

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Eleventh Legislature
12th Day

Friday, March 3, 1950.

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

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. J. T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, I want to raise a point of privilege regarding a statement of the hon. member from Melville, yesterday. The statement of yesterday just came out in the press this morning, and it said that while I was in my office I had refused to see the member for Melville, or my secretary had refused to come in to see me. I want to say that at the time he called at my office, on one occasion I understand that I was out; on the second occasion I was in my office and I was engaged; I had another party in the office with me. That is easily answered. The thing that I take objection to, a thing which I think is a very small and rather mean, is that he should leave the inference that a civil servant had been discourteous to him. As a matter of fact I find that she had gone out of her way to accommodate him, had taken the petition which he had, wanted to know whether or not he wanted an answer from me or whether he would answer himself. That is what I find is the rule not only with my secretary but all members of the staff, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is most unfair and very small and very mean when a member will rise in this Chamber and cast aspersions on members of the staff who are unable to defend themselves in this House.

Mr. V. P. Deshaye (Melville): — Surely, Mr. Speaker, I have an opportunity of replying to the hon. Minister of Highway's insinuations which are absolutely untrue. Surely I have that privilege and I rise on a point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: — The Hon. Minister was acting on a point of privilege to give information in regard to a direct charge that you made in this Chamber. We cannot allow a debate on it.

Mr. Deshaye: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that the inference the hon. Minister has left in this House is absolutely wrong and I believe, if he checks the record, he will see that I did not impute any discourtesy on the part of his secretary. The record is clear on that. I said that I had gone to his office and that his secretary said that he was busy. I asked her if there was anyone in there, and she said there was not, but that he could not see anyone. Now that is all the inference that I made, and I ask the Minister of Highways to withdraw the remarks that he has made in this House because they are untrue.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member knows that under the rules of this House you cannot charge any member with telling an untruth, a direct untruth. I will ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement.

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Thursday, March 2, 1950, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Wellbelove for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

March 3, 1950

Mr. W. S. Thair (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, in opening my remarks I should first like to extend congratulations to the hon. member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Wellbelove) as well as the hon. member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Buchanan), who so ably moved and seconded the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I would also extend congratulations to the newly-elected member for Gull Lake, Mr. Tom Bentley, the Minister of Health, the new representative for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy), and also the new representative for The Battlefords (Mr. Maher).

I regret indeed the passing of the late Mr. Paul Prince, the former member for The Battlefords, whom I always found to be a friendly and courteous gentleman. The passing of my former deskmate in this Legislature, Mr. Alvin Murray, is, because of my close association with him in the past six years, a particular loss to me.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, whether I am on the radio or not, I would like to bring greetings to all my friends and fellow-citizens in the Lumsden constituency whom I have the honour to represent. It continues to be my honest desire to serve everyone, regardless of their political affiliations.

Mr. Speaker, in this year 1950, having reached the middle of the twentieth century, we might well pause and take stock of our material progress in the field of science as well as our moral and spiritual resources. The beginning of this century was hailed as the dawning of a new day in human history and, taking everything into consideration, the first half of the twentieth century has been, in many ways, one of great scientific advancement and social progress, indeed, greater advancement in material things of life during this half century and probably more than in the previous two thousand years. During this period of time men have dreamed of a glorious future for humanity; unbelievable progress has been made in the field of science, and men and women in the more advanced stations have caught a vision of a world free from poverty, sickness and disease, a world in which people might live in comfort and peace. Therefore, we must be sure that the qualities of character are created in man which will make him able to control rather than be controlled by the scientific devices which he has created up to this present time. Indeed, Sir, this kind of world was envisaged by the late Franklin D. Roosevelt in his declaration of the Four Freedoms which has often been quoted: the freedom of religion and freedom of speech, freedom from want and freedom from fear. These four freedoms are heartily endorsed by the C.C.F. and are part of our 'humanity first' programme and actually of our own Bill of Rights, 1947.

Mr. Speaker, members on both sides of this House may derive satisfaction from the fact that two Canadians who received the unanimous support, on the Citizens' Forum, as belonging among the six greatest Canadian of the half-century were W. L. MacKenzie King and the late J. S. Woodsworth, the former leader of the C.C.F. and one of its greatest humanitarians — a splendid tribute indeed to the sterling characters and ability of these two leaders. However, when one considers the present time and over the last few months the holding of the McGregor combines report by the Liberal Party until after the Federal election, and the statement by the Hon. J. G. Gardiner that Britain is deliberately drowning us out of the British market, particularly wheat, and the overpayment of wheat participation certificates with this election which forced the Government to borrow, \$23,000,000 at three per cent in order to make a 20 per cent bushel payment, and the

recent suggestion by Mr. Studer, Liberal member of parliament for Maple Creek, that Saskatchewan be divided and handed over to Manitoba and Alberta respectively indeed one is led to believe that the masterhand of the former leader of the Liberal Party, Mr. King, is no longer at the helm to keep them from breaking the very laws of Canada which they are supposed to honestly administer.

Mr. Speaker, analysis of the election results, or so-called post-mortems, have seemed to be a popular pastime of the preceding speakers in this debate, and I probably will follow suit. It is generally admitted, Sir, that a small percentage of votes may make, quite frequently, a definite swing one way or the other in election times. In 1949, Labour was defeated in Australia by a coalition of the Liberal and Country Parties whose combined vote gave them only a three per cent majority over Labour. In New Zealand, the National Party formed the Government with slightly more than a majority of four per cent over Labour. It was said that three votes out of every hundred transferred to the Labour Party from the National Party would easily have kept them in power.

We on this side of the House, of course, are pleased to see Labour returned to power in Britain in spite of a small majority, which will no doubt make it difficult for them. I understand they have already formed a government. One of the greatest surprises in the British election is probably the fact that the Liberals only won eight seats out of a total of 475 seats that were contested. This constitutes the greatest Liberal defeat in the history of Great Britain.

Now, Mr. Speaker, out of the Liberal redistribution of Federal seats, I find myself now, as a farmer, living and voting in the Moose Jaw Federal constituency. However, there were some interesting features to me in this past Federal election. The Lake Centre constituency has some twenty polls of Lumsden provincial riding surrounded within its boundaries. In Saskatchewan, the C.C.F. dropped some 13 seats to the Liberal Party which I naturally regret very much. But strange to say, Mr. John Diefenbaker, the Conservative, retained his seat with a vote of nearly 9,000, actually a vote of nearly 6,000 over his Liberal opponent. There is not any doubt in the world, according to some of my friends who are Liberals, that the Liberals sold their own candidate 'down the River'. That some 3,000 votes made up the 9,000 votes by Mr. John Diefenbaker, and this in areas which were in the Provincial election either Liberal or C.C.F. – Arm River, Liberal. How he managed it I do not know.

With 14 Saskatchewan Liberals at Ottawa, I would just like you, Mr. Speaker, to note how they vote on various questions which are of considerable importance to Saskatchewan people. I have Hansards on my desk, a whole lot of them here; rather dangerous looking material. In someone's hands it might be. And I have Hansards on my desk giving the actual vote on a number of motions during the fall session of 1949, in the House of Commons. I am going to quote just a few of them. On page 40, of Hansard here, you will find that 13 Liberals voted against Mr. Coldwell's Throne Speech amendment which called for the abolition of the means test for old age pensioners. Mr. Diefenbaker voted with the C.C.F. On page 77 of Hansard, 43 Liberals out of the 14 voted "no" on the second reading of the C.C.F. motion to bring the meat packing industry under a national code, a national labour code. This will be of interest to labour members. The C.C.F. members voted for it. Then again page 577 of Hansard, 11 Liberal M.P.s voted in favour of a motion to increase the judges' salaries; all the C.C.F. M.P.s

March 3, 1950

from Saskatchewan voted against this motion, the three other Liberals were missing. There is another one of very great importance down there. It seems to me it was the vote on page 2,134 of Hansard on the McGregor Report: 11 Saskatchewan Liberals voted against the Tory leader, George Drew's motion to have a committee investigate the Government's administration of the Combines Act; all the C.C.F. members and Mr. Diefenbaker voted for this motion, and 11 Saskatchewan Liberals voted against it. The following day, the same 11 voted in support of the Speaker's ruling, which throttled Mr. Diefenbaker's motion and which would have censured the Government for delaying the report. And the next day, some 10 Saskatchewan Liberals (the rest were away) also supported the ruling which brought up a similar motion by Stanley Knowles of the C.C.F. The other four Saskatchewan Liberals, as I said, were absent. All the C.C.F. members voted against the Speaker's ruling at that time, as did Mr. Diefenbaker. Now another one: the 13 Saskatchewan Liberals upheld a ruling of the Speaker which barred Mr. Argue's attempt to bring up the subject of future markets for farm products; the C.C.F. voted for it. Well probably the one of the greatest importance here was an amendment by Ross Thatcher regarding the reduction of tariffs on British goods. It is estimated that the tariffs in this country which protect eastern industries cost Saskatchewan over \$40,000,000 per year. Mr. Ross Thatcher's amendment in the budget debate was for reduction of tariffs in order to encourage imports from the United Kingdom and other sterling countries. And just at this point I would like to read, from the 'Leader-Post' of December 10th, an address by Walter Tucker in Milestone:

"Walter Tucker, Saskatchewan Liberal Leader, Friday night called upon the Federal Government to abolish all tariff and other restrictions on imports of British goods. By such a step, he said, the Liberal Government would implement the platform of the Liberal Party and give a lead to the rest of the world in tariff reductions. Canada under the only admittedly Liberal Government in the world should give that leadership and be proud to do so."

