

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Eleventh Legislature**  
**25th Day**

**Wednesday, March 22, 1950.**

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

**ON ORDERS OF THE DAY**

**Hon. T.J. Bentley (Minister of Public Health):** — This morning's 'Leader-Post' reports me as supporting the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Arm River, yesterday. I will read the paragraph — the 'Leader-Post' says:

“Mr. Bentley said the amendment met with his approval and he advised every member to support it.”

This is an error in reporting, Mr. Speaker, and the 'Leader-Post' and I have been in touch with each other and they will correct this statement in this afternoon's and tomorrow morning's edition.

**BUDGET DEBATE**

The House resumed from Tuesday, March 21, 1950, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer); that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair. (The Assembly to go into Committee of Supply).

**Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour):** — Mr. Speaker, seeing that this is the first time I have officially spoken in this House, I would like to add my regrets to those already expressed here in regard to the passing of the two members who were with us just a year ago. Mr. Prince of The Battlefords and Mr. Murray of Gull Lake — and to extend to their families my deepest sympathy. Naturally, I knew Mr. Murray the better of the two, although I have heard Mr. Prince spoken of very well by members on both sides of this House; Mr. Murray having relatives in this city whom I was well acquainted with — I, perhaps, might mention the fact that one of nephews was a survivor of the sinking of the Corvette 'Regina' in 1943. They are a very fine family.

I would like too, to congratulate the three new members, and want especially to mention the fact that their maiden speeches in this House were all excellent. I want to mention now the speeches of the Provincial Treasurer and the member from Gravelbourg. They were both very good and expressed the points of view, as far as Government and Opposition are concerned, on the Budget. We could not help but notice, Mr. Speaker, that they both blossomed out in new suits when they made their speeches; possibly they are preparing for television or something of that kind, or perhaps they were just trying to beat the three per cent tax.

Now, just before I get into my speech, there has been some talk here — not for the last week or two — concerning the election campaign in England, and I have a copy here of the 'Daily Mirror' dated

**March 22, 1950**

February 23rd. It is quite a Conservative paper (with a small 'c'), but had supported Labour in England consistently in the last five years. Now this was printed the day before the election, and I have a statement here of the policy of that paper which, I think, will be of interest to this House, and I will read it:

“WHERE WE STAND: The Daily Mirror supports the Labour Party at the general election. We have made this decision after full and careful consideration of the claims of all the Parties. This has convinced us that the Labour Party's plan for recovery is needed for the safety of Britain as a whole. This is a critical moment in our history, and the world. It is not a time for starting to dither and go backwards. We must go forward, determined to make secure the future of our great country. Economic difficulties are bound to be ahead. We believe that the Labour Party is the only one which can deal with them.

**We support the Labour Party because it has kept its promises and earned our trust. Its policy has been one of fairness and humanity; we believe it is the only policy that can work. We must go forward with the people because in these days it is absolutely impossible to go forward without them.”**

Now that is what was said a month ago in Great Britain, by a paper that we possibly would not think would back the Labour Party — the ‘Daily Mirror and Sunday Pictorial’.

I am going to speak mostly on my Department, this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, and possibly I might say to our friends in the fourth estate that to save them the trouble I have divided up the percentages; perhaps I will be two per cent outside of the North American continent, 10 per cent outside of this province, and the other 88 per cent in the province of Saskatchewan, which, of course, will include the report of my own Department.

Now, the nerve centre of the Department of Labour might be said to be contained in three Acts — The Minimum Wage Act, The Hours of Work Act, and The Annual Holidays Act. We have other important legislation, of course — The Trade Union Act, One Day's Rest in Seven Act, The Workmen's Compensation Act, and so forth. The one I mentioned first, however, are the Acts that deal largely with the lower-paid employees and those who are, perhaps, not very well represented as far as unions are concerned.

During the past year, the Department has made 5,995 inspections and collected the amount of \$36,956 for 1,632 employees. I might just read some figures here, breaking it down this way: The Minimum Wage Act — \$26,027 was collected for 1,061 people; The Annual Holidays Act — \$10,161 was collected for 573 people. The totals that I have just mentioned. It is interesting to compare the figures, Mr. Speaker of one year ago, which were a lot larger — almost twice as great as a matter of fact. The total then

was \$83,487 collected for 2,215 people. Now the obvious difference is that the employer in this province is becoming used to our legislation and we find comparatively very few infractions. We hope that the amounts will be less as the years go on. It is not the best indication to be able to get up and say that we collected large amounts of money; we would prefer that those amounts be paid in the usual way and not be found by our inspectors.

In this same period, we found it necessary to prosecute five different groups of firms. I might say we are always reluctant to take that action, and we only do it in cases of defiance of the law or glaring infractions or something of that kind. The most recent case was right in Regina, and I am just going to mention this one case over the air. It was the Assiniboia Club, possibly the last place in the city where you would expect to find an infraction of that kind. It was the caretaker, I believe who had been there for four or five months without any day off, and eventually he asked for one — I think he had been off sick an odd time. When he did ask for a day off, however, the reception he got was “Yes, you can have a day off; you can have lots of days off; in fact you are finished — fired!” When the case came to us, naturally we were quite put out about it, and took the case to court, and the strange part of it is, we lost the case. It turns out there was a loophole in The One Days Rest Act and The Master and Servant Act which will be plugged in a few days, Mr. Speaker; but the loophole was there. The Assiniboia Club, through their lawyer, claimed it was not an industry so that we lost the case — although we won a case and they were fined the full amount (I think it was \$25 and costs) for not keeping proper records.

I am not criticizing individually the board of directors of that Club, because I know that they are considered good employers when in their own particular business and I might even say that one or two — Ian McLennan of Burns, Gordon and men like that — are well thought of by their own employees. But this case it was the secretary, petty and small, and he is the one that got them into the difficulty.

I am just going to mention strikes and man-days lost, for a moment. It is not very large in this province, it is true and even although the situation was fair this year, it was even better than last year and very good in comparison with other parts of Canada. Any time there are strikes, we always see the figures in the paper and there is quite a bit of publicity given such things; but when we stop and consider that the man-days are very few in comparison with, we will say, man-days lost through unemployment or through injury, I will just read off what we have here for the last three years:

1947 — 42,908 man-days lost during that year on account of strikes and most of that was striking packing house industries; Accidents — 133,377 days lost owing to accidents; Unemployment — 1,674,000. So even in 1947, which is the biggest year we have ever had as far as strikes are concerned, it is very small compared to days lost in other ways.

1948 — 12,333 days lost in strikes; Accidents — 145,011; Unemployment — 1½ million, in round numbers.

This year, 1949, very small — 4,574 days lost through

**March 22, 1950**

strikes; Accidents — we have not got that compiled yet; Unemployment — 1,759,000.

