speech, too.

I think that even the Government is acknowledging the desperate plight of the farmers with regard to the coyote situation, and I certainly hope that the Government will do something in changing its policy with regard to lessening the coyote menace. The farmers in our district are becoming very alarmed about this coyote situation, and I know the other day, they had a special hunt. They tried to organize people from the towns to go out and kill these coyotes, and the thing is they could not get enough people out there organized and, although they say hundreds of coyotes, apparently they weren't able to get very many of them. I think they only got three, and this is what one chap writes about this:

“There is one thing I believe that should be done with regard to the coyote situation . . . If our Government doesn't do something about the coyotes soon, instead of talking about it, they will kill all our animals. I have lost three young heifers already.”

Now that is the situation about a man worried over his stock.

Hon. I. C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — It's the first time I ever heard of a coyote killing a heifer.

Mr. Deshaye: — I am sorry the Minister hasn't more knowledge of the situation of his Department than he displays here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to get down to a little more order here, and I want to make a few serious recommendations to the Government. I wish the Attorney General was in his seat, because I want to make some recommendations to him, and I think that it is too bad that he is not in his seat. I am not too concerned about the people of Moose Jaw, but I do think that, if he accepts a Cabinet position, he should be in this House so that he can hear the representations that are made to his Department by members from other constituencies. If he is in the building I wish that he would come to his seat, because these are important recommendations.

Here is a recommendation that I wish to make. A lot of farmers in this province have lost considerable money in buying these used cars in the cities. They have come in and bought a car which is represented to them to be clear, and when they get the car back home the first thing you know it's seized by some finance company, and it's sold before the statutory time for registration of a lien in this province and the first thing you know the man that sold the car isn't worth anything, isn't worth peanuts, and the company sizes the car. I admit the farmer maybe should have been a little more careful, but then we have farmers in this province who are not educated in the lines of business and they buy these automobiles and find that, after a few weeks, they don't own a car at all and are out the \$1,500 or \$2,000 that they have paid for this automobile. So I suggest to the Attorney General's Department and to this Government that they pass an amendment to one of the statutes, whether it be The Vehicles Act or any other statute that it will work in, that automobile dealers should be bonded to a certain extent to assure the people who buy automobiles from these secondhand dealers that they will not be paying for something that they haven't got, that they will not be

March 2, 1950

paying for a pig in a poke. I think that that is serious enough for this Government to take into consideration. It is not difficult to pass an amendment to one of the statutes that will cover that, and I think that should be done by the Government. That is a constructive piece of legislation that I recommend.

Hon. C. M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Does the hon. gentleman now suggest that we have The Vehicles Act amended to require compulsory bonding of these dealers?

Mr. Deshaye: — Anybody that deals with the public where the public is liable to be swindled out of money, or where there is danger of financial loss not necessarily intentional, then, I say, the public is entitled to be protected. That is my personal opinion, and I recommend to the Government that something be done along that line.

I also make this recommendation to the Attorney General's Department: I think that there should be some statute passed protecting an innocent farmer mostly, or anybody else that goes in and lists his farm with some of these real estate dealers in the city. We have a lot of real estate dealers and 99 per cent of them, I'd say, are honest men. But we also have the type that will go out and solicit sales, and have a man sign a contract of that type, a long contract, which the farmer or the man who wished to list his business or his farm for sale would not take the trouble to read. He may sign more than one of these, and then after he signs it he sells the property himself; but by this contract he is stuck for the commission to the real estate agent who has done nothing more than obtain the contract from him and file it away. After the man, through some other agent or himself, sells his farm or his piece of property, this real estate agent who obtained his signature can come back and say, "pay me my commission". Now in one year I have had two cases of this description brought to me. I think when that situation arises there is responsibility upon this Government to protect these innocent people who give these listings, and I suggest that the Government pass an amendment to one of the Acts that, if the sale has not been made by the party who took the listing, he is entitled to no commission. I know of the case where a man is stuck with \$1,200 commission. Now, I think those people deserve protection.

The other recommendation I want to make is that, whether or not we know it, the Justice of the Peace in this province are paid only for convictions. I say to this House that that is a medieval way of justice. After all, you have a man brought up in court before a Justice of the Peace. If he is acquitted the Justice of the Peace doesn't get a fee; if he is convicted the Justice of the Peace gets a fee. What assurance has a man that he is going to get a fair trial when that is the set-up. I know of two very interesting cases where the public were shocked by the judgments handed down by a Justice of the Peace. In both cases all the evidence was there to warrant the innocence of the men who were charged and who were found guilty. It is evident that the Justice of the Peace have a pecuniary interest in the result of trial he sits on, and I say to this Government that it is time that we get out of that backward step and see that the Justice of the Peace are paid regardless of whether they obtain a conviction or an acquittal,

because, when they have a pecuniary interest in the case, you cannot expect, in the majority of cases, a fair trial; especially when you have today appointed as Justice of the Peace old men for whom that is their only source of livelihood in many cases. They are naturally anxious for convictions, and I think that it is time that we brought this procedure up to date.

I just want to say one thing more; I feel that I should say it. We have heard a lot of remarks across the House of the confidence, or something like that, that we lack in our Leader. I want to assure this House that every member on this side of the House is solidly behind our Leader, and if the Government on the other side think they are going to undermine the Opposition by making those remarks – which are actually Communistic tactics, those things have gone on for years, that type of underground work; if they think that they are doing anything on this side by making us solidly behind our Leader, then they are badly mistaken.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — It's not the members on this side of the House making remarks, it's the 'Leader-Post'.