Now, I would just like to read Mr. Tucker's final appeal:

"The hon. members of the Liberal Party will see that there are no strings attached to this amendment. Anyone who believes in free trade can have no difficulty in voting for it. I call upon my Liberal friends to vote the way they have been talking for the last 50 years."

Now, what happened? In the vote that was taken six of the Liberals had the courage to vote against this resolution and the other eight suddenly remembered other engagements and were absent, or were in hiding, for the vote.

I might say that wheat payments paid in 1949 before the election amounted to about \$116,000,000, over \$31,000,000 more than in the previous year. The greatly increased farm income of the province, of course, was partly due to high prices for livestock and P.F.A.A. payments, although these payments

were \$2,000,000 less than in 1948, I believe. In regard to livestock, I might say that great credit is due to a great many farm organizations, the Western Cattlemen's Association, the Wheat Pool, as well as this Government, for the pressure exerted on the Hon. Mr. Gardiner which induced him finally, after two years, to allow the farmer to take advantage of the American markets for beef cattle. The 20 cent per bushel wheat payment prior to the last Federal election, helped the farmers financially especially in those drought-stricken areas. It is possible that it was intended maybe to win votes in the election; anyhow it showed remarkable political foresight. It seems that the Federal Government also over-extended itself in its payments to the extent of \$23,000,000 which they were forced to borrow at three per cent in order to make this payment, and no doubt it did influence many farmers in the vicinity to vote Liberal in this last Federal election. If this election had been held some two months ago, I'll venture the Liberal Party in Canada would have lost some 50 seats.

In order to get an over-all picture we must examine the present position of agriculture in this national economy. While approximately 45 per cent of the people of Canada were living in rural areas in 1948, they only received 13.6 per cent of the national income. The fact that 40 per cent of the machinery bought by the farmers, this year, was purchased on deferred payment, would justify this claim. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, the profit of the machine companies, particularly the Massey Harris, set a new record for this past year, and quoting here, in eleven- months' period alone their earnings were up 26 per cent over previous years. Their net earnings or profits were nearly \$14,000,000 as compared with \$8.5 million the year before. This same picture of farm accounts, Mr. Speaker, could be everything that enters into the cost of agriculture production. The operating cost of farmers have increase by the huge sum of \$50,000,000 since 1944, and now total over \$200,000,000 in the province of Saskatchewan. As a farmer myself, I would say that, with this greatly increased cost of production and the way the markets are going under Mr. Gardiner, farmers realize what this means when prices for wheat and farm products slip to new low levels, with such high cost of production.

A few words now on another branch of agriculture. I believe that the only solution of farm problems in southern Saskatchewan is in greater stabilization of agriculture through greater diversification and mixed-farming, including field crops, pasture feed, fodder reserves, and by instructing these farmers to acquire ample reserves of feed and fodder. This is exactly what the Department of Soil Conservation is doing and I believe they have made a splendid beginning. I need not touch on any of the these projects at all because they were given on Wednesday night, in an able manner, by the hon. member for Gull Lake, the Minister of Public Health. I will say that the Minister of Agriculture deserves great credit for initiating this work and will I am certain give a complete report of the activities of this new Branch during this past year and the estimates of projects contemplated in 1950, when he speaks on the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to agricultural prices, farmers are viewing with great apprehension the problems of future prices of farm products and the higher cost of production, as I have stated before. The farmers are only asking for a parity price and a fair share of the national income. When speaking at the World Convention in London, Mr. McCubbin, Parliamentary Assistant to Mr. Gardiner, was reported to have said – and I quote from the 'Family Herald' of January 11, 1950:

March 3, 1950

“Mr. McCubbin urges an early return to selling Canadian farm products by private enterprise rather than by Government contract, and that the sooner the Dominion Government gets out of handling the farmers’ products, the better the Canadian farmer will be.”

Now, in reply, I would like to quote also from Mr. Ben Plumage of Alberta Wheat Pool. He took exception to this. Mr. Plumage said:

“He was sure that a great majority of farmers in Alberta were entirely opposed to the views expressed by Mr. McCubbin.”

I am sure that Saskatchewan farmers will agree with Mr. Plumage.

During the war and early post-war years the farmer submitted to quite moderate prices for their products for the benefit of the Canadian people, and farmers are not forgetting the 50 cent wheat of the early war years nor the opposition of Mr. Tucker, the Leader of the Opposition, to \$1.00 wheat when a motion was brought in, in 1942, in the House of Commons, by the Hon. T.C. Douglas, now Premier of this Province. I have the Hansard here, but I have not got the time to go into it. When we had lost a considerable of the British market, Mr. Gardiner then in Brantford accused Britain of making a very decided effort to drive Canadian wheat from the British market. In reports in the Canadian Press published December 14th in the ‘Leader-Post’, Mr. Gardiner was reported to have made this statement:

“During the last two years a very decided official effort has been made to drive farm products, such as, apples, pork, cheese, beef and eggs off the British market. And now that the wheat contract is drawing to a close, an effort is being made to drive off a considerable amount of our wheat as well.”

Observers at Ottawa were looking for some political motive behind Mr. Gardiner’s sudden attack. The most common suggestion was that the Minister of Agriculture was seeking escape from a situation that the time, public opinion was forced the Government to continue the Canada Wheat Board. We just don’t know whether we are going to have an open market or what form of a Wheat Board it will be. I am sure we would be glad from the Leader of the Opposition sometime, that there will be no open market, and that the Canada Wheat Board will take full control of wheat again. I would like to continue summing up Mr. Gardiner’s statements, with what Mr. Strachey said. Mr. Strachey’s statement was made in reply to Mr. Gardiner’s accusations. Mr. Strachey said:

“I can certainly deny these rumours. The British people are extremely interested in buying Canadian foods, but they are also equally interested in finding out a way of paying for it. That is why there is need of a substantial increase in the sale of British goods to Canada, by means of which we can earn the dollars to buy your food.”

These are the facts regarding the British markets, yet not one Saskatchewan Liberal voted to reduce tariffs on British goods when the matter was brought up in the House of Commons, last fall.

Mr. Speaker, there have been some criticisms in the Press as to the value of motions sponsored by private members of this Legislature, and the usual criticism of our making requests from Ottawa for legislation or financial assistance which were opposed by the Liberal members of this Assembly. The main object, of course, of private members (and they know as well as I) is to get a body of public opinion. Several of their motions are used by all parties. At the recent opening of the House of Commons, 25 motions were introduced by the Liberal Party. But during the years, 1930 to 1935, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals asked the Bennett Government, then in power at Ottawa, for everything but the moon. I have a list of private members' motions here (and I would just like to touch briefly on them) asking or urging the Federal Government to take some form of action. One that was moved urged the Dominion Government to extend every facility for promotion trade with Russia. The next one, by Mr. Grant, was with regard to a select special committee to be set up to look into the problems of the National Marketing Board, a fixed price for wheat and a domestic allotment plan. I think there was one more that caught my eye, and I think it is really a good one. This is by Mr. Hutcheon: "In order to restore agriculture to a more normal condition, the Parliament of Canada be requested to enact legislation at the present Session to provide for the payment a bonus on certain farm commodities over a period of ten years, in the following manner: a pegged price for wheat, beef, hogs, seed, butterfat and eggs – a pegged price for over ten years. They were really 'going to town' those days when they were in the Opposition, the Anderson Government was in power and the Bennett Government at Ottawa. This is asking for pretty nearly everything. Today, Mr. Gardiner would hold up his hands in holy horror if anything like that were to happen.

Mr. Speaker, no one would question, I think, in this House, the tremendous control the Federal Government at Ottawa has over every phase of economic and political life of this province. Everything that enters into the cost of farm production as well as the cost of farm homes, and living costs of every kind, to a greater or less degree is affected by the policies and decisions of the Federal Government at Ottawa, over which we have no control. I wish we had. The Federal Government at Ottawa, actually has a stranglehold on the C.C.F. Government in this province. Perhaps we can break it.

I would just like to say a few words on the field of health and social welfare, particularly the field of health. The Government has a record of which we might well be proud. Unfortunately, some people have short memories, and some may be inclined to forget already that, prior to the C.C.F. Administration, they did not enjoy the many services that are available to them now at a very low cost, or almost entirely free. Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan continues to be one of the most humanitarian and popular pieces of legislation on the North American continent. It is little wonder that it has the support of all practical citizens – except the other side of the House. With the exception of some misunderstanding or oversight of administration, there is little opposition to it from any political group in the province. In my constituency, in the three years of operation, over half of the people have received hospitalization whether for a day or for years, for a yearly fee of ten dollars, or thirty dollars per

March 3, 1950

family. British Columbia with a similar plan but less services, now charges \$21.00 dollars per single person and, in addition, has a three per cent sales tax to pay for there scheme. At the present time this Government has been paying about 40 per cent of this cost which I think, this year, will run around \$4.5 million.