So strikes are not a problem in this province, Mr. Speaker, and we are very glad of that fact. We have very few of them.

I am just going to take a moment to mention the railway service. I am glad to see that it has been restored, a week or two ago, after the drastic cuts on account of the shortage of coal. A good many people are rather sceptical that it would ever be restored and thought that the shortage of coal was merely an excuse to take off the service; but the officials have kept their word and that service is back on again. We are all pleased about it and especially the residents of the towns and communities it served and the railway employees who had been put out of work.

Unfortunately for the railways, over a period of twenty or twenty-five years, they have lost a great deal of their traffic to the trucks and buses. There is no need to go into a discussion here as to whose fault it was. Possibly it was the fault of the officials of that day; they didn't keep close enough touch on the trend of traffic. In the United States quite a number of railways did; but in Canada, both the C.N.R. and C.P.R. have lost out to quite an extent and, as a result, practically carry everything in sight in the wintertime while the trucks are able to jack up their tires in the garages and keep them there pretty much all winter, then bring them out in the spring again and take the cream of the business. But they have lost a terrific amount of business, and, as a result, have been after increased freight rates.

I will just take a moment, Mr. Speaker, and mention an idea I have had pertaining to one of the railways, it must be ten years ago or more. It is just this: I believe it is feasible to have much smaller equipment than they have at the present time. We all know the size of their passenger coaches; they weigh from 20 to 30 tons apiece, and often we see them going over their roads with maybe two or three people riding in them. My suggestion was that they take buses, take the wheels off them, put on cast-iron wheels, put them on the rails and they would have a perfect level, smooth roadbed, and they would be able to make good time between the various towns and, I believe, would, sooner or later, put the buses out of business. Perhaps I should not be saying that on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, but I am saying exactly what I think.

Some attempt was made a few years ago to cut down on this obsolete heavy equipment, and they got out some diesel trains. One runs from here to Radville and back every day via Weyburn; but still that, I think is much heavier than is required. I would like to qualify it, however, to the extent that the equipment I suggest would not be possible for trans-Canada runs or anything like that. I am referring to the small branch lines. Someone here, the other day, complained about the fact that there was only one train a month up in his constituency. I think it was the member for Redberry, (Mr. Korchinski). Well, it costs a lot of money to run a steam train up that particular line and back again, and no doubt the traffic does not warrant any more than one trip a month. But with the buses which would, as I said, make good time, and be economical to operate, they could give these lines daily service, maybe twice a day, and it would not cost them nearly as much as hauling this heavy equipment. I think it could be experimented

with, with very little cost and, if it was found successful, more frequent service could be put on.

There is just one more thing I want to mention before I leave railways, Mr. Speaker, and that is the fact they have decided not to grant a reduced rate to exhibition stock coming into our fairs and going back home. I think that is a mistake. Both railways apparently got together and agreed that the stock would be charged full rates. Now it seems to me that is rather a short-sighted policy. As the stock comes in, the farmers and the stock growers have this stock as a competitive interest. They buy fresh new stock to take back, and sell what they have brought in and, as a result, we have a great deal more stock produced in this country, I believe, on account of these winter fairs and the exhibitions we have during the summers. Now, if the railway is going to persist in the full rate, I feel it is going to cut down on the amount of stock moved in for exhibition purposes, and I would suggest that it would even pay them to move it for nothing rather than insist on full rates because, if there is more stock produced here, it means more stock and products and feed and so forth to be moved by the railways, and that also comes into their general revenue.

I am going to mention something for a moment, Mr. Speaker, primarily of interest in the City of Regina and that is the water supply. We are greatly concerned about that. For many years we had lots of water, but over, we'll say, the last ten years — the population of this city has increased from approximately 55,000 people until now it is up over 70,000 people, and accordingly the artesian wells we have north of the city simply cannot supply enough water in the summertime. Ever since I have been in politics here, Mr. Speaker, which goes back a period of ten years now or more, there has been talk of securing the supply from the Saskatchewan River. A thorough and extensive study was made back in 1930, by American engineers, and their reports are still on file at the City Hall. The thought that there would eventually be this shortage is not new and, in this connection, I would just like to take a moment and read a letter to you. I am sure it is going to surprise everybody here. This is to Mr. F.H. Peters, Commissioner of Irrigation in Calgary, and it is from Ottawa.

“Sir:

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 21st of April enclosing your copy of report of Mr. T.A. Murray, C.E., Consulting Engineer of the Saskatchewan Bureau of Public Health, and the proposed scheme of the province to divert one hundred million gallons of water per day from the South Saskatchewan River.

“In view of your letter it has been decided to reserve the quantity of water asked for until further investigation, and feasibility of the scheme has been ascertained. It is noted that you intend to look into the matter personally, and will make mention as to what investigations, if any, should be made by the Department.

Your obedient servant,  
L. Travina.”

**March 22, 1950**

That letter is dated at Ottawa, June 6, 1911. So obviously, this situation has been considered from time to time for almost forty years. We all know where this water eventually must come from, and all that we need to do now is to have the ditch dug, put in the pumping station, piping and so forth, and bring the water to the cities of Regina and Moose Jaw. That is all that needs to be done excepting to find the money, and the amount they expect to need is approximately six million dollars. All municipalities, all governing bodies, whether Federal, provincial or municipal, are faced with that problem sooner or later. Where is the money to come from? Six million dollars is not very much in the budget of senior governments; but it is a lot of money for a comparatively small municipality the size of Regina. The Mayor has indicated that the city could handle approximately one-third of it, and someone has made the suggestion that the Provincial and Federal Governments put up the difference. Well, that would be a simple solution if feasible — and I am referring to the other 800,000 people in the province of Saskatchewan who would not wish to see two million dollars of the Provincial Revenue used for approximately the other 70,000 people.

I am going to go back for a moment to the '70's and the '80s — 1870 and 1880 — back there when this province was being pioneered by the people to whom we owe so much. Now, due to rather arbitrary action, I think on the part of the Federal Government of that day, the capital city was placed right here in Regina, then called Pile O' Bones. Fort Qu'Appelle was the original site, but it for some reason or other was discarded and the capital made right here. I believe the Federal Government must assume some responsibility for the actions taken by the government of that day, whether 70 or 80 years ago, this has now become a problem too great for the citizens of Regina to cope with. Obviously, some help is needed and, at the present time, delegations to Ottawa have made very little headway.

Last summer most of us here will remember the election on the 15th of June. Our Liberal member was put in, by a handful of votes to be sure, but still one of the main points of his platform was that he would assure the citizens of this city of a supply of water. I think the situation is pretty much up to him, and he should make good that promise. There is something else too. We have a fairly active Board of Trade in Regina and I think they should be all-out to get this supply of water for the very industrial life of the city, and it is not good enough for them to say the Provincial Government should put up 2 million dollars. That particular Board of Trade group gets \$14,000 from the City of Regina, every year, to carry on — and I am not complaining about that; but I think it is up to them to put on the pressure the Board of Trade can. It consists of business men, top-flight business men, of this city and I think it is up to them to assist in every way possible to have this project started and finished.