Mr. Deshaye: — I have heard two speakers already on that side of the House making these remarks that are not becoming to a Parliamentary form of this type, remarks that are absolutely out of order, and made about our Leader, that he thinks we lack confidence in him. I will tell those men that everyone on this side of the House is right behind our Leader, and don't you for one minute think that you are going to gain anything by that, because everybody here is growing more confident of his ability every day. As we get to know him better we realize his ability more and more every day, and the only thing is that you fellows must be afraid of him if you are going to make those remarks. We are happy that he is where he is, and we are going to be right behind him.

I will not support the motion.

Mr. Speaker (Hon. Tom Johnston): — In reply to what indirectly was an attack upon myself I am going to confine my remarks, and I may say very reluctantly, to the mention that was made of the episode that occurred in my constituency. The hon. member for Melville, if he had remained at home, might have been justified in dealing with things that he might have knowledge of; but I am absolutely satisfied that he has absolutely no knowledge of what happened in relation to the moving of the Metis of "Little Chicago" to any length. I myself was responsible for the initiating of that endeavour to take these Metis people, who were living in insanitary, overcrowded, and absolutely inadequate shacks on the road allowance to an environment that would give them an opportunity to become self-sustaining, and there was absolutely no coercion at all. In the first place, when this project was mooted by myself, they were very enthusiastic for it and, to make sure that they could never have the excuse they were sent somewhere that they knew nothing at all about, we did take a representative group of them, who were selected by the Metis themselves, to Green Lake. Unfortunately, I was taken very ill on that trip. I was with them and proceeded with them as far as Humboldt when I had to return to Regina, and as you know, was in hospital and had two serious operations. I have spoken to some of these Metis since, and those Metis that you could depend upon were satisfied that they did have an opportunity there; but many of them did not decide to take advantage of it, and there is very grave suspicions that certain inducements and certain financial help was given to them to leave Green Lake and return.

March 2, 1950

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — By the Liberals?

Mr. Speaker: — I am not saying who it was by. As to what happened at Green Lake, if the hon. member had come to someone who had the information, he would have got reports on the attitude and the behavior of everyone of them and they did not all return. Some of them are established there. Not many. But some of them are established there.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — How many families?

Mr. Speaker: — I could not tell you at the present time, and I'm not making any statements that I do not know whereof I speak. What did happen was this. The Metis were claiming that in the environment where they were, near Lestock, there was not any opportunity in securing even the start of a livelihood in the way of food. They said there were no rabbits left, no muskrats, and under the Indian Department they were prohibited from even getting fuel off the Indian Reserve alongside which they were located. In fact one of them was prosecuted and fined for taking some dead wood off the Indian Reserve. So they could not do that. They said there was no employment, and we all know there is not the same employment for that a class of people that there used to be because of the mechanization of farming. I hired many of them myself in past years. So they were quite willing, in fact quite anxious, and no one was transported to Green Lake, except on their own application.

Then I come to the question of destruction of the homes. The Municipality of Kilross had had the administration of the Metis' relief, and found it very unsatisfactory because they found that those Metis who were receiving considerable sums of money by direct relief supplied by this Government and by family allowances, were dissipating it and squandering it. As a matter of fact, I understand that there are some changes being made so that that public moneys can be controlled in the interests of the younger generation which the public are supposed to be looking after.

Many of those residences — call them residences if you like — were absolutely unfit for human habitation; many of them were absolutely insanitary; they were located on the road allowance. The council of the municipality, when the Metis had departed taking their belongings, decided that they would remove those obstructions from the road allowance, which they had the perfect right to do. It had absolutely nothing to do with the Social Welfare, and if the hon. member had gone and asked the council of the municipality, he would have got the correct information and would not have tried to create an impression that those people were very inhumanely treated. Anyone who knows anything about the Metis knows that you have some good ones, who don't make any problem; you have some who can be rehabilitated; you have others whom you might as well write off as a dead loss as far as becoming self-supporting is concerned, and who will be permanently on relief. The effort that was made at my instigation was to take these able-bodied Metis, put them into environments where they could start farming, where at a certain time they could get trapping leases, where they had fish at the back yard, where there was food that they could trap and, in the meantime, a guaranteed wage any time they wish to work. If they did not decide (as some of them did not and I am very, very sorry that they did not) to take that opportunity, who is to blame? Is it not those individuals themselves, or would the member say that it is the duty of a municipality or of a government to take care of able-bodied men by giving them relief, by supplying

them with money without work, or is it much preferable that you try to make them self-respecting citizens by giving them an opportunity to establish themselves in an environment that was not in the wilderness?

I was up to Green Lake before I mooted this project. There is a settlement there. They have a big Catholic church. These Metis, by the way, were of the Catholic faith. The settlement at Green Lake is practically all Catholic. They have a very fine Catholic church. They have a school there and a better opportunity for the educating of the young ones than where they were situated. They had the material there that they could use in an endeavor to build their homes. Some of them did start to build homes, but the hon. member for Melville, if he had had any experiences at all with these people, knows that there is absolutely no blame and no ground for the charge that he made. I myself feel that I was doing those individuals a service, and a service to the community, and I resent very much any other member of the Legislature, while I am sitting in the chair where I have not very much opportunity to reply (I am very sorry that I had to take this action), making charges that at least indirectly reflect upon myself.

Mr. A. T. Stone (Saskatoon): — Mr. Speaker, I hope that I will be able to interpolate a little into this debate. After listening to the hon. member from Melville, it would appear that he has a chip on his shoulder; that he is more intent on making political capital. I would suggest that he use his services as a Member of this House to bring some material aid to those cases that he has presented in this House. I represent a constituency of approximately 50,000 people. I am sure that I have more of these cases than the member of Melville, and I can assure him that I do not save them up and wait for a Session where I can bring them here to the House; I do something about them.