Mr. Speaker, the hospital bed accommodation has been increase nearly 75 per cent under the C.C.F. administration. In 1944, the hospital bed accommodation was 3.7 per thousand and today stands at seven beds per thousand, which is about the highest in Canada. As for hospital construction under this Government, in the past few years over one million dollars has been granted. The C.C.F. Government established an Air Ambulance Service which has saved hundreds of lives in emergency cases. It saved Mr. Gardiner's life, I believe, this last summer: I hope it did. Since this service was established, air ambulance planes have flown one and three-quarter million miles and is believed to have carried more than 3,000 patients during 1949. Nearly 900 patient flights were made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, because of government competition in insurance, rates have been reduced by the regular companies in Saskatchewan and nowhere else. In the Automobile Insurance – a very adequate insurance – the motorist pays \$10.00 with his license fee and if he wishes a package policy of \$17.50. For much less coverage, Alberta motorists pay \$107 to \$149; Manitoba motorists pay from \$77 to \$119 and in Ontario they pay \$83 to \$125 for equal coverage or less than this coverage. Other provinces, I may say, are watching with great interest the coverage and the low cost rates in Saskatchewan with the added protection to every citizen in the province which is not obtainable anywhere on this North American continent. People are so used to these things, taking them for granted, that there a number who may not appreciate them, but a great number do. The following editorial from the 'British Columbian' paper of New Westminster is of interest. This paper supports the Coalition Party, by the way. I quote:

“There is an implied obligation on the Province of British Columbia to give this protection (speaking of the protection we get in Saskatchewan) and the only way it can be done is to underwrite risks by making insurance a necessary part of licensing premium to be added to the licence fee. This is done in Saskatchewan and it can be done here.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have endeavoured to point out that the few of the many services rendered by this Government towards attaining a fuller and better life for all Canadian citizens. While much remains to be done, we believe that sufficient progress has been made in 5½ years of C.C.F. administration to fully justify our adoption of the slogan “Humanity First.” If proof were needed, Mr. Speaker, that we are on the right track, it may be found in the fact that Winston Churchill's Conservative Party as well as those parties which oppose Labour in New Zealand and Australia, promised if elected to retain most of the Socialist laws already enacted. I intend to support the motion.

Hon. J. H. Sturdy (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with those members who have expressed the regret of the House of the passing of the former members for North Battleford and for Gull Lake. Those were fine men, and their loss will be greatly felt, and we can ill-afford their loss particularly at this critical time in the world.

I would also like to congratulate those members who have recently joined us. Some of them have already given a demonstration of their ability, and I am sure that they will serve their constituencies and this province well. Naturally, it will be understood if I express particular satisfaction over the presence here of the member from Gull Lake.

I would also express my gratification for the very splendid speeches given by the Mover and Seconder of the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I can assure them that I will support them in seeing that this motion is passed.

During the past week we have been listening from this side of the House to members' speeches from the other side, and I am going to comment very briefly on them. The speech of the hon. member from Moosomin sounded to very much like the self-confessions of a political schizophrenic. Any man who can be a Liberal, a Progressive and a Conservative all at the same time, must be suffering from a split personality. The hon. member for Redberry sounded to me very much like a fugitive from Lower Slobovia, and he will henceforth undoubtedly be known in this House as Comrade Korchinski. The hon. member for Pelly, who is not in his seat — the best I can say about his speech is that it was inoffensive. As for the hon. member for Maple Creek — the members opposite were taking a great deal of satisfaction out of his speech until the Minister of Health got through with him, and then they felt exceedingly sorry for him. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle, my very old friend, favoured us again with his annual rhetorical endeavour, and that would have ended the comedy of errors on the part of the members opposite, had it not been for the hon. member from Melville who interjected a "tragedy of errors", and I am certainly going to deal with him in detail.

I ask if the Liberal Party in this province has come out as an advocate for war. I wonder if they realize . . .

Mr. Korchinski: — Are you defending Stalin?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Your statement was published in your own political bible, the 'Leader-Post', and you should look it up. You are one who advocated force. I would point out that it comes remarkably ill from a member who has not had the courage to even taste the horrors of war. These are the people who advocate, in this day and age, the manufacture and the use of the atomic bomb. I do not know what the religious persuasion of the member for Redberry is — it is his business entirely; but there are several members in this House to whom the following statement which I shall read, should have grim and terrible significance. I read from a dispatch published in the 'Leader-Post' from Vatican City dated February 4th. The Vatican Newspaper "Osservatore Romano" in its first comments on American plans to make the hydrogen bomb, said:

"The world is being sucked into a whirlpool of inhuman chaos. If one of the peoples most professing

March 3, 1950

peace undertakes the construction of such a destructive instrument, despite its incalculable cost and the terrifying prospects of its use, then the world is slipping and sliding irresistibly into open war, and when the only argument which people believe can prevent war is to present the dilemma of peace or the destruction of civilizations, what must we think of diplomacy and politics.”

And what must we think of the members Opposite who, at this stage of the game, are openly advocating the use of force. To go on with the article:

“We are sucked into a whirlpool in which human foresight is unequalled and intelligence totters as the conscience dies. We are in the chaos of the inhuman.”

Now, as far as I am concerned, this is my declaration of things. I shall fight and sacrifice for peace. To me, the use of the atomic bomb is repugnant to the dictates of my conscience and I shall fight, to the death if necessary, against any nation or group of nations that will be the first to use the atomic or hydrogen bomb in any future war or so-called aggression or defence. That is my declaration, and I know that there are millions of people on this continent alone who would not be afraid to stand up and be counted on that kind of a declaration.

It is sickening and a bit terrifying to find men appointed to high office, to the Legislature of this province who glibly advocate the use of force and war when they have experienced nothing of the horrors of war, and seem not to realize the menace of the wars to come. Is there no honour or constancy of purpose or courage left in the Liberal Party? In the past, you know, they courted Russia. The hon. member from Arm River does not believe that. Well, here I have the Sessional Paper, the Journal of the Saskatchewan Legislature of a very few short years ago, and this is the Resolution. It was mentioned by my hon. friend from Lumsden. This is the Resolution passed in this Legislature right here when Grits and Tories only were sitting in this House: “That in the opinion of this Assembly the Dominion Government should extend every facility for promoting trade with Russia on a barter or exchange basis and when necessary, by arranging long and short term credits, or in any way that will best lend itself to an extension of the markets abroad for our agricultural and farm products.” The year was 1933, and it was debated on . . .

Mr. J. Benson (Last Mountain): — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. gentleman raised a question of privilege.

Mr. Benson: — The speaker stated in his remarks that that resolution was introduced in the Legislature that contained only Grits and Tories. Jacob Benson was neither.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Mr. hon. friend, Jacob Benson, was neither and I do not think he will ever be either.

Well, the debate was continued and the question was put with minor amendments, and every Liberal and every Tory voted for close trade relations with this country that they want to bomb out of existence now. Who were present? Well, I find the following voted . . .

Mr. Tucker: — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member says that we want to bomb the Soviet Union out of existence. I would like to repudiate that suggestion entirely. We have taken the attitude that we are upholding the attitude of the Atlantic Pact members. This is an important matter and I am dealing with a question of privilege. The hon. member is attributing to us and misrepresenting our position, and I claim the right, Mr. Speaker, to state our position when it is being misrepresented in this House by the speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member will present his side of the question tomorrow.

Mr. Tucker: — It is a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. We cannot be misrepresented in this House by a member of the Government. Now yesterday, Mr. Speaker, you permitted Members of the Government to get up and correct the speakers on this side over and over again, and we demand the same rights as you extend to the people on the other side of the House. I do not propose to stand here and have the Minister of Social Welfare misrepresent our speakers.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member will take his seat. Never at any time have I consciously given any privilege to the Government side of the House over the Opposition, and any charge of that kind I resent very much indeed. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition believes that I am not filling this office quite tactfully, then he knows his course of action and he should take that course and not make charges against the Chair which he knows is entirely out of order.

Mr. Tucker: — I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. If you are going to say that we cannot put our view in this matter which is misrepresented by the Minister and you rule that I am out of order, I appeal against your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to put up with that sort of thing.

Mr. Speaker: — You will obey the orders of this House, or else you will receive the criticism of this House.

Mr. Tucker: — I appeal against your ruling that I have no right to put our view and correct the misstatement of our stand to this House, as made just now by the Minister of Social Welfare.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Speaker has not said that the hon. gentleman had no right to get up and state a question of privilege. The hon. gentleman has stated his question or privilege and surely having stated his question of privilege that should be the end of the matter and the House should be allowed to proceed with the debate.

March 3, 1950

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, had I been allowed to conclude my question of privilege I would have been satisfied, but Your Honour interrupted me and did not permit me to finish my speech.