Needless for me to say, the Provincial Government is going to assist in any way it can. We have always taken that attitude, and the Department of Agriculture and our genial Minister has done considerable preliminary and survey work. I would like to see the project proceeded with this year, if possible. We can not go along indefinitely with an inadequate supply. Just as a matter of interest, I believe Regina has the reputation of being the largest city in the world that is not on a lake or a river or ocean or something of that kind. That is not just the best reputation to have; nevertheless, it is true, and the people who live here now are not responsible for it.

I would like to take a minute to mention the high cost of living. Prices seem to continue going right up although they have levelled off somewhat in the last three or four months. The history of this index is rather interesting. It now stands at approximately 162. In January, 1944, it was 119. Two years later, it had only gone up a fraction of a point to 119.7 but then climbed up six points by September of that year and, during the early part of 1947, when controls were taken off, the cost of living started to go up sharply and has continued ever since. Now, it is no explanation to say that labour is asking for increased wages has brought this about. My experience is, all along, that wages usually lag behind, and it is only when the cost of living has gone up to such an extent that the wage-earner has to have more money to support himself and family that another round of wage increases is asked for. I feel the responsibility should not be placed on labour's doorstep continually, as it has been done. I have suggested that if we can not have Federal controls we should have voluntary controls on the part of the manufacturers, the wholesalers, the jobbers, retailers and so forth. I refer to the large concerns because, obviously, the small business man has not got very much to say about it. I also suggest that these large concerns get together and see if they cannot get along with less profit. That is roughly what I mean, and I have had some correspondence with the Secretary of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association along those lines. That is all I am going to say about the cost of living for the moment.

I am going to briefly mention the rental control which this House has had under discussion, the last week or two, and, on behalf of the thousands of wage earners in this province who rent, I want to thank this Government, particularly the Attorney-General, for bringing in this Bill. I want to say that I know the people concerned are grateful for what is being done. We all know that many rents were 'frozen' too low. That is obvious. Everyone in this room knows of cases of that kind; but that can be corrected and will be corrected at the proper time. What we have in mind is fairness to the landlord and a fair rent to be paid by the tenant. We know that difficulties lie ahead and there are many unseen technicalities and circumstances that will arise. We prefer to face these difficulties rather than see many of our citizens suffer a loss of real weight to them, with resulting lowering of living standards through being forced to pay unreasonable rents. It is enough that the wage-earners in this country must spend considerable part of their pay for fuel and to have to pay exorbitant rents in addition.

Generally speaking the Department of Labour has been engaged in the consolidation of its positions and the development of more effective and efficient service to the public with which it is concerned. We have no outstanding legislation in sight for the moment and, as I say, prefer to consolidate what we have done in the last five years.

The outstanding achievement of the Department in the last twelve months is the passage of regulations under The Minimum Wage Act which brought in and covered all towns of 300 population and over. There are 83 of those towns, and we provided the rate of \$18.50 a week for the employees who work in those towns. At the same time, the eight cities and nine larger towns have been raised to \$21.00 a week, and all towns over 300 and over 500 are at the rate of \$18.50.

I am just going to mention labour for a moment as to what actually is "labour"; what does that one word mean? I would say that it is a word used in a collective sense to include all wage-earners, men and

**March 22, 1950**

women, regardless of whether they work in offices, stores, garages, banks, or are school teachers, railway employees, and so forth. The one word "labour" describes them all. Statistics show that approximately 65 per cent of the people in Saskatchewan live on farms; the other 35 per cent, of course live in towns, villages and cities. I think that that is pretty close to what one of the members mentioned, the other day. The farm population remains just about at what it is, but many of the young people from the farms come into our towns and cities, and, in many cases, in a short time are employed and join organizations of one kind and another. Really "labour" in Saskatchewan is the people who come from the farms. I don't see where there need be any distinction at all, because most wage earners have the rural background in the province of Saskatchewan.

I was going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the younger or middle-aged people left the farm and now live in the town or city, and when they go home for the Christmas holiday season, they might mention to their parents and to the other people who might be on the farms, that there should not be this distinction. We are all the same, the farmer and the wage-earner. There should not be any distinction, and there should not be any wedge driven between us either purposely or in some cases accidentally by well-meaning people. As one who has always been a wage-earner himself, I think I can speak for every wage-earner in this province when I say that we are only too anxious to see the folks on the farms get a fair price for what they produce. And I think, on the other hand, the farmers of this province want to see those who work for wages get a fair return for what they do.

At the national convention of the C.C.L., in 1943, a resolution was passed endorsing the C.C.F. as the political arm of the congress and that endorsement has been renewed at each convention since. Now I think the term "political arm" is one as it creates something of a possessive impression which should not be there. This Government is not connected with any congress in a possessive way. They support this Government because this Government has done things for the benefit of the wage-earners in this province. That is the reason why I support it, and I believe the possessive suggestion is entirely erroneous. The Trades and Labour Congress has not made any official gesture of support, but we do know that behind it all most of them do support this Government. It is true that both congresses meet with the Cabinet, every year, and present briefs for things that they think the wage-earner should have. That is no different from any other groups we meet. We meet with the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the Boards of Trade, the Urban Municipalities, Rural Municipalities, Teachers' Federation. They all present similar briefs telling us what they think should be done, and they bring them to the Government to sift through these various recommendations and suggestions and pass legislation or whatever is decided on. I think that is all I will say as far as the congresses are concerned.

The Hours of Work Act was designed to give the employees a reasonable deal as far as wages are concerned, but there is one feature there that we do have difficulty with from time to time, and that is the definition of the word "manager". Obviously, you can not take everyone in a shop or in a factory here and say that the eight hours is up, or the forty-four hours a week is up, you must drop everything and run. Obviously, those who are in charge cannot just do that, and we realize that problem. So anyone in the capacity of a manager is not included, although we don't expect management to take advantage of that fact. But we have on occasion

found that some employers will give certain individuals maybe high-sounding titles, and they continue on doing the same work that they have always done and are kept excessive hours. Well, there is a solution for that. If the management feels these men should be in a managerial capacity, all they have to do is write in and we will decide; but where we find that the employee is really being worked these long hours by being given a high-sounding title, then we insist on the back pay.