I want to add my few remarks and regrets at the passing of the two late members of this House. Those of us who are here since 1944, came to respect and appreciate the work that Mr. Murray did on this side of the House. I was also able to meet the late member from The Battlefords as I commuted between my home and Regina on the weekends, and I always found him a very agreeable, and a very admirable individual. I am sure his loss is greatly felt by the members on the other side.

I also want to congratulate all the new Members. Two of them have already made a great impression on this House, and after listening to the Member from Gull Lake (Hon. T. J. Bentley), yesterday, I hesitated upon taking part in this debate. However, I am here and I am going to do my best, Mr. Speaker.

I thought that the Mover and Seconder of this motion both made a very good job and were justified in bringing in the world's markets, as it affects all the economy of all the people of this province. I have heard speaker after speaker deploring the fact that everybody else has talked about Federal matters and they themselves have gone right into it. I am not making any apologies, and it is quite possible that I may touch on Federal matters. But I do believe they were justified, and I think that they would have been lax in their duties had they not interjected this most vital question to the economy of the people of this province, not only the farmers, people on the land themselves, but also the citizens in the urban districts. When the Federal Minister of Agriculture dropped that bombshell

March 2, 1950

in the House of Commons (and it was a bombshell), around December 7th I think, and when he admitted that most of the agriculture markets were lost, there was quite a depressed feeling amongst the people, the wage-earners in the cities. We have come to realize (it took us maybe some time) that our security depends on the ability of the farmers to produce and find markets for his produce. I say it took us some time as we had not given it a great deal of thought in years past. We thought when a depression came, unemployment and so on, it was just one of those things that had to happen. We have learned a lot since those days, and I feel that this is a very vital subject effecting the economy of all the people of this province.

Now I was kind of shocked, kind of upset, that the Liberal Party should go back and receive such a majority, last spring, to the Federal House; but I am rather pleased that they are down there and they have to accept this responsibility. They knew, without a doubt, that the markets were gone before they went to the people at the last election. All the C.C.F. members told the people that they were gone, despite the fact that the Liberals and the Minister of Agriculture were denying that fact. They knew it at that time, and I am glad now that they have the responsibility in their lap. As the member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley said, yesterday, the Minister of Agriculture is a pretty smart man. He's pretty crafty; he is a pretty smart politician; there isn't any doubt about it. I doubt very much, although it is a matter of opinion, that he will wiggle out of this; if he does then he surely is a very astute politician.

I was also rather amused at the few words that the Member from Moosomin said about the "grass root" movement. That isn't the way I heard it, because in my constituency we, my fellow member and I, have to stack up against a compromise between these two old parties. It was a very fine thing; it worked out good. It was an admission from these two old parties to many thousands of solid citizens in my constituency, that there was no fundamental, basic difference between them, that this fussing and feuding that has been going on for years was just a sham battle, and our party won a great many solid citizens at the last election. I know, because I have tried for a long while to convince those people that they ought to support us. They believed in what we did, were pleased with some of the things – with hospitalization, and what we did to help the unfortunate people. They always remarked how well we had done, and yet, because their grandfather and their father and the whole family tradition was either Conservative or Liberal, they felt bound to get behind the 'old school tie'. I am very glad to get those people. They are very difficult; they are very stubborn; but now that they are won over, they will be just as hard to get back to the other side.

I feel a little hurt by the expressions made by the member from Redberry. He may have some aspirations about the British people. He took great delight in pointing out that their rations were very meager and I was rather impressed by a letter we all received, yesterday, and I would quote the words of the Rev. Frank H. Morgan, who said in a radio speech, recently:

“We owe our liberty and perhaps our lives to the people of Britain, and we have a moral obligation, not to give them charity, but to pay a portion of our debt to them. It is not the voice of Britain that appeals, it is the voice of honour.”

I do not think the member from Redberry realized that this great little island pledged all its financial resources, gave all its overseas investments, went into bankruptcy, to fight that very devastating war. I do not think the Member from Redberry realizes either that, if there was not a Socialist Government in Britain, the people would not be given an egg and a half a week, because there would be just a few people given all the available eggs and the great masses would be getting none.

The Opposition have been quite cocky this Session and I think they have every reason to be so, and very often we hear that the C.C.F. need 'one more push and out they go; that'll be the end of the C.C.F.'

The Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party feels now is an opportune time to revive the Progressive Conservative Party, and he often feels that the C.C.F. is on its way out. I cannot understand intelligent men speaking along those lines because in every reverse that the Democratic Socialists have had (and we have had several in the last two or three years), we have always maintained that solid block of votes. We have, in some cases, increased our popular vote and as long as we have the problem before us, the problem of distribution, we will always have Democratic Socialists here and, as the question of the distribution becomes more aggravated, the tide of the Democratic Socialists will rise.

I was rather impressed, in December, when the director of Food and Agriculture Organization admitted rather dejectedly that, in spite of hiring all the world's best economists, statisticians and research workers, there was no known way of getting the surplus foods from this side of the ocean over to the people on the other side who needed those foods. We found that out in the hungry 'thirties. We had stores, granaries, wholesale houses full to the roof, but yet there was no method under this economy to get those foods out to the people who needed them. As long as we have those conditions, as long as we have that condition of distribution, you people on the other side need not worry about the fate of the C.C.F. or the Democratic Socialists.

I sometimes think that the Opposition should take stock themselves because it seems to me that about all they have done since 1944 is to go around this province trying to irritate people, trying to scare people, with their 'Tucker and Tyranny' and their 'Socialists' and 'Communist'. I am always glad when they come into my constituency with that kind of tripe because all they manage to do is insult the intelligent electors in my constituency and make them a little more mad. I feel they should take stock because as yet we don't know what their policy is. We have never heard it in this House, and I don't think we have heard it out in the province. We do not know what they would do if they were suddenly put on this side of the House. As the Member for Moosomin says, he stands for nothing: for doing away with Socialism; for a negative policy.