Mr. Speaker: — When a person rises on a point of privilege he is not entitled to make a speech. The hon. member got up and said that the hon. Minister of Social Welfare had made a statement which you contradicted, and you did contradict it and then you went on to make a speech.

Mr. Tucker: — No, Mr. Speaker, I desired to say what our position was and put it succinctly to this House.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Mr. Speaker, is the hon. Leader of the Opposition deliberately trying to keep me off the air?

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I ask that that statement be withdrawn. I am doing nothing deliberate in this matter. I am just asking that the hon. Minister shall not misrepresent the position of our party, and I just ask the right to put the true position when he saw fit to misrepresent us.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member has accused the Speaker of the Legislature of exercising favouritism and I will not tolerate it.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, I drew this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that yesterday, at least twice, two members of the Government got up and corrected our side and said what the true facts were, and I claim the same right as you had extended the people on the other side of the House. That is all I said, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, Order! I will finish my statement first. When an hon. Minister of a Department rises on a point of privilege to put a speaker right on accusations against his Department, I hold that the privilege does extend that far, and that is all that I have ever done.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I point out to you that no member of the Government has any higher privilege in this Legislature than the people in the Opposition, and if they claim anything is misrepresented, they have no more rights than we have in that regard.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member will have to obey the rulings of this Chair. I have told you once, and I tell you again, that if you are not satisfied with the conduct of this Legislature, my sitting here as Speaker who is charged with the conduct and maintaining order as far as possible, you know the procedure and I am going to allow no other procedure as far as comments on conduct of myself as Speaker.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, as a private member of this House, I have been accused by the hon. member, who should be speaking, of having advocated aggression and that we should go and bomb Russia out of existence. That statement is absolutely untrue and false from beginning to end.

Mr. Tucker: — Every member has a right to get up and repudiate a statement that is untrue because we have never suggested such a thing, Mr. Speaker. I repudiate it in my turn.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — This statement is contained in the record and was used by two hon. members opposite, both the member for Redberry and the member for Wilkie.

Mr. Korchinski: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. Mr. Speaker, at no place in my speech did I ever advocate attacking Russia. I stated, and this is on the record . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I will call the record in to substantiate what the hon. gentleman said that the Russians behind the Iron Curtain in Europe could only be forced back by force of arms or by war.

Mr. Korchinski: — I never mentioned the words “forced back.” I merely said that the advance of Communism could not be stopped in any other way.

Mr. Horsman: — Mr. Speaker, have we your permission to refer to the record?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I will let the record speak for itself. I shall deal now with the hon. member for Melville. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that there are 40,000 people or more in this province who are served by the Department of Social Welfare, and yet the hon. member for Melville has managed to dig up four cases he presented on authenticated statements and letters to this House. He admits that he did not have complete information on at least one of them . . . (interruptions) . . . I refuse to be interrupted further.

Mr. Deshaye: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the hon. Minister made an absolute misstatement.

Mr. Speaker: — That is not a point of privilege.

Mr. Deshaye: — I deny that there is any truth in that statement and I wish he would get down to the truth.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Mr. Speaker, this man has been accorded every courtesy by my office and my Department, but never on a single instance has he visited my office or the offices of any of the senior members of my Department, that I am aware of. I was warned by . . .

Mr. Deshaye: — I have visited the Department of Social Welfare . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I was warned by a leading citizen of Melville that the hon. gentleman was going to resort to the tactics which he used in the House, yesterday. The hon. gentleman wrote me quite frequently. He wrote on Legislature stationery. Here is the type of letter that I get from him. He is a lawyer. I gave him confidential information – but never again! You know, any member, or any man, who will so debase himself for political purposes as to use a young, unfortunate girl of fifteen years of age and then reveal her name over the radio, is unworthy of any confidence whatsoever. The hon. member callously remarked that she had been in his office many times, and she did not care who knew the circumstances of her misfortune. Well, we care on this side of the House, and let me tell you, Sir, that the electors, the good people of the Melville constituency, care too, and your conduct has been most

March 3, 1950

reprehensible. We care, not only on her account, but on the account of the child in question. This hon. gentleman has accused me of the discourtesy of not replying to a letter of December 19th. I happened to have been in the hospital at the time, undergoing an operation; but I am happy to inform him that I have recovered to the extent that I am prepared to administer to him the lesson he deserves, if he will accept my challenge.

I do not like to bring up the private business of any old age pensioner or anyone who comes to the Department of Social Welfare, but this hon. gentleman leaves me no other recourse, Mr. Speaker. The case referred to by him, yesterday, was referred to us by the R.C.M.P. in the spring of 1949. On the very day that it was reported, our child welfare worker went into that home and gave advice to the girl and to the parents, advised them what should be done, what facilities were available by way of hospitalization, nursing care, prenatal care and so on. The parents (and it is possibly understandable) resented it; that is, they appeared more concerned about punishing the putative father than they were, apparently, over the welfare of the girl, and they refused to take any advice from our child welfare worker. The worker left with them her name and address. The putative father was interviewed. He agreed to settle out of court for the sum of \$1,500; but again the father (and it is understandable possibly) was determined to punish the man. He was haled into court and he, the putative father, was given a four-month gaol sentence, and an affiliation order in the amount of \$11.11 per month was given in favour of the mother and total amount of \$50.00 for the doctor and \$90.00 for costs and legal fees. The parent was not satisfied with this judgment and evidently went to the hon. member for Melville who appealed the case and lost it on September 13, 1949, when the case was dismissed. The putative father left the province. He went to Manitoba where we have no jurisdiction. We have been trying ever since, and will continue to try, to see that he lives up to the terms of the affiliation order. Our child welfare officer has visited the home of the unmarried mother on three occasions; a mother's allowance has been granted to this child-mother in the amount of \$15 a month, on February 1st. Now the facts remain that this mother was only a child. She was in the home, and has continued in her parental home. We shall do what we can on her behalf and on behalf of the child, but I wish to say to the hon. member for Melville that, if he dares again, on any occasion, to divulge confidential information, giving over the air, or in public, the name of these unfortunate girls, then I shall take whatever means that I have at my disposal to see that it does not happen again.

He brought up three other cases, and I shall deal with them as quickly as possible. He complained that one mother's allowance case was not given the full mother's allowance. The fact remains that this mother's allowance case had not reported to the hon. member for Melville the fact that, last year, she had received a Canadian Wheat Board payment in the amount of \$688. She is a mother with one dependent. She is entitled to a total income of \$840, and she did not inform him, as he could readily have found out, that she had received this Wheat Board payment of \$688 as well as other income. We stretched a point in seeing that the mother got an allowance, and she is in receipt of an allowance of \$7.16 a month; but the main thing she wanted was her medical card so that she would have free hospitalization, free medical and dental services for herself and her child who is under the age of 16. That was

the second case. He was holding this up as an example of how the Department of Social Welfare, trying to care for the needs of over 40,000 people of this province, was not undertaking its full responsibility.

The next was a case of a pensioner, a blind pensioner well known to the people of this province. True, the hon. member from Melville pointed out, yesterday, that he was a very ardent Liberal supporter down through the years, but as far as we are concerned in our Department, it makes no difference as to his political affiliations. That is a day gone by. That was the situation under the Liberals. But from the members of my Department there will be justice and equity for all people requiring assistance.

Now this is a simple case. I am not going to reveal any names, of course, because I want the public throughout this province to know that their affairs, their confidential affairs, which they repose in the Department of Social Welfare, will always be considered as confidential and they will never be betrayed. The fact of the matter is that this gentleman came to us and he admitted that he had, from sale of wheat, last year, \$820; from revenue from pasture land, \$200; Wheat Board payments of \$420 – a total income of \$1,440. Now that was his income for last year, and yet he was most insistent on a full pension of \$42.50 a month. Well, this Government did not impose the means test; that was imposed by Ottawa. The C.C.F. in Ottawa have repeatedly, down through the years, endeavored to have that means test removed, but the Liberal cohorts and the colleagues of the hon. gentleman opposite and the fourteen that we have sent down from Saskatchewan, last year, all voted against the removal of the means test, and that is why we have a means test today. We have an agreement between our Department and the Pension Authority in Ottawa to pay pensions according to regulations imposed by Ottawa. We intend, without fear or favour, to live up to that agreement. Our Department is subject to the audit of the pension authorities from Ottawa. They come in, and if they find that we are not living up to that agreement, then we are responsible for any moneys that we grant unjustifiably. As I have said, this gentleman was entitled to an outside income, being a blind pensioner, of \$1200. That was his allowable income. He had an income of \$1440 last year, and these are the facts. That meant that he had over \$240 more than he was allowed, and hence was not permitted to have any pension whatsoever. But it appeared, he informed us, that he had paid to the Mortgage Company on behalf of a mortgage which he owed, the sum of \$600 – \$300 from the sale of wheat and \$300 from the sale of farm machinery. Well, we looked upon that sale of farm machinery as transfer of capital, so we did not take that into consideration; but the \$300, we did. He was advised to ‘phone the mortgage company to see if some of this \$300 which he had paid could be applied on interest and not charged against the principal of the indebtedness. I would point out to the House, all payments which a pensioner makes on behalf of a mortgage on the principal are considered as a part of his income, but if it is paid on the interest, it is not considered part of his income. So he was advised to get in touch with the mortgage company. We were anxious to get a pension for this gentleman if we possibly could, and on the 22nd of October we received a letter from the Manager of the mortgage company to this effect:

“With reference to yours of the 5th instant, we call your attention to the fact that out of the last payment made by Mr. . . . the sum of \$311.00 will be utilized to cover the interest due on the 1st of November, 1949.”