The Department also administers the fire commission permits, steam boilers, elevators and hoists and the theatres and public hall permits. The inspections made of boilers, pressure vessels, refrigeration plants, grain elevators, factories, freight elevators, liquefied petroleum gas, amount to a little over 48,000 in the year. No fatalities are reported either in the electric stove or steam boilers for the past year, and we feel that things are under control there — and you may have noticed, Mr. Speaker, that various buildings, not only in this city but in other parts of the province have installed new elevators. The old ones were being worn out and obsolete and on recommendations of our Steam Boilers Branch the owners put in new equipment. I know the public must appreciate this new service.

The Theatres Branch is in the charge of Mr. Vaughan, who acts as censor and administrator. He censors the films. I mentioned that before in this House, and I will not go into detail again. One picture was rejected, last year, and a number of eliminations made. Two pictures were submitted to a Board of Appeal and passed. We have 1030 theatres, and 741 public halls in the province.

A few days ago I was looking over some old speeches that I made, and I came across one made on the 14th of March, 1947, I had almost forgotten. Here is what I said on that day:

“Our pictures are not the only offenders. We have these detective stories, sex magazines, and so forth. We see them in the book stores in various parts of the cities and towns and they are anything but what children should get a hold of.”

I can recall that, in my day, it was the Chicago ‘Blade and Ledger’. This is still in existence I believe, perhaps someone in this House can say for certain. They have become more streamlined now, and I think not anything to be desired; and if there is anything that can be done to keep these out of the province, I think it should be done. I referred of course to these so-called comics; I never saw anything funny about them. But perhaps I ought to join those groups that now take the credit for being the first to think about banning these comics. I see the Federal authorities have done something along that line, just a short time ago. But there is always a certain group, Mr. Speaker, who will do anything for money from the making and peddling of French postcards to the establishing of so-called comics or producing questionable stage plays, pictures, so-called literature; they are all of the same brand. These people care nothing for the harmful results and would wreck the morals of the nation as long as they made money out of it.

I would not feel right if I did not say something in my address about the Workmen’s Compensation Board. They had quite a busy year and have had a little over 12,000 cases reported, I believe. There are some amendments being made; I had intended to mention the two outstanding ones, but I haven’t the time. However, the fund is solvent and no extra assessments

**March 22, 1950**

will be required. I can assure any of the employers who might be listening to me that anything that we are doing is not going to raise the assessment. The Board gets out pamphlets every once in a while, and I have one here dated February, 1950, that I thought was very good. It mentions the most unusual accidents and the most common accidents, and the luckiest person who has had an accident. I mentioned the man who had the most usual accident last year. This is a bit of a subscription with a cartoon over at one side which shows him being carried out. It says:

“Mike is a foreman who in a hurry to get back to the job after a rest period was gulping down a cup of coffee. The coffee was so hot that he choked and dislodged his false teeth. The teeth turned crossways in the gulper’s mouth and cut his lip. Unnerved, Mike fell of his chair, struck his head against the table and cut his ear. It doesn’t pay to take chances even on hot coffee.”

They have a cartoon here which shows them carrying Mike out and the waitress behind the counter is looking very sad about the whole thing.

The most common accident that we have, and I presume it is the same in all provinces, is the man who tries to lift heavy objects with only his arms or his back. Here is what they say about him. They call him George:

“George is a 32-year old warehouseman with several years of experience in warehouse work. One day last August, George was stacking 60 lb. cartons of stock and while bending over to lift one from the floor he felt a pain in his back. The pain to his back, from strain which George sustained, laid him up for three weeks. George might have prevented this injury had he used proper lifting methods, bending his knees and getting down, keeping the back straight and lifting with the stronger leg muscles rather than the weaker back muscles.”

That is all I will say about Workmen’s Compensation, Mr. Chairman, but I do want to say something about fire. Fires seem to happen every few weeks even in a province as sparsely populated as Saskatchewan is; and we have fatalities. The latest was in Kinistino just the other day. The annual convention of the Fire Commission Branches was held in Regina, last May. That is the first time since 1933. We had delegates here from all over Canada and some of the States, and were pleased to be their hosts for the first time in 16 years. Much valuable information is assembled at these conventions, and we were fortunate in securing a Mr. Stevens, from San Francisco, who came here and spoke to the convention and left, I think the same afternoon. He was a very busy man and could not stay any longer. But one statement he made impressed me a great deal as I think it did everybody and this is it:

“We do not have to have fires, and if there is a fire somebody is responsible for it. If there is a loss of life someone is responsible for that, or if the fire spreads someone is responsible.”

We have our Fire Commission Branch here. I think we have eight inspectors, and we have inaugurated a system of having schools, classes,

throughout the summer months and here are some of the places we had them in last year. We had 23 altogether. Our expert instructors go out and they call the local fire brigades together, mostly voluntary brigades, and instruct them on how to fight fire and how to handle the equipment properly, and so forth. Quite a number of places took advantage of this: Radville, Melfort, Rosetown, Mossbank, Quill Lake, Esterhazy, and quite a few others; and if towns want this service if they will write in we will be glad to provide it if we possibly can. Last year (1949), the total number of fires was 1503, with 22 deaths which included 11 men, 4 women and 7 children. The per capita loss was \$3.22. I think someone in this House, someone good at figures, figured out the other night that \$3.03 was the per capita cost of this new three per cent; well, we lost \$3.22 last year as far as fire is concerned. The year before was considerably worse — 36 deaths; 13 men, 11 women and 12 children. So we are improving as far as fatalities are concerned.

I hope the members of this side of the House will pay particular attention to this. The no. 1 cause of fires is smoking; (2) flues and chimneys, and that is the same in every province; (3) stoves, furnaces and smoke pipes. The fourth highest cause for fire in the province of Saskatchewan is electricity; fifth, matches, mostly children playing with matches; sixth, lightning, and that's practically the same all across Canada. The province of Saskatchewan has an excellent record. If I had time, I would like to read something from 'McLeans' magazine, from the issue of last December, which gave the province of Saskatchewan and the province of British Columbia a good deal of credit for the way they have handled the fire problem.

I have enough material here to go on for another hour and a half anyway, but we have more or less to divide the radio time, and it is almost 4 o'clock and I will have to take my seat. But I am just going to make this one comment before I sit down.

I see the member from Gravelbourg is in his seat — and we were quite interested in his very fine address, the other day, of which "Cash in the Bank" might be the title. That would make a very appropriate title, I think. But possibly it could be explained this way as far as the Budget is concerned: When the baby wakes up in the middle of the night, the Government would give him a bottle of milk, I think the Opposition would give him a milk ticket.

Now Mr. Speaker, I think that I have said enough to indicate that I will support the budget.