In my constituency, of course, there was a big vote came out to vote against the Socialists and I am glad to see they came out. I think we should take credit for that. The C.C.F. should take credit for thousands of people who, for the first time in their lives, took the privilege of coming out and voting even though they did vote on a negative issue. I feel that, sooner or later, those people will take some interest in the affairs of Government and will want to do something more than vote on a negative issue. It is quite true that a few years ago the Liberals did have

March 2, 1950

a convention. They brought up a very high-falutin' platform. Since that time, and the records of the House prove it, in the House they have spoken against every one of those resolutions that they drew up there in Saskatoon. "The will of the people speaks," they said.

I want also to take a little time to mention some remarks in the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. He seemed to get a great deal of satisfaction out of the caustic criticism of Chief Justice Brown to our Labour Relations Board. No doubt Chief Justice Brown is in an exalted position. Being in that position his remarks must be respected, and I could understand that the Leader of the Opposition would get some satisfaction from that statement. But I can assure him that there are lots of workers who do not agree with the opinion expressed by Chief Justice Brown, and it only substantiates the ear of the workers, not only in this province, but all across Canada, that our judicial courts do not understand labour-management troubles. We find that particularly true in Saskatchewan. I think Saskatchewan possibly has the worst case, in our judicial courts, in the understanding of labour-management disputes. It just seems that you can't win.

At that convention in Saskatoon, of course, they had a 'new deal' for labour; they had a labour code. They had a 40-hour work week, I think, and holidays with pay and so on, and yet our records show, and we can go back to the Journals, that they voted and did everything they could to stop the passing of those Bills in this House.

In the 1948 election, we were able to increase our popular vote from 48 per cent in 1944 to 52 per cent in 1948. There must be a reason for that. I am very pleased that I come from a city like Saskatoon; we have a very informed electorate in Saskatoon. Some of the reasons are, of course, in this urban centre, the welfare of the wage-earner has improved considerably since this Government has come into office. The Trade Union Act means a great deal to them. It means security to them, not only to the organized workers, but to the unorganized workers, because the unorganized worker realizes that any time that he so desires he has the unqualified opportunity of becoming organized in any association of his own choosing. We find, today, many employers (we have some in our own city), who are paying better wages, and better conditions than like industries where there is an organization, and they are doing that so that their workers won't become 'ornery'. The position of our unorganized workers under The Minimum Wage Act has greatly improved, and the enforcement of that Act has certainly very much improved since this Government has come into office; certainly the two weeks' holiday pay is appreciated also by our workers.

Much has been said about old age pensions. It is surprising to me that some of these complaints should be brought here, for instance, the complaints about the establishment of the age; because it seems that some of the members of this House do not know where the jurisdiction of the Provincial Government ends and where the Federal Government's responsibility begins. I think the former Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Valleary), went a long way in making recommendations and was successful in getting them through to ease and make more speedy the age qualifications for old age pensions. I have a suggestion to make to those members that are having difficulties. I have some, too. I have a group of Chinamen and if you have trouble you ought to try and establish the age of some of these Chinamen

who come here; they migrate under one name and change their name after they get here. So I have those difficulties, too; but I suggest that you should refer those complaints to the proper place down in Ottawa. While you are doing that I would suggest, too, that the Federal Government remove the means test, at least for people over seventy years of age. Surely in this day and age we can afford to do that for the old people! I know it is going to come, but I know it won't come until the Liberal Government go back to the people for the next election. I know one man who should get the credit for that, and that is Stanley Knowles of Winnipeg. He has been the champion for the old age pensioners in Ottawa. I know he won't get the credit, but I don't think that worries him as long as our old people do get that means test removed.

We heard from the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), who is not in the House at the moment. He was complaining about what the Government has done for old age pensioners. Well, this Government is doing what we promised to do: we are giving our share – \$12.50 of the \$50 a month pension, and it is almost time that the Federal Government came through with their promise of a \$50 a month pension. What, I think, pleases our old age pensioners more than anything (and we have plenty of them in Saskatoon), is this free medical card. I could not express here what has been said to me on many occasions by these old age pensioners. It means a great security to those old people, and I have many other pensioners who were drawing a meager pension, perhaps from railroads or other sources, who would gladly like to get on old age pension. Of course we have plenty of mothers who also received this card, that is mothers on allowance, and, of course, blind pensioners. Now that means a great deal to our municipality. It is hard to measure in dollars and cents, but it means a lot to our municipality because then these unfortunate people got sick in the past somebody had to pay that bill and most certainly it had to be the municipality. We don't always get credit, unfortunately, for those things; it is not often they are mentioned. The hospitalization is, of course, very much appreciated, and our people are hoping for the day when we can expand and go farther in that line. They realize the difficulties of the economy of this province, but they know if the benefits are ever to be extended that will be done by a C.C. F. Government.

The Bus Transportation is receiving a lot of interest from our people, too,. We have a really attractive bus depot in Saskatoon, and our buses come in and out and a great interest is shown in our Transportation Company. I looked in at our power house, the other day. An addition is being made to it, and I was wondering just where they would go next, as I am sure they will have to add to that power house again in the very near future when our boys get going.