March 3, 1950

That was the manager of the company, and we put a pension through for this gentleman and, at the first of the year, when we were estimating his income for next year, we were able to raise his pension. And I received a letter of appreciation from him to this effect:

“I may say that I appreciate your attention to my case, and that from all the officials of the Department with whom I came in contact I’ve been treated courteously with the exception of one.” – who, to my mind, is one of the most courteous gentleman, and one of the finest civil servants we have in the civil service of this province. – That was the second case.”

The third case is that in respect to an old age pensioner who was a woman. She was left a farm by her husband. I have a copy of the will here. This is what it states in the will, – signed by the husband:

“I give, devise and bequeath one-third share of all my real estate to my wife, and an undivided two-thirds of all my said real estate to my son.”

She had ample; it amounted to one-third of a quarter-section of land, and the income from that as admitted by herself and her son was approximately \$500 a year. This elderly lady did not want a pension, and under date of October 5, 1948, she stated to our Social Welfare Officer:

“Why should I keep the pension when I don’t need it? Ask the pension board to stop sending it to me. My son has promised to keep me, and it is not right that I should take it.”

Now, that woman had an income, and she was being kept in good circumstances, and there are three to one people in this province, old age people, who are not receiving pensions. That is about the average.

Then the hon. member from Melville enters the picture and from then on things begin to happen, and I don’t know what he is getting for his services in taking care of the affairs of old age pensioners. The fact remains that the son wished to get the one-third share of that very good farm and he wished us to remove our caution or notice which was filed against the land, which we are prepared to do. Under the old Act, under the old Statute under the Liberals, caveats were registered against all property of pensioners and spouses, and pension payments were charged against the land. That is, they recovered all pension payments against all the land. Under the C.C.F. Government this was amended in 1944. It was repealed and provision is now made, merely for a notice.

Mr. Danielson: — It’s the same thing.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Oh no! It isn’t the same thing. A caution or a notice is filed in the Land Titles Office to protect the interests of the pensioner, otherwise these holdings of these old age pensioners could easily be disposed of, and they would have nothing whatsoever. Now we did not care; we were prepared to reinstate that woman’s

pension in full and she was told that; or she could be supported by her son and the land would be turned over to him. The latter method was preferred, and we have a letter from the son stating:

“This letter will constitute my undertaking to keep and maintain my mother for the rest of her natural life, if your Branch will withdraw the notice of granting of a pension that you have registered against the prescribed land.”

Now, there are the cases: not a single instance in which there was a vantage of injustice or inequity being done any of the four people referred to by the hon. gentleman. On the other hand, more services are being rendered to the people requiring help than ever rendered in the history of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I wish, while I am still on the air, to read the statement from the records made by the hon. member from Redberry. He was referring to the Premier, and was saying something about “Communism cannot be contained except by military force.” He went on to say: “I wonder what he (the Premier) proposed to do: sit down and sing them a C.C.F. lullaby to stop them coming to Canada: I consider Communists as criminals when they are out of bounds and the only thing that will stop them is force because that is the only thing they are used to.” Now, what the hon. gentleman advocates is force. Well now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to devote the rest of my remarks to my Department.

I would like, at this time, to pay a tribute to the civil service of this province. I have discovered in the civil service of this province an increasing dignity and courtesy and dynamic purposefulness that was sadly lacking under the patronage days of the Liberals prior to 1945. Personally, I am proud of the men and women who are working with me in the Department of Social Welfare. They are courteous, they are efficient, they are doing a good job; many of them could receive much higher salaries outside this province but, out of loyalty to their job and the fact that they are given the opportunity of doing something worthwhile, they have remained in the province, and I do wish to express my appreciation and, I know, the appreciation of all the people on this side of the House at least, for the splendid work that they are doing. I spoke of the opportunity the civil servants of this province have for doing a better job than they have ever done before. I would like to quote to you an excerpt from Hansard from a speech given by Tom Reid, Liberal member of Parliament for New Westminster, and this is what he says:

“Everyone who knows anything about what is happening in Saskatchewan must give the authorities and the people of Saskatchewan a great deal of credit for what has been accomplished in the matter of hospitalization and social services. I say that in all fairness. The province from which I come, British Columbia, is endeavouring to emulate what has been done in Saskatchewan because we believe a fair standard has been set by that province.”

March 3, 1950

Evidently there are good Liberals and fair Liberals in the Dominion of Canada.

I would like to speak of the Old Age pensions and Blind pensions, and briefly, of the origin of old age pensions in this Dominion. This can be credited to that man of the sainted memory, J. S. Woodsworth. It was in 1926 when he headed the 'ginger' group in the House, and Mr. King had a very small majority. Mr. Woodsworth gave, as his price of support of the Liberal Government to keep them in office, the promise that they would pass the Old Age Pension Act and it was passed, and for a time the Liberals remained in power with his support and Woodsworth, both in season and out of season, within parliament and out of parliament, was concerned and concerned himself with the welfare of the people of this country. You know, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition only had the courage that was possessed by Mr. Woodsworth! He sacrificed for his ideals, even to the extent of working on the waterfront in Vancouver; he would not compromise his ideals or his principles. Well, under constant pressure by the C.C.F. consideration improvement in social welfare has been achieved during the past few years. It was a sad day indeed in 1949 when this province returned fourteen Liberals instead of fourteen additional C.C.F. members to Ottawa.

Well, I am going to give you some contrast of what has happened within a very few short years in this province, yes, and throughout the Dominion of Canada, because of the example set in this province. On April 30, 1943, the number of old age pensioners in this province was 17,000; it is now over 21,000, an increase of over 4,000 pensioners. The average old age pension in 1943, under Liberals, was \$17.53; it is today \$38.83, over twice as much and, if you add to that the \$6.88 which is the value of the free medical services and hospitalization which they received, you have a total pension, in 1943, under the Liberals of \$17.53, a total average pension today in value of \$45.71, almost three times as much today as it was six short years ago. The amount paid in pensions in 1943, that is for the fiscal year 1943-44, was \$2,557,000; this year, we budgeted, 1949-50, for \$8,879,000, and that does not include the million dollars that is paid for medical services and hospitalization. That gives you some idea of the contrast . . . I have been rudely interrupted and kept off the air for half an hour this afternoon; I insist on continuing my speech until I have finished with it and then the hon. member can ask all the questions he wants to.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, am I to be deprived of a question of privilege? The hon. member said he was rudely interrupted, this afternoon, and kept off the air for, I think he said, some time by these rude interruptions. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that those interruptions were not rude and the hon. member should withdraw that suggestion.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I would point out to this House, as this House well knows, that it was this Government that gave to the old age pensioners, the blind pensioners and their dependants, to mothers' allowance cases and their dependants, complete hospitalization, health services, dental services, medical care and so on, and that is worth a very great deal to the people of this province, and it is so highly thought of that our example has been emulated in the province of British Columbia. In the case of blind pensioners there were 435 in 1944; today

there are 633. The average pension to the blind paid in 1944, (April 30th), was \$24.49; today, the average pension, including the value of hospitalization and medical services, is \$46.89. In mothers' allowance, the Liberals in their last term of office, 1943-44, spent \$520,000; we have budgeted, this year, for the expenditure of \$1,106,000. They paid an average monthly payment to mothers' allowance cases of \$18.63; today, the average is \$35.33 – just twice as much. Besides medical services and hospitalization we have added several categories, thus relieving the municipalities of the responsibilities for this type of person. We have added unmarried mothers, divorced mothers, incapacitated widowers and mothers whose husbands are incapacitated. If there is a child at school who has attained the age of 16 years, the payment of the mothers' allowance has been extended to the end of the academic year, provided the child is continuing at school. So much for pensions.

During the period, we have relieved the municipalities of this province, through our Social Welfare and Health Services alone, of millions of dollars. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has, on many occasions, erroneously informed the people of this province that municipal taxes in Manitoba are lower than they are in Saskatchewan, and the same way in Alberta. I had occasion to be down in the Cannington constituency, last year, and I made comparisons between farms along the Manitoba and Saskatchewan borders having comparable assessments value and size; in Manitoba they are paying from twenty to thirty dollars more per quarter actually than they are in Saskatchewan, and that is the truth of the matter in spite of the statements of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. You know, the Liberals of this province think (and probably do so with good reason) that they can make any misrepresentation, tell any lies they want to, and get away with it, because they have the backing of a biased daily Press in this province which gives them all the publicity they want. Now, I will tell you why the municipalities of Manitoba are paying more taxes than they are in Saskatchewan, just with respect to my own Department alone. Thee old age pensioners in Manitoba have no free medical services there, except that which is provided by the municipality, and they have no hospitalization there either; that is borne by the municipality and these people, who just manage to qualify for old age pension, do require a great deal of hospitalization and medical services. This constitutes a great burden on the municipalities of that province. Why, it is only recently that the Manitoba Government relieved the municipalities of paying 50 per cent of the Province's share of the old age pension.