**March 22, 1950**

**Mr. Harry Gibbs (Swift Current):** — Mr. Speaker, on rising to officially take part in this Budget debate, I would like to join with other members who had preceded me, in passing on my condolences and regrets to the families of the late Mr. Alvin Murray and Mr. Paul Prince. I sincerely concur with members of this House that we have lost two valuable friends and able workers of the province, who did their duties earnestly and conscientiously. The constituency of Mr. Murray and my own of Swift Current adjoin, and naturally Mr. Murray and myself had very much in common. Mr. Prince I knew best as one of the two Liberal members who went along on the trip to Weyburn, last year, when we paid a visit to the mental institution, and I personally found him to be a most genial sort of chap and of a very observant nature.

However, Mr. Speaker, time marches on, and now I would like to congratulate the new members from Cannington, Gull Lake and The Battlefords. Knowing the hon. member for Gull Lake (Hon. T.J. Bentley) personally, I can assure this House they have a worthy member whose qualifications cannot be questioned and one who has the courage of his convictions, and one who will fight for the principles in which he believes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is getting towards the end of the Budget debate. The speakers we have had before have pretty well run me out of ammunition, so I think, this afternoon, I will have to try and, possibly convert the members of the Opposition to Socialism. They might get a great kick out of it — you never can tell.

At this time I would like to congratulate the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Hon. C.M. Fines) on bringing down the budget. True, the budget is the highest in the history of Saskatchewan, but I have always been of the opinion that in advancing progressive measures while we live and exist under the monetary system, we shall have to spend money, and if money is being spent on behalf and for the benefit of the people of our province and for progress and development and all that is provided for the welfare of our people and the province as a whole, then I am greatly gratified.

Now, Sir, since the opening of the present Session of the Legislature, I have listened patiently to the rantings and the ravings of some of my hon. friends the members of the Opposition, and how they have belaboured with castigation the hon. members of this side of the House, and I have yet to hear any one of them come out with any kind of constructive criticism.

To me, their aim has, as always, seemed to be to destroy and condemn, and they seem to be sticking to it religiously. It is quite true, Sir, we are not perfect, and I have yet to see or come in contact with anyone that is; but at least we are trying to build up and construct, under a planned economy, a province and future that will be beneficial to every man, woman and child within our boundaries. That, no doubt, to my Opposition friends will sound somewhat of a paradox, because in their league of private enterprise it is everybody for themselves and the devil take the hindmost. Now the hon. members and the good people of our province — have they forgotten already the dreadful, miserable days of the ‘hungry thirties’ and the depression, when under Liberal administration, thousands of our citizens were unemployed, yes, and going hungry? The youth of our province and of our country were sent out to work in slave camps in this province of ours at 20 cents a day. Have they forgotten when the cream of young labour were travelling this country from stem to gudgeon seeking employment and travelling by the only transportation they could get in those days — the boxcars on the railroads? All they were doing, Mr. Speaker, was looking for and trying to get work in order to give them a decent standard of living and surely, Mr. Speaker, we haven’t forgotten what happened to them here in Regina! I am just bringing up that point, Mr. Speaker, because I do think, after the past election that took place in our province, the people are forgetting those days; they are forgetting the struggle they were in, and it is about time they realized it because, if ever they return a Liberal or Conservative government to this province, I can assure the people of this province they will be back again in those dreadful days which we came through.

And have our farmers, Mr. Speaker, forgotten a few short years ago — 1942 — when they asked the Federal Liberal Government of this Dominion of ours for parity prices on the product which they produced — wheat? Have the people forgotten, and the farmers — yes, and a lot of them voted against this very Government? Have they already forgotten that they took up a public subscription — two bits here, and two bits there, ten cents here and ten cents there — in order to furnish and found a delegation to go and appeal to the ‘big shots’ in Ottawa? Well, did they get their parity price? No, Mr. Speaker, you know they didn’t and I know that we have members in this House, today, who were delegates in that trek to Ottawa.

I know one thing, Mr. Speaker, that when the appeal was made to that friendly Liberal farmers’ Government in Ottawa, every member in the House at the time, including my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition, voted against the farmer and dollar wheat.

**Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of Opposition):** — On a question of privilege. There was no chance to vote for or against dollar wheat. The vote was whether we would raise this price from 70 to 90 cents, and I voted for 90 cents.

**March 22, 1950**

**Mr. Gibbs:** — And, Mr. Speaker, not only that, but the Liberal Government of that time concurred with the manufacturers of farm machinery in raising and taxing the farm machinery at that time. And yet our farmers out here in the west, they still vote Liberal — I can't conceive it at all, Mr. Speaker. You see the manufacturers weren't getting enough lavish banquets so they had to kill a few more fatted calves at the expense of the hard working western farmer. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and also my Liberal friends: who supported these demands of our wheat farmers? I think it is common knowledge and on the record that it was the C.C.F. group in the House of Commons that fought the good fight once again for the farmer and the common man of our country.

So far here, every Opposition member that has spoken has condemned the present Government for spending money, and they have the audacity to say that nothing constructive has been done. I can tell them that the members on this side of the House know that a great deal has been done to improve the lot of our people and the province as a whole. They have the hon. Provincial Treasurer's Budget Speech on their desks, giving them facts and figures. I would advise them to read it conscientiously, and compare the improvements today to what we had when our Liberal friends were in office.

Now, Mr. Speaker, after listening to the address of the hon. Minister of Education (Hon. W.S. Lloyd), the other day — and for my money it was a masterpiece — surely he must have convinced the hon. members across that the ideologies, if any, of Liberalism are obsolete, and it's about time they started putting their thinking and actions on a higher plane.

To avoid repetition, I do not intend to go into detail of the good legislation this Government has put into effect since 1944, because, as I said previously, the Ministers and private members that have spoken from this side of the House have given out figures very very extensively; but it is rather amazing when we find members of the Opposition opposing and objecting to progressive measures. This Government has increased health services; there are more hospitals, air ambulance service, better education, more schools and dormitories, better roads and highways, permanent security for the farmer, better old age pensions, increased mothers' allowances, assisted and introduced Co-op farms for our vets, assisted handicapped persons, provided to a great extent housing for vets, done a lot of prison reform, and publicly-owned enterprises have provided jobs for over 3,000 men and women.

I think I heard, the other day, when the member for Arm River was talking about 'just a handful of people'. Well, after all is said and done, Mr. Speaker, the Crown Corporations and industries are like every other kind of business. You can't expect them to be turning over fabulous profits and returns in a couple of years' time. You wouldn't expect it, even if you homesteaded on the raw prairie and started to break — you don't expect to get rich in one or two years; but no, it doesn't matter, it seems to me that they just have to go out and condemn everything we undertake. I say, my friends, give them a chance! We have only been in office for five years; you folks over there were in office for thirty-five years; but there was never anything entered your minds with regard to

trying to industrialize our province, or even trying to put people to work, so surely we have some credit coming to us as far as that is concerned. I would suggest to my hon. friends, if they would go out into the country and be salesmen for a lot of the industries this Government has put into operation, rather than condemn it for lousy votes, they would be doing something substantial for this province and for the country they live in.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Trade Union Act. My hon. friend, the hon. Minister of Labour who just sat down, told you quite a few things about the trade unions so I am not going into that; but it is the best in the Dominion of Canada and other provinces are starting to follow in our footsteps, whether you like it or not. We never asked them to; but they can see the sensible method of legislation we are bringing in and they are starting to follow in our footsteps so, therefore, we are pioneering, to a great extent, in that kind of business.