We are also very anxious to get a good road between Saskatoon, Moose Jaw, and Regina, and we feel satisfied that No. 11 must be the route. We think that we will get that in the very near future – we hope. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to make some mention of a part of the Throne Speech which deals with The Correction Act. I think this is something that is needed in this day and age. We know that, just after the first Great War a great many social problems arose. That has increased tenfold, I would imagine, since this last Great War. I noticed in the 'Saturday Evening Post' that the United States of America are becoming really alarmed at the increased

March 2, 1950

divorces and separations of families, no researches are being made down there, and new experiments are being made, to try and do something to stop the trend of family separations. I think our Government should be commended for meeting this situation. It seems some people feel that perhaps a Government should keep out of this particular line of work. They feel that this work could be done better by local and voluntary organizations, and so forth. I think that our Government realized that a lot of good work can be done by those organizations, and I think they will be encouraged to do all they can, because those people are right on the scene and they know the circumstances and do a very good job. The situation seems to be mounting. We have come to the position where these voluntary organizations sometimes cannot take care of some of these cases, and then there is need for the Government to do something, and I am glad to see this Act coming in this Session. I hope it won't be too rigid. I hope it will be elastic so that our administration can meet the rising problems from day to day.

I am rather sorry sometimes, when I hear remarks from the other side about the civil servants. I was very sorry, today, to hear the remark about the Social Welfare workers. I think that these field officers do a wonderful job. There is no forty-hour week for those people; there is no overtime for them, and they put in an awful lot of time. I know sometimes they are often stuck out on the roads (opposite sex, too) when they ought to be at home for the weekend. I can assure the member from Melville that, although I have never asked many of these people their political affiliations, I don't care what they are as long as they are doing a good job. That is all that interests me. As far as the office in Saskatoon is concerned, I am pretty sure that only five per cent of them would be supporters of this Government; but I do think some mention should be made of these people. They are terribly overworked; they do a real good job, and I want to say that I think these workers should be excluded when remarks are being made about the civil servants.

Mr. Speaker, another matter which appears in the Throne Speech is the one about rentals control which, of course, has a great bearing in my constituency. I think we all realize that rental control, has not been very adequately handled in the past. I don't think the situation should ever have got to the point where it is today and, I think, as the Minister of Health said, yesterday, that if the Dominion Government had left the controls on building supplies and materials so that at least our boys, when they came back, could have got a decent home at a reasonable price, much of this rental condition today would not have come about. I shudder sometimes when I hear of workers who build or buy houses at seven, eight, or nine thousand dollars, because I realize that no wage-earner can possibly hope to pay that kind of money without meeting disaster, and I expect any day now that they will not only lose their homes but also lose their equity in those homes. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that going into rental control is possibly a bad situation. There is no doubt about it, we have a job to do here and I don't think we could do anything else but go into rental control at this time. I am satisfied that there are lots of landlords who are not getting a fair return for their investment, but at the same time I don't think we could have allowed this twenty and twenty-five per cent increase indiscriminately all across the Board, because of the effect it would have had on so many lower-paid workers. I am glad to see that our Government has taken this step. We could, from a political point of view, I guess, do like the Liberals used to do – just sit here and do nothing; but I am glad that

we have made a stand on this, and I hope we do the very best job we can and continue on as we have done for the welfare of the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Mr. J. W. Horsman (Wilkie): — I have a pamphlet here. It is a very nice little pamphlet, and I am not criticizing the scheme either; I am just mentioning it. It shows a prospector reclining on a magic carpet and being whisked into the north country so comfortably and easy and everything, and I wondered if, by some magical means, we had been placed on one of these magic carpets and all transferred to Ottawa; but anyway I kind of woke up and realized where I was. I cannot say I blame the hon. gentlemen for wandering away from their own province sometimes and speaking of Federal and world-wide matters and affairs because, when you come to size up the Throne Speech, there was not an awful lot to it. I imagine the hon. gentlemen, to have anything to say at all, pretty nearly had to get somewhere away from that speech, because anything of importance or anything new it seemed to me, was pretty well conspicuous by its absence.

However, I want to congratulate the Mover and Seconder of the Motion on the very masterly addresses which they made. The hon. member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Wellbelove), confined his remarks principally to Federal matters, chiefly in condemnation of Federal Government in connection with their policy, of marketing farm products, but, of course, we have heard that same argument a good many times. We heard it expressed very much in The Battlefords by-election.

In speaking of Federal matters though, there is one thing that the hon. gentlemen forgot to mention and that was the Federal election, last summer. Now we had a Federal election, last summer. I may say that the hon. gentleman from Kerrobert-Kindersley and I are neighbours out there. Our farms don't join, but our constituencies do, and the Federal constituency of Kindersley takes in both of our constituencies — all of mine expect one row of townships, and all of Kerrobert-Kindersley. So we were interested in the same election, and I may say that we nominated a young man out there, known very well I am sure to the hon. gentleman from Kerrobert — a neighbour of his, I believe, who does not live very far from my hon. friend's place. I really thought he would make some mention of that here. I am sure he is proud of the representative of his constituency in the House of Commons now. We nominated this young man, and we put him up against one of the strongest men that the C.C.F. have in Canada (I don't think anyone will dispute that), Frank Jaenicke. I know him very well, and he is a man who is respected for his honesty, integrity and everything, a man with wide public experience, a good speaker on the public platform. I say he was a hard man to beat, but our boy took him out with a fair majority. We were rather proud of it and that is why I mention it. I took some small part in the election, though not very much, and I did not see the hon. gentleman from Kerrobert-Kindersley taking any part, but I suppose he did down in his own country — I didn't see him up in my part of the constituency, but I was down in his part once or twice. I did not do much down there. I just went to see what the country was like, but I am quite sure that even he is proud of the man that we elected, and if he sees him anywhere in a crowd he will be proud to point him out and say "See that young fellow over there! That is our representative in the House of Commons at Ottawa."