I am going to speak of our rehabilitation of civilian handicaps programme in this province; they have no such a programme in Manitoba, it is all the responsibility of the municipality. I heard misrepresentation regarding mothers' allowances paid in Manitoba, that they were more generous than they are here in Saskatchewan. Well, the fact remains that, according to the best information I have received, there are only 700 mothers on mothers' allowance in Manitoba, and the Manitoba Government, last year, paid \$383,000. In this province we have 2,580 mothers on mothers' allowances and 5,990 children, and, last year we paid \$1,075,000, three times as much as they paid in Manitoba. The additional cost is borne by the municipalities of Manitoba because it is very difficult, the regulations are so stringent, that only a relatively few mothers in Manitoba manage to get on mothers' allowance. Moreover, in Manitoba a lien is registered against all the property of a mother who happens to be on mothers' allowance, and

March 3, 1950

recovery is made on values over \$12,000. In this province there is no recovery on account of mothers' allowance payments to any mother in the province. In Manitoba there is no scheme of direct assistance to municipalities such as we have in this province. Manitoba only provides assistance in unorganized areas, and the costs appear to have been, as nearly as I can find out, \$200,000 last year, whereas in this province we paid out, last year, \$1,280,000; the annual cost is \$914,000 to this Government and \$366,000 to the rural and urban municipalities, on account of the 8,500 cases of social aid which we have in this province; but in Manitoba they paid out \$200,000.

Then in Child Welfare, in Manitoba they had 300 wards because Children's Aid Societies and the municipalities are largely responsible for the care of children. They have 300 wards, and the cost to the Government, last year, was \$44,000; the cost of our 2,000 wards in this province was \$600,000. These are some of the reasons why taxes to the municipality in Manitoba are considerably higher than they are in Saskatchewan, in spite of all the propaganda and misrepresentation of the members opposite.

Social Aid has increased, during the past five years, from \$670,000 until, this present year, it is \$1,280,000. Now that is for the year 1948-49, the last full fiscal year, when the municipalities, rural and urban, paid out \$366,000, the Provincial Government, \$194,000. Besides that, during the past four years we have paid out on behalf of Metis and some Mennonites, for whom we have assumed fully responsibility, \$343,000.

I was amazed when I was down in Gull Lake constituency, last year. The hon. Leader of the Opposition, in dealing with Social Aid or "Relief" (as he still loves to call it) made the charge that this Government had introduced a new application form which I shall describe presently. His statement was entirely false from beginning to end; it received frontline publicity in the 'Leader-Post' and when I asked the Editor if he would permit me equal space and equal prominence, he relegated my article in a greatly emaciated form to the twenty-third page; this is the size of my article of explanation. That is the conception in this province of the freedom of the press.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says that my statement was false. If he wants to go so far as to say it is untrue, that would be all right; but when he says it is false I suggest to him . . . (interruption) . . . Now, Mr. Speaker, am I going to be permitted to state my question of privilege? The last time I tried to do this we were on the air, or I would have said a good deal more than I did. The Premier interrupted and did not permit me to finish. I have the floor, Mr. Speaker, and I am speaking on a question of privilege, too.

Premier Douglas: — I will rise on a question of privilege on his question of privilege. I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman. He had better get his record straight.

Mr. Tucker: — You certainly did. The hon. member said in the first place, Mr. Speaker, that I said that they had introduced this document, and I said they were using this document. It was absolutely

true. And when the hon. member says that I made a false statement about it, he is stating what is also absolutely false, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — This is what Mr. Tucker said, as reported in the ‘Leader-Post’, that shining example of journalistic rectitude and freedom of the press! “‘Under the C.C.F. Government the relief recipient’s home ceases to be his castle,’ said Mr. Tucker, Saskatchewan’s Liberal Leader.” He said that new application forms for social assistance which have recently been distributed by the C.C.F. require the following declarations. He gave the people to understand that these were new forms used for the first time when they have been in existence for twenty years. Our only fault was to follow the forms used by the Liberals that had been in existence for fifteen years. But what we did do was to make the forms less stringent. Under the Liberal form, the applicant for assistance was required to sign a statement that he would work anywhere in Canada if required; but this Government does not believe in forced labour and so we had that deleted from this form.

Mr. Tucker: — Why not read what you did require?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Here is one of the forms used back in 1936, and this is what it stated:

“For the purpose of taking possession and recovering said property the Minister or his agents may enter into or upon any building, enclosure or land using such force as may be necessary for this purpose, and damage of such property by any means whatsoever shall not release me, the recipient, from my liability . . .”

They could go in there, one would assume, with shotguns, back in those days, and with axes in order to recover what has been paid for their relief.

Mr. Tucker: — Why not read what you ask them to sign?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — My, my, Mr. Speaker! I can just see the hon. Leader of the Opposition weeping crocodile tears as big as golf balls for the poor relief recipient under the C.C.F. and I can see him on the platform exuding sympathy and hot air.

Mr. Tucker: — That’s what you did in 1944 from one end of this province to the other.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — This is what he said, as reported in the ‘Leader-Post’ on the front page:

“And now in Saskatchewan under the C.C.F. Government the unfortunate man who, through no fault of his own, has to ask for relief, must throw open his doors to a Government or municipal official whenever they desire to search his premises. The relief recipient is as much entitled to have his home environment as the wealthiest citizen of the country.”

March 3, 1950

Mr. Tucker: — It's a good thing I did cite it because you withdrew it.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — That is the type of thing being propagated. We did not withdraw it. The reason the hon. Leader of the Opposition did that was because he knew that he would get front-page publicity in the 'Leader-Post' as he did get, and he knew that any statement by Sturdy would be relegated to the twenty-third page — that is the freedom of the press in this province.

Mr. Tucker: — That's untrue and false, too, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Now the Leader of the Opposition has been going up and down the length and breadth of this province stating that the C.C.F. is driving people out of the province and that we are losing our population. Well, what are the facts. Do you believe the Dominion Bureau of Statistics? From 1936 to 1943, there was a drop in population in this province of almost a hundred thousand people and the Liberals were in power at that time. What were you doing to drive people out of the Province?

Mr. Tucker: — There was a war on at the time.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I know and former relief recipients know. But from 1946 down to the present time there has been a steady improvement in the population of this province by almost 30,000 people. The tide has been turned, and that is the story: under 10 years of Liberals a loss of 100,000 in population; in the last four years of C.C.F. government administration in this province, a gain of 30,000.

Well, to continue. I would like to speak briefly on the Rehabilitation Division of the Social Welfare Department. It is doing something that has never been done before in this province, and very little in the Dominion of Canada, in the rehabilitation of civilian handicapped persons. That Branch has dealt with 356 cases of men and women who, by physical disability caused by accident or disease, were not able to work. They were on social aid, and now 102 of these have been rehabilitated and they are earning an average of over \$100 a month. There have been 44 cases of physical restoration where we have purchased the necessary appliances to overcome their handicaps, where we have paid for the necessary surgery. There are 160 of these seriously handicapped people who are at the present time receiving training or training has been arranged for them. We have, at Moose Jaw, 24 handicapped women who never earned money before in their lives, who are employed in our garment manufacturing shop there. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley is evidently not interested in the plight of many hundreds of unfortunate people in this province. He made a most facetious remark. You may not have overheard him; but I did hear it. As far as I am concerned this is an unfortunate class of people, that I do feel extremely sorry for; these people who, through no fault of their own, with their physical handicap brought on by disease or accident, are unable to take their place in the normal life of this province and are unable to earn their own living.

Mr. Tucker: — Who's shedding the crocodile tears now?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I have good reason to shed tears over the neglect of the Liberals in this province over a period of 35 years.

In our workshop at Moose Jaw, 24 of these girls are now employed, full-time; they are earning the minimum salary, which is over \$20 a week. They are a pretty happy group of people because, for the first time in their lives, they are earning their own living; they are taking their place in society; they feel that they are making a contribution. Forty more handicapped persons, who are so seriously handicapped as to be home-bound, are being sent work-kits so that they can perform a part of the process in our garment manufacturing and are able to earn a considerable amount of money. Now, if the hon. members of the Opposition are not concerned about this, then Ottawa is. The Federal Minister of Health and Welfare visited my office over two years ago to discuss with me the problem of physically handicapped persons, and he promised to call a Dominion-Provincial conference. It has been a long time in convening but it is being held this year, and I do hope that something worthwhile comes out of that conference.