And also, Mr. Speaker, we brought down the best Minimum Wage in the Dominion of Canada — the highest wages paid for unskilled labour in the whole of the American continent. Now that is something. I remember a few years ago when my Liberal friends were in office, we all had some idea of what the going standard of minimum wage was at that time — why it was absolutely ridiculous. It was around \$8.00 for girls, \$12.00 for men and what have you, a week. We all know that kind of thing is too small. True, I must admit that since those times wages started to move, but we are keeping in time and in tune with the times and raising wages, to a decent standard of wages on account of that, in order to keep up with the times.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could go on with scores of other improvements which were never dreamt of under past legislation. I ask you, Sir is this doing nothing? The queer part about it is that the Liberals are, both in the House, and on the hustings, knocking and sabotaging all these worthwhile efforts, purely for political expediency. It is about time the people of our province realized and accepted the proof of these most important matters.

Now, once again, some of my friends in the Opposition are throwing their barrage of hate across to this side of the House and I say that hate, the way that it has come up this Session, from some of my hon. friends — some of them, not all of them — is being nothing but fascist hate, pure fascist hate, and when I listened to the hon. member from Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) the other day, throwing that hate across here to the members on this side of the House, I was just trying to size him up. I thought to myself, “Boy, there is a vicious chap”. He must be, he would probably have fit in very nicely with Hitler’s gang — that same guy. Now, I wonder if any of my hon. friends have come through the bitter school of experience when exploitation in this country was rife, when the law of the ruling capitalistic classes was divide and rule — and it is so, today, my friends, and when he tells us on the other side of the House that we are everything that is rotten and bad — well, I want to tell him emphatically that I was brought up a Socialist and I am proud of the fact. I would also point out to him that hundreds of thousands of Socialists have fought and defended our country in time of peril and will do so again if the need arises; but I must emphasize that we Socialists do not advocate war, we believe in

**March 22, 1950**

construction — not destruction. It seems to me, Sir, that my friend has got the war jitters, and he is trying to create mob hysteria. I personally think, at this time, if more and more people were thinking and advocating in terms of peace rather than war, maybe we could impress upon our Governments to take some of the millions of dollars they are spending in materials for destruction and apply them to the field of construction. We all know there is lots of room in that field.

I wonder if my hon. friend over there has ever done any reading of Socialistic works. Sometimes I wonder at the statements they throw over here to us on the Government side of the House. I would just like to refer them to some of the Socialists of another day. We can go back to the Plebeians if you like — the Faebian Society, which preceded the Socialists, good people, every one of them; and, today, over in Great Britain we have a Socialist Labour Government through the efforts of those people and the working-class combines. They are good people, Mr. Speaker. They saw the struggle when they were children. I saw the struggle myself when I was a child in Great Britain and I am going to tell you, under the powers that be in those days, exploitation was rife. Has this gentleman forgotten the child labour laws that were in force those days? Has he forgotten the millions of kids that went to work at twelve years of age? Does he know anything about the girls that had to go in the mines in those days, in order to make a living? I don't think he knows the first thing about it; yet he comes out with "Russia, Russia", Mr. Speaker. Thousands and thousands of people from Great Britain and the British Isles have had to emigrate to this country because they were being exploited, not by the 'Russians', but by the powers that be in those days — the Conservatives and the Liberals. Mind you, they came to this country, and the exploitation there was not under the Russian flag; that was under the Union Jack.

I would like to refer my hon. friends to read some good books. Take the work of Robert Blatchford. I remember reading Blatchford when I was just a school boy — when he wrote "Merrie England", "God and my Neighbour", "Britain for the British"; and the books of Bob Tresall, and then later on Upton Sinclair. I wonder how many of my hon. friends have read those books. Well, you want to get busy and read some of them, and I would advise you to do so, because I am sure it would not only improve your minds but would probably improve a heck of a lot more. I wonder if these men have ever asked the likes of George Lansbury, Sidney Webb and his wife, Arthur Greenwood, and scores of others! They are not Communists, Mr. Speaker. They are all good men and women — no, they are not all dead. They are all good people. I would like to ask the member from Redberry when he cast these reflections over here to this side of the House, does he think that we take our hon. member from Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. J. Wellbelove) to be a bad man, a rotten type of citizen? Would he say that my hon. friends from Lumsden (Mr. W.S. Thair) was a rotten bad man and not fit for decent company? Now then, Mr. Speaker, he may laugh, but the day is coming when these facts will come right home to him and so they should; because I can tell him and also other members: I don't think they have thoughts likewise to the man over there; I can't conceive of them having those thoughts of the member from Redberry, but the hon. members I have just mentioned — the member from Kerrobert-Kindersley and the member

from Lumsden — I can say to this House that I have been in association with them for a number of years and I think they are the most honest, good-living Christians I have ever met in the province of Saskatchewan. You had better get busy over there and get some reading matter into you and do something about it.

I wonder if they ever think of scientific advancement. It seems to me here in this House that they don't want to advance anything. But yet, every day in their lives they can see scientific industrial advancement taking place, and you have never got much of scientific advancement until the socialistic field was opened up. That's right, you never did. And I would suggest to the Liberal Party we see all these changes, they go right on under our eyes, each day and every day. They can see them too, but they do not want to change their political activities of their political stripe. They seem to think that everything else can change but politics. Well, I say it is about time politics changed. We are changing them, and I think it is all for the better, Mr. Speaker.

A couple of years ago, Mr. Speaker, I happened to pick up a paper and I saw a caption in that paper of Socialism and what Socialism is, and that was written by an old lady in Saskatchewan, who had lived here for over 45 years. This is what she had to say, what she thought Socialism was:

“I believe in the full plan of life, the intellectual with the physical, the spiritual and the social. Socialism then, to me, is this. How can I be happy intellectually, physically and spiritually and socially if you are not happy intellectually, physically, spiritually and socially?”

Now that, Mr. Speaker, embodies a great deal of what the common people are thinking and hoping for today. And we are not trying and wanting war and bloodshed on our doorsteps. We wish to live generally in peace and happiness and comfort and without class diversion and surely in a great country like Canada this philosophy can be accomplished if we can get together and oust the bitterness and hatred from our social and political life. I would like to quote a few words of a man who lived a number of years ago who said:

“No men living are more worthy to be trusted than those who toil up from poverty. None less inclined to take or touch that which they have not honestly earned.”