March 2, 1950

As I said, we have heard a lot about marketing. I am not going into this very deeply at all, but I don't see any danger in the immediate future, at least, of the farmers of this country dying of starvation. I know that the demand for some of our farm products is not quite as good as it was but basic farm products are selling all right yet at a fair price. The prices for hogs have slipped some. There is another thing, too. I heard the price of hogs and cheese and eggs mentioned here. There is one product, a very important one, that I have not heard mentioned and that is the price of beef cattle. There is an all-time high for beef cattle, I think, in this country, and when we average the price of bacon and hogs and the price of beef together, I think we will find that we are getting a really good price in this country for meat. When a farmer can trot out (and most farmers do have a steer or two to sell at some time in the year) any kind of a steer almost (they don't have to be a topnotcher at all) and get anywhere from two to three hundred dollars for it I think, Mr. Speaker, that as long as a farmer can do that, that alone should keep the wolf away from the door for a while at least.

There is another product, of course, that has dropped very much in price since we were here, last winter, and that is butter. I think everyone in this House knows what affected the price of butter and cream in this province. It was introduction and sale of a cheap substitute which was put on the market here, last winter, and is sold over every counter in this province – margarine. When the Bill was up in this House, there was an amendment against it. We wanted the matter held up until the law was clarified in connection with whose authority it was to control that product. I remember that there was an hon. gentleman on that side of the House, the member from Last Mountain (Mr. Benson), who spoke in that debate and he said that, if anything like that was done to labour, anything to break the wages down like that, it would be considered an unfair labour practice. It went on and, of course, butter went down in price and I do not think it becomes people very much, when they do a thing like that here to the dairy farmer, to criticize so severely men who are trying to do something to find markets if there are markets available for the products of the farms of this country.

I don't think, as I said, that things have gone to the dogs altogether. I don't think so; and I don't think we should prophesy disaster until something does happen. It is all right to look ahead and plan ahead. I think that should be done; but I don't think we should howl all the time about something that might never happen at all. I am glad to find, though, that many members on the Government side of this House are just as great magicians as they ever were. I noticed, at least, that they never have any trouble in making a mountain out of a molehill. Of course they have not very much to blow about themselves, so they have to direct public attention to some other direction.

Now the hon. member from Kerrobert-Kindersley among other things spoke of the threat of Communism in China, and he said that if we fed the Chinese people in the past we might have done a lot to stop the advance of Communism in that country. That may have a lot of truth in it; but it is a physical impossibility. I don't see how it could be done. We might have done something for the Chinese if we had let the British people and some of the other people in Western Europe go without food. He said the Chinese love starvation less than they love Communism. I suppose that is true. Starvation is a pretty tough thing, and that is a very lovely phrase, Mr. Speaker. I would like to congratulate the hon. gentleman

on constructing such a lovely phrase. It sounds almost like something you would read in Shakespeare. As a matter of fact it may be a parody on a certain quotation from Julius Caesar. When Brutus was speaking to the Romans after they had murdered Caesar, and trying to tell the people that they had done it for the good of Rome, he said, “not that I love Caesar less, but that I love Rome more.” I think people would recognize the impossibility of a nation of 13,000,000 people starting out to feed the teeming millions of China. It would be a physical impossibility, unless, as I say, we did it at the expense of Britain and other countries in western Europe.

There is one thing the hon. gentleman did not mention, and I notice that runs right through the whole bunch over there. Pretty near every man who spoke about the spread of Communism in China took the same line – that food and care could have halted Communism in that country. No hon. member on that side of the House has ever mentioned the fact that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics might have had anything to do with the spread of Communism in China. It is a well-known fact, Mr. Speaker, that the aid given to the Chinese Communists by the Russians is the one thing that kept them going and made it possible for them to spread Communism in that country.

I am willing to admit that I myself believe that the Chiang Kai Shek government may have been a corrupt government, but, at the same time, it was the established government of that country and we do not believe in overthrowing constituted authority by force. I did not hear the hon. gentleman give any credit to the United States or Canada for what measure of recovery they have in Great Britain or the other European countries. I did not hear that mentioned, although the hon. gentleman did speak of Britain, and say something about British agriculture. Of course, British agriculture is entirely different from Canadian agriculture, because they are not an exporting country.

The hon. gentleman who seconded the motion for the Address-in-Reply (Mr. Buchanan) made a very fine speech. I will admit that it was eloquent, and delivered in a very masterly manner. He spoke about world affairs and Federal affairs, and condemned American ‘Imperialism’ and all things of that nature. He spoke about the ‘A’ bomb and the ‘H’ bomb and the spread of Communism in China – but he never mentioned that Russia might have had anything to do with the spread of Communism in China. I think it is a fact that everyone knows, and I cannot understand, when the hon. gentlemen are speaking about Communism in China, why they fail to mention that very important fact.

Now, I know, and I think everyone is willing to admit, that the capitalist system as we know it is not perfect; but I believe that it is the best system that we have had up to this present time. And when a man stands up in this House, like the hon. member from Notukeu-Willow Bunch and condemns American Imperialism, yet never has a word of condemnation or criticism against Russia, never blames them for the spread of Communism across the world, I think it is a very extraordinary thing. I think that, if you are going to talk about Communism, you should say something about Communism, you should say something about Communism in Europe. We know that the ‘Iron Curtain’ now is spread halfway across the European continent. About half the population of Europe are behind the Iron Curtain, not because they wanted to be there, but because Russia just spread her influence that far and there is no way of getting her out of there

March 2, 1950

now. She is there to stay unless she is driven out by armed force; there is no other way.