I would like to deal also with another type of handicapped persons, I refer to the socially handicapped people, the Metis people of this province. I know many of them; I lived in the Qu'Appelle Valley for a period of twelve years and had the opportunity of getting to know them; I had many of their children go to my school. There were many fine people among them, people with pride in their ancestral origin. They sprang, for the most part, from good stock, too: on the paternal side from the couriers du bois, from the early Scots, the adventurous type of people, and from the native Indian women who possess many desirable attributes. In 1874, when Western Canada was taken over from the Indians by the Federal Government, the Metis refused to go on reservations. They were too proud; they did not wish to become the wards of the Federal Government, and so they remained outside the reservations. But in 1898 (I think it was), scrips were granted in the amount of over a million acres — to the Metis of Alberta and Saskatchewan. Now it is too bad that this was done in the way it was done. The Metis people of that time were hunters and trappers and messengers and scouts, and took care of transportation. They lived by trapping, hunting and fishing and so on. They were not farmers in any sense of the word. They did not want to go farming. They were not trained in farming. But the Federal Government gave them each a half-section in scrip, and then the predators in this province and Alberta started to take over the land from the Metis and they followed the commissions around like birds of prey, taking the land away from the Metis, as quickly as they got it, for a bottle of whiskey, a horse, a song. That is how these predators took away from the Metis of this Western country the scrip that had been granted to them by the Federal Government. That was free enterprise, you know, in its most virulent form, and I do suggest that these people who exploited the Metis in the past formed the hard core of the Liberal Party of this province.

Mr. Tucker: — Fond of slander aren't you?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — No I'm not, I am quoting facts because I lived where I could observe the facts. The only time that I have noticed the Liberal Government take any interest in the Metis people in this province in the past was just before election, when they took

March 3, 1950

whiskey and cheap wine into those communities and ‘bought’ their votes – and then the hon. member from Melville across the way has the audacity to send me a letter a day or so ago:

“Would you be kind enough to let me have your reply advising me what are the intentions of the Government with respect to relieving the municipalities of the Metis problem.”

And yet in the House, yesterday, he was the one who condemned the Government and the municipalities for attempting to do anything whatsoever for the Metis. I greatly regret the condition of a great number of Metis people in this province. I feel extremely sorry for them. I had hoped that we could include on the agenda of the Dominion-Provincial conference on handicapped persons, the Metis problems, but to date that has been refused. They had been exploited by the whites in this province for political purposes, and the greatest offenders in that regard have been the Liberals in this province. We have done what we could. At Green Lake, we have the children’s shelter which is housing at the present time some 47 Metis children. These are children who, in the past, were neglected, and certainly the past government or any Liberal Government did not start the project we have at Green Lake. All the buildings were built entirely by this Government and started in 1944. And in the past the children of that North Country, the Metis children, were neglected. They suffered from disease. They suffered from malnutrition. And the only means the Liberals had of solving that problem was to let them die. The infant mortality among the Metis children of Northern Saskatchewan was a disgrace in any civilized country in the world.

And now the hon. member from Melville has something to say about the treatment that the Metis were receiving in the North Country under this Government. Well, now, strangely enough, I just picked up this letter which was on my desk as I came into the Chamber, today. This is from the Battleford Presbytery of the United Church of Canada, and is dated February 28th, so that I just received it. This is what it says:

“Dear Mr. Sturdy:

At a recent session of the Battleford Presbytery, Rev. Robert Hall, Superintendent of Missions for northern Saskatchewan reported on an airplane trip taken to Green Lake for the opening of a newly-erected shelter for children of Metis families. Mr. Hall was high in his praise for the work done for these folk long neglected by Governments of Saskatchewan. Mr. Hall told of the fine work being done in school and hospital, commending the Welfare Department for the efforts being put forth on behalf of these children.

After his report the Battleford Presbytery passed a vote of appreciation and instructed the secretary to forward a letter of appreciation and commendation to you and the

Welfare Department. The Presbytery is interested in the work that you are doing and urge that it be maintained at the highest degree of efficiency possible.”

Now who is this House to believe: the hon. member for Melville or the Battleford Presbytery and the Rev. Robert Hall?

The Green Lake project, under the Department of Municipal Affairs, is a very fine experiment and it has lifted approximately 700 Metis out of relief until they are now self-supporting. They have employment in fishing and trapping and lumbering and so on. They have farms that have been brushed and the settlement is a very fine one indeed. And because the settlement was doing so well it was decided to transfer 100 poor unfortunate Metis from R.M. No. 247, last year. This was done at the request of the municipality and done at the request, by resolution, of the Rural Municipal Association, who have asked this Government, as they undoubtedly asked previous Governments, to find land and new settlements for these Metis who were crowded into areas of the province where they could not possibly earn a living. Well, we transferred 100 of them, approximately, to Green Lake. Unfortunately there are only 36 who stayed. A great number of them left; they only remained there a very short time. They were given 40 acres of the land there and an additional 40 acres if requested. They were given lumber and glassware and so on for the construction of their homes. They were taken up in June so that they would have the whole summer in which to build their homes. But there are Liberal cells of sabotaging in this province that I think the people of this province should know about, and deliberate efforts were made to persuade those unfortunate people to leave Green Lake. One merchant in Lestock, I am told under very good authority, possibly because he had been cashing their relief orders for the past fifteen years wanted them back to Lestock, wanted them back to ‘Little Chicago’, living on the road allowance, and inducements were made by others to have them come back. But I will say that even some of those unfortunate Metis who did leave Green Lake have since made application to return to the project, and if the exploiters and the saboteurs will keep their fingers out of this project and out of what we are trying to do on behalf of the Metis, I think that we can accomplish very considerable. We talk about Communist cells in this province; there are Liberals cells sabotaging social work, health, larger units and advancement that is being attempted by this Government in this province; and let me tell you that people in this province are beginning to resent that sort of thing and you will hear about it come the next election – I am quite confident of that. We have the Metis farm at Lebret which is supporting 70 Metis at a good standard of living; their children are going to school, and we hope to be able to extend that farm to take care of additional Metis people.

In education, the degree of illiteracy among the Metis people has been very high. At Crescent Lake in the hon. member from Yorkton’s constituency, the people in that area, so depraved had the Metis become, so poverty-stricken and altogether diseased in many respects, would not permit them to attend this ‘white’ schools, It was a sad commentary, and illiteracy prevailed. A school was built there a couple of years ago. It has not been increased to two rooms at which sixty-six Metis children are in attendance. We are very

March 3, 1950

fortunate in having a teacher there in charge who is doing a marvelous job in helping to rehabilitate and educate the Metis in that area. We have a new school at Duck Lake, at Glen Mary and elsewhere. We are anxious to help, to do what we can, to promote the welfare of the Metis people of this province, but when we are subjected to the sabotaging that is going on it is very difficult indeed. Some of this sabotage comes from certain self-styled leaders of the Metis themselves. I have in mind Joe LaRoque from Lebret, whom I have known for many many years, and he is and has been, as long as I can remember, participating in the patronage of the Liberal Party either in the province or Dominion. At the present time he is one of 'Jim' Gardiner's engineers under the P.F.R.A. He rides around in a good car inspecting dugouts and that sort of thing. As for being an agriculturist, he knows about as much about agriculture as my foot knows about astronomy; and yet he is employed as an agricultural expert under P.F.R.A. He is the political Adonis of the Metis people in that area of the province.

I would like to continue to point out what this Department has done in Veteran Land Settlement. We have not settled over 1,800 veterans on provincial Crown land, on approximately 600,000 acres. That is the best job that has been done by any Provincial Government in the Dominion of Canada. As a matter of fact this Government has settled more veterans on land than have any three Provincial Governments in the Dominion of Canada. I want to say that these veterans are getting along well in contrast to the 14,000 veterans after the first World War who lost their land under the Soldiers Settlement Board, and 3,000 of whom have not got their titles to their land yet, after thirty years of settlement.

I want to mention something of the eight veterans' co-operative farms comprising ninety-five veterans' families. They have 18,800 acres of land under cultivation. There are more of these co-operatives in the process of organization. They are doing an excellent job, in spite again, of the opposition that was placed in the way of organizing, or permitting these veterans to organize, co-operative farms in this province. The 'Farm and Ranch Review', I understand, (is not that under the Sifton press?) Well, at any rate, it isn't very friendly towards this Government; but this is what the Farm and Ranch Review has to say:

"The co-operative farms in Saskatchewan deserve a good deal more in the way of encouragement than they are getting from the Income Tax Department."

I wish the Opposition would make up their minds as to what these farms are – one calls them communal, another calls them collective; but the Income Tax Revenue people call them "Corporations", and they not only tax these members of the co-operative farms as individual workers on the farms but they tax the farm as a corporation. Everything has been done that can be done to discourage the development of co-operative farms in this province, and yet I assure the Opposition that they are going ahead and they are going to flourish. Quoting again from the 'Farm and Ranch Review':

“What is important is that the co-operative farms represent the most constructive step that has yet been taken by any prairie Government to solve the vexing problem of populating our land. The high capital cost of land and equipment is the greatest single deterrent to young men who want to get their living from the soil. It is driving thousands of our farm boys into towns and cities to work for wages. Unless some means can be found to enable young men whose capital consists only of their strength and their character to go farming, there is disaster ahead for the west. To us, what matters is not the political colours of Government, but the efforts being made to tackle this problem. The C.C.F. Government of Saskatchewan does not normally rate our cheering approval, but it at least has done something to try to stem the tide towards corporation farming. It is surely entitled to full marks for its effort. It is surely commonsense for the Dominion Income Tax Department to reverse the legalistic position it has taken and end the discrimination against co-operative farms.”