Now those words, Mr. Speaker, were not uttered by Maxim Gorky, or Joe Stalin or Lenin or Tolstoi. Those words came from the great emancipator, Abraham Lincoln. I don't know whether our friends thought he was a Socialist or not. Well, those are the words he uttered. I think it is great Socialist philosophy, don't you? Now, Mr. Speaker, I remember when I was quite a kid reading Carlyle and he described to me very effectively on the one hand of society's start, and this is what he had to say:

**March 22, 1950**

“We have the king in the centre. He rules all. We have the priest on his left. He prays for all. We have the judge on his right. He judges all. We have Tommy Atkins or the soldier on his right flank. They fight for all. And we have the common labouring man on the left flank, who works for all and keeps them all going.”

And that's about it, gentlemen.

I would just like to give you a little story I heard a while ago, Mr. Speaker. You know, we are talking about Socialists and land and one thing and another. Let's add them up in language that I can read. This happened in Lancashire. You see, Mr. Speaker, the working lad in those days, in order to get a bit of shooting of rabbits, ducks or anything, had to go poaching. So this lad is going poaching for rabbits one day on his Lordship's land. So, as mostly happens, here comes his Lordship and he saw this lad, with a couple of rabbits, you know. “Aye”, he says, “My man, my man! What are you doing here poaching rabbits on my land?” So the lad says, “On your land?” “Yes,” he says “on my land.” “Well,” said the lad, “I'll damn well fight you for it!”. We have all fought. There are thousands of us in this Canada of ours who have fought for land. We have fought for the very country we live in and we have been very proud, but that was just a passing effort.

Now, I am going to come, Mr. Speaker, to that topic my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition likes, and that is our good old bridge up at Saskatchewan Landing. I wish to tell the member of this House that that bridge is coming along under construction 100 per cent — it is coming along fine in spite of the Leader of the Opposition when he said in Swift Current a couple of years ago, “Don't put your money in that bridge, folks, because that bridge is obsolete. They'll never build it”, in as many words — he might not have said those exact words. But you see, our Federal Minister of Agriculture, ‘Jimmy’ Gardiner, was talking about building a dam and he tried to divert the audience's attention away from the bridge to the dam. “You won't need a bridge where Jimmy Gardiner is going to build a dam in about 15 or 20 years”, or something like that. But, I'm going to tell you, my friends, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition, come up there this late summer, and you'll be driving over it about September. You'll be driving over that bridge you said couldn't be built.

**Mr. Tucker:** — On a question of privilege: I know my hon. friend wouldn't want to misrepresent what I said. I said, Mr. Speaker, that when that bridge was built and the dam was built, the bridge would be 15 feet under water, and I think that is correct, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Gibbs:** — No, my hon. friend, you always said it was obsolete, too. Well, anyway, when you come up there probably in the late summer, please leave your scissors at home, because I don't think you will have to snip the ribbon. You know, Mr. Speaker, I am going to tell my friends opposite what the Federal Government has done when they were in power in this province with regard to the building of bridges, and what they have done

with the C.C.F. Government as far as building bridges is concerned. I know for fact, that, when the Liberal Government was in power in this province (I'm not going to quote figures or years, but I know it for a fact), they built five bridges over the Saskatchewan River. For three of those bridges the Federal Government put up 90 per cent of the cost, for two the Federal Liberal Government put up 80 per cent of the cost, so that left 10 per cent and 20 per cent for the Provincial Liberal Government to put up. When we entered into that bridge up there, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has not given us one red cent. I think it is a downright shame, and my hon. Friend should be ashamed of that condition. It is the only bridge up there in that western part of the province, and it will be a good bridge, Mr. Speaker, and it is being constructed very good and strong. But when we get that type of condition, and when my hon. Friends over there say that our Liberal friends in Ottawa have been good to us, I have got to say "No, they have not!" They could have done something with that bridge up there if they had wanted to; but no, Sir – they probably would if a Liberal candidate had got in at the election; but he didn't so, therefore, they wouldn't give us a cent.

The same thing applies, Mr. Speaker, when handing out jobs. I have heard some criticism since our hon. friend the Minister of Health has taken his seat in this House, about it being handed out on a platter. Well, that is a matter of opinion; but I would just like to bring you back; don't be like the farmers and a lot of the working people of this province who have forgotten the past. Probably you have forgotten the past, but I just want to refreshen your memory – that, when Gordon Taggart was knocked out by myself in 1944, he was the Minister of Agriculture of this province. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Liberal Government, for services rendered, had to provide a position for Mr. Taggart. They did so, and I might say probably they have improved his position, both financially and everything else, so that was a good move, maybe he did good by it. Then when my hon. friend the Minister of Health, sitting in the present House, a year later, knocked out the Liberal member for Swift Current – Roy Graham, the same thing happened again. Roy Graham, a very efficient, respected lawyer in Swift Current had a good business and a good practice; no doubt he was making a good living – but, no, for services rendered, our Liberal friends at Ottawa had to say "Come on, Roy! We are going to give you a boost"; and they did. Now he is in the big money down there. That is two, and when our hon. friend, who used to sit right where the member from Gravelbourg is sitting was finished – Okay, when he gets too old to work, too old to run – you know, like the old horse – for services rendered, the Liberal Government said, "Here, we will give you a cushy job for life" and they have done just that.

Then, when our genial Opposition Leader comes back from Ottawa and says, "Well, I am going to make this old province go". He is doing his best to make it go, too! They had to do a bit of conniving. He was getting a bit uneasy and shaky too, you know. "All right, I'll give you my statement", said the Leader of the Opposition, and he did, and once again, what happened? That former member got a job for life, for services rendered: he was made a judge. Now, that is pretty good stuff, and I am going to tell the members on that side of the House – oh, yes, there was

**March 22, 1950**

another one – ‘Billy’ Patterson, good old Billy. It was either the old man’s home or just a nice easy job, so he took the soft job. Well, anyway, it is all right and I am going to tell my hon. friends over there and their Liberal friends out in the country that they do not need to worry that our hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, is looking after himself, too, because, Mr. Speaker, he has nothing to lose, nothing to lose whatsoever. You see, now he is the Leader of the Opposition. Okay, he gets a nice little salary, you know. Now, if the election comes around and the Liberals don’t win, well, he can either be probably the Leader of the Opposition – although I think maybe they are doing a bit of trading on my friend from Gravelbourg for that, Mr. Speaker; but it doesn’t matter, he has nothing to lose, because if he misses out as the Premier of this province, they will either make him a judge or he can go to the old man’s home.