We speak about the United States. I wonder if the gentleman ever thinks just how fortunate we are here in Canada to have right across an imaginary line, a great, powerful friendly nation like the United States! I wonder how long we would last here, if Russia was across the other side of that border! When we think of aggression in this country, if we ever do (and we are beginning to think about it now), we never think of it as any possibility of aggression from the South. Those people there are the same kind of people that we are. They speak the same language; their habits and ideals are the same. We can go across that border any time, and we are just as much at home there as we are here. Those people can come up here, and we try to attract them to this country. That is why that fine blacktop road was built down to the border, which runs through the Weyburn constituency; I believe that the main purpose of the road was to allow American tourists to get up to this country. But we never think of aggression from that direction. I might remind the hon. gentleman that there is a military exercise going on now, "Sweetbriar" up in the Yukon, training men and trying out machines under our conditions, so that if there is any threat of aggression, we do not fear it from the South. I think that Canada and the United States, Mr. Speaker, give to the world, the greatest example of international goodwill and friendship of any two nations anywhere in the world. We have three thousand miles of boundary, touching all the way across this great continent, and there is not a fortress on that boundary; there are not any armed soldiers or anything else, and, as I say, we can cross and recross at will. I think it is a great example to other nations. If we can live in peace and friendship with the United States, why can't we do the same with other nations? Why can't other nations get along like that? Yet, they are condemned for their American 'Imperialism'. Had it not been for United States' dollars and help from Canada, what would Great Britain have done in this emergency since the war? I never heard one hon. gentleman on that side of the House give Canada or the United States any credit for British recovery. Sir Stafford Cripps was over here late last year to Canada and the United States and he said that Britain's recovery was due principally to help from Canada and the United States. He said Canada's participation had been between six and seven billion dollars. For a country of 13 million of 14 million people, it gave the greatest per capita help of any country in the world. And we are a capitalist country, and we were helping a country that had a Socialist Government. They did not stop because the Government of Britain was Socialist. There was nothing of that nature. They wanted to help Britain. We knew that the help was coming to her, and we did what we could to help.

I have one thing in common with the hon. gentleman from Notukeu-Willow Bunch and that is when he said he had a lot of bad roads down there and he would like to have some money spent on roads. I can certainly back him up there, because I am in the same unhappy position. We have not had a dollar spent on roads up there for such a long time back that I cannot remember how long it was; that is, any new roads or anything of that nature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier made a speech in this House too, the highlight of the Session, I might say, as far as the Government side of the House went anyway. A very eloquent, masterly address. He said something about the Atlantic Pact, and I do not know ether he admitted it or not that, insofar as the C.C.F. are concerned, they are not very much behind

that pact. But he said this: "Military pacts may be necessary to check the advance of Communism"; may be. I do not think I quoted him wrong. He did not say that military pacts are necessary to check the advance of Communism. Now we have other great Socialist leaders in the world who do not believe that. We have Premier Attles of Britain; Ernest Bevin, Sir Herbert Morrison, and all those great leaders in Britain – they are right behind the Atlantic Pact. They know they have to be. I might say that the idea first came from Winston Churchill that they should establish a United States of Europe, and this was the outgrowth of that plan. I am sure that British Socialists back it as strongly as anyone else. The Premier said the same thing about China. He said that if the Chinese had been fed and looked after it would have checked the spread of Communism. I say I agree with that; but I don't see why he did not mention that Russia had something to do with that too. I do not think there is a man in this House but feels sympathetic towards the starving people of any country. I think we all do. I think it is time those backward nations over there did something for themselves or tried to help themselves, and I do not blame the people of China for going Communist. They could not be any worse off than they were; but it is just like a drowning man grasping at a straw. He might know that the straw won't do him any good, but you can't blame him for grasping at it, because nothing else is in sight.

The Premier went on to speak about the oil development in this province, how that so much of the province is under lease after the coming in of American and Canadian men who had the money – these terrible capitalists that we hear denounced every day; this system that they say is an outworn system, system of a different age. But these are the men that he claims are putting money into this development. He said that we have given these people every assurance that they can invest their money here in Saskatchewan and that their holdings will be protected. Well, that is a long way from the position as it used to be. If I remember correctly, oil was one of the main things that the C.C.F. thought should be socialized, and the Premier stated that a C.C.F. convention would follow him on this platform. Well, I hope that is true, because, if it is true, it is such a departure from former C.C.F. policy, that all I have to say is that, if that is the case, Socialism is a dead issue in this province. I might say, from Hamlet, "It is a consummation devoutly to be wished." But then, just after making that statement, Mr. Speaker, the Premier read the Regina Manifesto and he read these words: "No. C.C.F. government will rest until they have eradicated Capitalism." A moment before, he said, "capitalists are safe in Saskatchewan," "we will never take their holdings, "we will never touch them," "their investments are safe;" in the next breath, "we are going to eradicate Capitalism." What sort of reasoning is that, Mr. Speaker?

Perhaps he read the other paragraph, too, from the Regina Manifesto, that all natural resources and everything should be owned, controlled and operated by the people. Well, when you say that all the principal means of production should be owned, controlled and operated by the people, we in Saskatchewan know pretty well, I think, what the principal means of production is here. We only have one principal means of production, and over 80 per cent of our revenue comes from the land. I do not see anything funny about that. It seems to me that people that own land should think this over very carefully, and I have no complaint to offer to a Socialist as long as he is a Socialist, if he believes in Socialism and that is what he wants. If he is willing to have that applied to himself and to his own business, why should you criticize the Socialist? But when a farmer or a business man would like to see everything socialized except their own

March 2, 1950

particular business, I think it is a very unfair attitude to try to force a system on somebody else that you are not willing to accept yourself. That seems to be the unfair part of it.

I think it was the hon. member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) that said that Capitalism is a social order of the past. He said "Socialism is on the march." Well, I believe that. I believe Socialism is on the march in Saskatchewan, but it is marching in a different direction from what it did in 1944. I do not think there is any doubt about that. He said that if there had been a capitalist government in Britain there would have been chaos there long ago. And yet I just read what Sir Stafford Cripps said about Britain – that it was the help of American money and Canadian money that was the main thing in regard to their recovery over there. It seems to be a strange thing that these terrible capitalist countries like Canada and the United States should put their money and their resources and everything into Europe, into Britain! They will never get the money back. They know that; but they do it and they helped to shore up the broken structure of the wartorn countries of Europe. If they are a bad bunch according to Socialists, why would they do this? This gentleman made no reference to Russia either, when he spoke about Communism in China. No reference whatsoever.