I would like to mention something that this Government has done with respect to housing. We have provided over 700 housing units, intended largely for veterans, at a cost to the Government of \$800,000. We have these housing projects in many communities in this province that were refused housing by Ottawa; such communities as Melfort (the hon. member from Melfort will know the type of housing to which I refer), Assiniboia and Estevan and so on. You know, the only Provincial Government, with the possible exception of Nova Scotia, that has done anything in the housing has been this Government, and yet the only comment that we have ever received from the ‘Leader-Post’ was when the odd bedbug turned up in one of our apartments. Now I cannot prevent the Liberals from getting into places; they are to be found everywhere in the province, and, really, Mr. Speaker, I have this historical authority to back up my suspicions. The hon. gentleman whose statue stands on your right, Sir, is Sir John A. Macdonald. The Opposition may laugh – I see the member for Qu’Appelle-Wolseley is out of his seat; but it appears that Sir John was visiting his constituency, the end of the steel, at Indian Head, and he stopped overnight at the old Royal Hotel (some of you will probably remember it), and he found a few bedbugs, some vermin in his bed, and he was quite incensed about it. He reported to the proprietor, next morning, and the proprietor himself became incensed. He said, “I want you to understand, Sir John, that Sir Wilfred Laurier slept in that room, and what is good enough for him is good enough for you.” Sir John replied, “I have no objection to sleeping in a bed occupied by Sir Wilfred Laurier, but I do object to sleeping with the whole damned Liberal Party.” Again, the sabotaging that goes on in this province is terrific, and any time I want a writeup about the housing under my Department I can get it from the ‘Leader-Post’ if I can only turn up the odd bedbug.

Well, another housing project that we are very proud of is the University Housing project. It has provided for over 500 University veterans and their families during the time they were attending University; and not only were they provided with suites, but there was a dining-room

March 3, 1950

and kitchen as well as other facilities. This project has done an excellent job in providing housing and enabling veterans to live with their families during the time they were attending University.

Then on new housing proposals, that is one on the basis of 75 per cent by the Federal Government, 25 per cent by the Provincial Government. The Federal Government has considered housing to be its responsibility during and since the war, but now it would appear that it wishes to shift a part of this responsibility on the Provinces, and the Provinces are, naturally, a bit leery. We have had so many responsibilities that are Federal in nature shifted on the provinces that no wonder we are somewhat leery. I could name you twenty nations across the world that consider housing to be one central government's responsibility; but here it appears that it is to be a shared proposition. This shifting of responsibility to Provinces as in unemployment, in the Trans-Canada highway, in health, in the South Saskatchewan River irrigation development and so on, that have been promised as national responsibilities, may impose so great a burden of cost on the Provinces that they cannot bear them. It should be remember, too, that the Federal Government will have taken out of this province, last year, \$150,000,000 in taxes of all sorts direct and indirect, and I would like to know just how much of that \$150,000,000 we are getting back. However, we hope that we will be able to make an agreement with Ottawa respecting housing. It is greatly needed in this province; but we do feel that requiring the provincial governments to shoulder the responsibility of 25 per cent of the cost is going probably further than certainly the poorer provinces can possibly afford to go.

I would like to deal briefly with our Correction Branch. I notice in the Archambault Report that there are approximately 50,000 Canadian people committed to gaols and to corrective institutions, each year. Now, when we consider that the cost to the country of a habitual criminal is \$25,000, you can imagine the terrific cost of crime in the Dominion and in this province. According to the same report, from seventy to eighty per cent of the inmates of the penitentiary and goals are recidivists; they keep recurring as inmates, being recommitted time after time. In the past, it has meant that our whole emphasis has been placed on punishment and not on correction. These unfortunate people who end up in our industrial schools, in our gaols, are people whom the homes have failed, the schools have failed, the churches have failed, and society itself has failed. We hope, through a scientific plan and programme of correction, that a great number of these unfortunate people can be successfully rehabilitated into society. Now, if our people are physically ill they go to hospital; not all of them are cured, but certainly a great majority. If they are mentally ill they go to our mental health clinics or to our mental hospitals, and many of them are cured, more now than ever before. It was not long ago in this province that it was considered a horrible fate to been sent to a mental institution and now those mental institutions have so improved that ten per cent of the people who go into those institutions go in on a voluntary basis. That speaks well for the curative programme that prevails in our mental institutions. Where people are socially ill to the extent that they commit crimes against society, they are sent to gaols. In the past, they were shut up in gaol and nothing was done on their behalf, no training given to them, no trades taught. They were left there without any scientific care or treatment whatsoever, with the result that they became embittered or

confirmed criminals. That is why, throughout the length and breadth of Canada, 80 per cent of these people come back into the gaols on more than one sentence.

Well, I notice the time is getting on, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with this at greater length; but I would point out that we have a programme that has caused comment across the Dominion of Canada. Here is a statement emanating from Ottawa from the Bureau of Statistics:

“The Crime Rate down in Saskatchewan: The ugly tentacles of crime reached out and embraced other peoples in the prairies, but in Saskatchewan they enjoyed a substantial drop.”

Crime was more active in Alberta: it gives an increase of the number of cases there, but there was a drop of nearly 80 cases recorded in Saskatchewan. In Alberta there are 570 in their gaols; they are overcrowded. In this province we have 250. The reason for the difference is that we have inaugurated a system of parolement and probation; we do not send first offenders to gaol, but they are given suspended sentence under careful supervision. Our gaol population in this province has decreased to the point that we were able to close down one of our gaols, last year, much to the disappointment of the hon. member for Moosomin, who has been asking questions about it ever since. I don't know what his particular interest in maintaining another provincial gaol is, unless it will come in handy some day. Here is another statement from Ottawa: “Canada's penitentiary population increasing since the end of the war;” but here in Saskatchewan it is decreasing.

I think that the wisdom of the correction programme of this province has been well demonstrated in the fact that our gaol population has been kept down, while elsewhere in Canada new gaols are being built – in Collins Bay, Ontario, and Oakalla, British Columbia – and, as I have told you, there are 570 in the gaols in Alberta and only 250 here. Here is a statement by Mr. Edmondson, president of the Canadian Penal Association: “Saskatchewan leads the provinces in penal reform” and so on.

I would like to deal briefly with Child Welfare because that is one of the most important divisions of the Department of Social Welfare. There are four divisions under Child Welfare: the Family division, where children coming from neglected unfortunate homes, or where children are left without parents or where they are subjected to mistreatment or where marital difficulties exist in the home or through serious illness of the parents' children are brought into our Department and become wards of the Government. Then there are the cases of unmarried mothers and the services that are being given to them in attempting, and in the majority of cases succeeding, in having the children remain with the mother and homes being established for them. The Child Welfare division takes care of securing foster homes for approximately 2,000 foster children. In regard to foster homes at the present time I would say that the great majority of foster homes in this province are doing a wonderful job and rendering a wonderful service. These unfortunate children are placed in the homes where they are given natural home life and the parents are giving them every

March 3, 1950

opportunity to grow up normally in a happy, well-adjusted family unit. I dropped in to such a home, the other night, just outside of Regina in Churchill Downs, where four of our children are being taken care of in a foster home. The father was a young veteran of the past war, and the degree of happiness and comfort and stability and security which existed in that foster home was gratifying indeed, and the four children that were there are growing up naturally in a very fine home. I would like to pay this tribute to the foster homes of this province. In cases where children have disease, difficult cases of maladjustment, problem children, they are taken into our Child Care institutions of which we have four in the province.

I would like to speak of the work of the Adoption Division; the scientific care that is now used in the placement of children for adoption in contrast to haphazard method that existed a very few years ago. Now the background of the child is studied, his physical development; the child is given mental testing; there is a full study made of the proposed parents and the home. The personalities of the parents are taken into consideration, and their motive for adopting children. Sometimes, you know, parents who have marital difficulties think that if they had a child in the home their marital difficulties will disappear. Then there is a careful matching or selection so that the child which is being adopted will conform to many of the characteristics of the adopting parents. I wish to say that, in respect to the adoptions of the last few years, very few of them indeed have been unfortunate. There has been a most gratifying high percentage of successful adoptions here. Under Child Welfare of 1944, only \$175,000 was paid out in this whole field of child welfare; during the past year, \$556,000 was paid for this service.

I see, Mr. Speaker, that the time is getting on. I have spoken much longer than ever have before in this House. I am sorry that I have not had the opportunity of completing an explanation of the work that has been done in my Department, but I take very great pride in it, and take pride in the people of my Department who are working with me. I shall support the motion.

The question being put on the Motion of Mr. Wellbelove for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne, it was agreed to, on division, by 29 votes against 17.

The Assembly adjourned at 6:00 o'clock p.m.