**Mr. Tucker:** – I feel a lot better since you have case my horoscope.

**Mr. Gibbs:** – They will give you a good dowry for the rest of your life. So it is “heads I win, tails you lose”. He has nothing to lose and that is the way it goes. So don’t, please, any of you Opposition members ever criticize those persons over here about jobs. I think I have given you enough to think about for a few days anyway.

Now, Mr. Speaker, coming back to just a few words on my own constituency of Swift Current. It is true we have had a crop failure down there, and I am sorry that the farmers are not too well financed up in that part of the country, but for Swift Current city itself, I have very very little to complain about. We have built up there with the help and the assistance of the Provincial Government and the Federal Government, too, as far as that goes (I give credit where it is due), one of the finest composite schools and collegiates in Western Canada. There is no doubt about it; and I would invite any of my hon. friends in the House any time they are in Swift Current to just look that school over. It is really something, and for that I have to thank to a great extent the progressiveness of our educational system and also our Provincial Government. But, as I said, we did get help from the Federal Government also.

I would like to say something about roads – oh, the Minister of Highways has gone out; I wanted him to stay in here a bit. We had a crop failure up there as hon. members know. It is true, as far as the main highway is concerned, they are not too bad, not too bad at all; but I would like to get a little more gravelling done on some of the municipal or secondary roads, and, if it was possible, I was just going to mention to bring in a work-and-wage programme which would be all right, too, to help out these farmers that haven’t had a crop, some of them, for a couple of years. However, I’ll talk with him on the quiet and whisper in his ear; he might take notice. I don’t know whether he will or not.

Now, coming back, Mr. Speaker, to the education and hospitalization tax. I am going to speak only very briefly on that, because I took my stand on that, the other night, and you all know how I feel about it as far as that’s concerned. But if you recall, I did speak of some means of raising money. I am just going to put a suggestion over on one of the

things I spoke about the other night, for the consideration of this Government, or if not the Government, the consideration of the people as a whole in this province. And that is the lotteries I spoke about. I think, as I said the other night, we can raise quite a lot of money in order to take us out of debt and pay off all deficiencies and to even build hospitals. Now I am suggesting to the Government to consider this. If they don't want to consider it, all right, why not let the people of our province consider it? Take it out in the line of a plebiscite, or to the municipal conventions and ask them whether they would rather pay three per cent tax or introduce lotteries for say about four years. I think it would be kind of curious to know how the plebiscite lads undertake that. I believe we would win. I think the people would vote for these lotteries. And that is one way where they would accumulate money without being compulsory. We do it right along, I think pretty near every member in this House – we buy tickets for this, that and the other – it's no use putting our head under our shoulders; we do these things. I do; I buy tickets on pretty near everything that's going. I've never won anything yet. But nevertheless, if something was done of that description and run under the state and government control, I think it would be fine. I just put that to you for a thought and, surely, if other countries can do this sort of thing, and they have as many Christians in other countries as we have here, so there's nothing to be ashamed of as far as that is concerned. If they can do these things and put their hospitals on a good financial standing and basis, then, surely, you and I ought to have the courage to get out and try to do something about it too. Now, I'll just leave that for a thought. You may do something on it and you may not.

I just want to quote for the benefit again of my hon. friend from Redberry, what people thought in days gone by of society as a whole. This is what one chap said – I know you don't know him, but you have heard about him, and you've read some of his stuff. But he said:

“I painfully reflect that in almost every political controversy of the last 50 years the leisured classes, the titled classes, have been wrong. The common people, the toilers, the men of uncommon sense – these have been responsible for nearly all the social reform measured which the world accepts today.”

You know whose 'quote' that is, my friends? He was one of your old pals, 'Billy' Gladstone. So, why don't you follow some of their footsteps and teachings and what they advocate? It reminds me just the same, you have enthusiasm on your side for your Party, just as we have enthusiasm on this side, and it is quite natural but sometimes it goes a little bit too far.

Anyway, I want to tell you another story about enthusiasm. You see, this lad worked in the cotton mills, and, of course, on a Saturday they only worked till noon, and then took in a football match. Well, this lad is quite a poultry fancier, quite enthusiastic about it, so, after the football match on Saturday afternoon, he thought he would take a walk

**March 22, 1950**

around the market in Manchester – and I know that some of you lads who were over there, you know Manchester, all right. This lad went to the market, looking around at the rabbits, guinea pigs, chickens and everything. He finally sees a cage, and he keeps looking at this bird in the cage, and he looked at the other poultry, but he kept going back to this cage. So finally, he said to the proprietor: “Say, lad, how much for that flat-faced cock chicken over there?” The proprietor replied: ‘Flat-faced cock chicken? That isn’t a flat-faced cock chicken, lad. That’s an owl!’ “Oh”, he said, “I don’t give a damn how owl it is; it’s the breed I want.” So, you see, in his enthusiasm he thought this owl was a new breed of poultry and he was going to introduce it, and that is just what I am trying to introduce into some of you fellows – a mixed breed of poultry.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess I have said about enough and, in conclusion, I know that a lot of the speakers, especially on this side of the House, have mentioned international trade. I am not one to go out and condemn and try to get countries of Europe, or even the western hemisphere at loggerheads and at one another’s throats again. I think we have had enough of that kind of stuff. I really do, Mr. Speaker, and I say it conscientiously. We have had enough war in our country. We don’t want to see our children slaughtered and debauched in bloodshed in the battlefields of Europe again. We talk about the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb. Well, those of us who have seen instruments and machines of war, even in our day, know what they can do; but it seems to me that every time we pick up a paper, it has got this war hysteria facing us – talking about this country and that country, and we must prepare for this and prepare for that. Prepare for what? Prepare to be bombed out of existence if we don’t get down to commonsense and some intellectual thinking and do away with these methods of destruction. Let’s do away with warfare and all that it means, and let’s get together and try to live in peace and harmony.

As I said earlier in my speech, I was, as a child, a student of Socialism, and we were never taught to go out and slay our fellowmen and cause destruction, no matter which country it was. We believe in construction, as I have already mentioned; and I think it is a mistaken idea when people in this country and other countries get it into their heads that the Socialists are nothing but rabid executioners. It is about time they settled down and did some really honest-to-God thinking about this matter of peace, and I for one, Mr. Speaker, do believe in peace. I never want to see another war, and I know that my hon. friends on that side of the House and friends on this side of the House, who were in previous conflicts, don’t want to see it. We have to be honest about it. Let us get down to some sane thinking, because I think we should try and take this war hysteria away from the people of our province, rather than putting it on their doorsteps. We know what it means if it ever happens. We don’t want it to happen, and I think we should encourage and put all our forces behind it so that it can’t happen; and if we get intellectual, intelligent people of this world striving for peace, eventually we are going to get that peace which we all long and wish for. So, Mr. Speaker, with those few words in closing, I wish to say that I shall support the Budget.