Now, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) is a neighbour of mine, too. His constituency joins mine on the north. I am surrounded there, all the way around there, by C.C.F. constituencies. He said that the Liberals instilled fear into the hearts of prospective investors in this province. That is an idea. We are a capitalist bunch over here, or supposed to be, so why should we instill fear into the hearts of our own friends? Then, of course, he had a lot to say about the price of wheat. He did not say very much though about his own Department; he spoke mostly about other matters. Then he went away back into the 'thirties and talked about the price of wheat from there down to the time of the war. The worst depression, of course that the world has ever seen was during the 'thirties. It was not a depression or a hard time confined to this country, but it was world-wide and, of course, he blamed the Liberal Government of the day for all our troubles in those years, for world-wide conditions. No one country could have remedied them. The depression was less severe here than it was any other place in the world, too.

He talked about the drop in the hog population. That is very true; but it is not hard to see why the hog population dropped. We used to raise a lot of hogs up in my part of the country and then we quit it, and the reason for this was because coarse grains went up to a good price. You could get a good price for your grain without feeding it to your hogs, and help was so scarce and wages were so high that it did not pay to raise them. That is why most people in Saskatchewan ran out on hogs.

He spoke about the contract for bacon and cheese at the expense of the wheat contract. Very true. I think that was the right thing to do in that respect. Britain only had so much money to spend here on foodstuffs, and she wanted wheat alone; but she was persuaded to take a little less wheat and buy a certain amount of cheese and bacon. I do not think it would have been right for wheat farmers to have tried to hog the whole thing, and not let the other fellows in on it at all.

The Minister spoke of the high cost of building material, and said that was one of the reasons for the shortage of houses. That may

be true; but what struck me was whether or not the C.C.F. Timber Board had anything to do with that. They controlled all the output of Saskatchewan timber and they have a brick plant down here at Estevan making bricks. That is another building material. He spoke about highway construction in his own constituency. He might well speak about that highway he has up there. I have been up through that constituency and I know it pretty well. He has a lovely road there which goes all the way through the constituency; hundred-foot road allowance, great wide, sloping ditches and all graveled. Oh, it is a lovely road! He should be satisfied with that road.

The Minister made one very remarkable statement, Mr. Speaker. He said that if anyone makes a profit, someone has to take a loss. After being so sympathetic that the farmers were going to lose money on their grain, he turned around and said that if you make profit, someone has to take a loss. You know, my hon. friend has a very nice little ranch up there; at least he used to have, and I believe he has it yet. I was told that he had some very nice cattle there, and I know he used to have a bunch of black cattle. So I suppose that, when a buyer comes along and wants to buy a steer, he leads out one of those nice black steers and the buyer says, "I'll give you \$300 for that steer," he would say "Oh, I can't take that. I would be making a profit, and somebody else would lose money!"

There were a good many things I would like to have heard the hon. gentleman say about his own Department, which he did not say. There was one thing I was particularly interested in. I thought he might tell us whether they had all that toad flax eradicated up there in Cutknife and through his part of the country, as I understand that the country is very badly infested up around there. We do not want it to get down in our part.

Another gentleman spoke, yesterday afternoon, the hon. member from Gull Lake (Hon. T. J. Bentley). I was rather amazed at the speech he made because, for one thing, he was a great champion for the Minister of Agriculture and when you hear the Minister of Agriculture get up in this House and speak, you would not believe that he would need another Cabinet Minister to back him up. He is very capable of doing that himself. However, I would say that the hon. Minister of Public Health made a pretty good job. He told us all about everything in the southwest part of the province, all the money that had been spent on roads and bridges down there and everything of that sort; all the money that had been spent on dugouts and irrigation ditches and the planning of land for irrigation and everything of that nature. Well, I was amazed that he would have such a great knowledge of not only one other department besides his own, but two. He was a spokesman for two other Cabinet Ministers. Really, it is amazing that a man can come into this House, Mr. Speaker, and only be here about two months and seems to have such a great knowledge of three or four different Departments in the government. I think he should be highly commended. It just occurred to me, too, as I was listening to him, that you might have heard that poem about the village school teacher: "They wondered still and still the wonder grew, how one small head could hold all he knew."

We had another speaker here, this evening, just before we quit, the hon. member from Saskatoon (Mr. Stone). He did not have very much to say, but he made some very nice remarks. He spoke about the condition of workers, how secure they were in Saskatchewan and everything like that; wages were good. No one likes to see men get good wages any better

March 2, 1950

than I do. I have every sympathy for the working man; but it seems to me, when you see the young men leaving Saskatchewan and going to other provinces, it must indicate that they have some security as well in those other provinces. They go to Alberta; I know my own sons are almost all in British Columbia. I have only one boy at home; all the rest are out there and things must be more attractive there than they are here or they would have stayed here. He also said that, in the election last summer, or in 1948, he talked about all the people who came out to vote who did not usually come out to vote; they came out to vote against the C.C.F. However, there was not enough came out to defeat the C.C.F. You know, we had a condition something like that in my constituency when I ran up there. An awful lot of people came out to vote against the C.C.F., but there were so many of them came out that they defeated the C.C.F. there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have very much more to say. I do not need to remind the members of this House where I came from – that I am the member from Wilkie and I am very proud to represent that country. It is a very good constituency; there are very good people out there, and we have certain developments there that we are rather proud of, too. I will probably have more to say about that as I address this House again this Session.

From my remarks, Mr. Speaker, you would probably gather that I will oppose the motion.

Mr. W. S. Thair (Lumsden): — I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.