

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

Thursday, February 15, 1951

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

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Wednesday, February 14, 1951, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Howe for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. L.L. Trippe (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I desire to congratulate the mover of the Address-in-Reply, the hon. member for Kelvington (Mr. Howe), and the seconder, the hon. member for Elrose (Mr. Willis).

I wish also, Sir, at this time, to congratulate the Government for a few things. One thing is the calling of the early Session which was requested by a number of members last year, and I am very glad that they took note of our request in that regard, because very many of the members are farmers and they like to get back to their operations in the early spring before it gets too far advanced with the break-up.

I also wish to make a special comment on the redecoration of this Chamber and the improved lighting, and I am sure that has been of very great help to all of us. We work here a good many hours sometimes, and we like to work under nice conditions. I am sure this Chamber can compare favourably with almost any Chamber in the Dominion.

I also am pleased that the Government has got rid of the super-planner, Mr. George Cadbury. We are not awfully sorry on this side of the House to see him go. We never did know exactly what he came in here for, unless it was to plan the Government into office indefinitely . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The United Nations wanted him.

Mr. Trippe: — Well, as far as that is concerned, they can have him.

I also wish to comment, Mr. Speaker, on the appointment of Mr. Justice Culliton. I am sure that all of us new members, as we came down here, were very much encouraged by Mr. Culliton, and he is going to be missed in this House, I am sure, by all people. But we are going to see that we give you another good man in his place, of the same political calibre and qualifications. They tell me that the country is just bristling with fellows who are anxious to get that nomination, and so I expect when the time is about ripe that we will see each other out there in the hustings, and we will see that we bring the proper message to the people.

February 15, 1951

I am also very sorry, Mr. Speaker, to take note of the absence of the hon. member from Kinistino (Mr. Woods). I have had some communication with him, as other hon. members in this House have, and I can assure all of you, especially his comrades in the forces on any side of the House, that he would be most pleased to hear from any of you. He has ample time to read any thing that you write him. I write to him quite regularly, and just recently he has commented to me on the very good service that he is getting from the Clerk's office. He is getting everything that the members get, and I believe, really, that he has probably more time to digest the material than the rest of us. So, keeping that in mind, I would like to have you boys write to him as often as you can.

I note, Mr. Speaker, that you have made a trip to New Zealand during the last year, under the auspices of the Parliamentary Association, and I hope that, before the Session is over, you will give us a report on what you observed down there. I know, or have heard, that there have been some great changes taking place since 1949, and Mr. Diefenbaker, particularly, has noted a very great change, which he has told the people about throughout the country.

The C.C.F. Party, in this province and federally, seems to be very sorry that nothing has occurred to upset our prosperous times. They know that, in the '30's, those conditions were right to get them in power, and really, one way or another, they have been more or less praying for those conditions to come back again, with the hope of capitalizing on that to see if they could get another swing at the elections; but unfortunately, times have been pretty good. Up in the constituency where I live it would be as bad, or worse than the '30's, if it had not been for the policies of the Federal Government. Surely, they haven't had a paying crop since 1944, and six years going in the hole on the raising of crops does not make for very good farming practise. But, due to the policies of the Federal Government, and due to no policies of this Government, whatsoever, they have been able to get along, and, I may say, just barely able to get along. The Prairie Farm Assistance Act helped them a great deal in cases where they have a crop failure, and they have had quite a few of them. It gives them a chance, at least, to get their seed, and that was the thing that troubled a great many people in years gone by. In certain parts of the province the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act has also been very helpful to the farmers. The Family Allowances pay those people, who are most apt to be poor first, something as a matter of right, more, I believe, in many cases than they ever would be able to get if they were on relief. This is a very good service, I am sure.

The Federal grants to hospitals and health are something that helps keep the community and the way that they are setting up the returned servicemen as they come back has been a real good thing for them and a good thing for the communities where they live.

There has been some talk about redistribution in this province — called by some people redistribution, and by other people a "gerrymander"; and I don't know just how it is going to turn out but we do have an intimation. The hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) shouted across to us, the other day, and told us that it was "all fixed", so expect that he knows about that; but really, if it is going to be done right and above board, my suggestion to the Government would be that they make up a committee of this House to sit on that matter and let us argue the points out and see that the people are kept properly advised as to what is going on.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Did the Liberals ever do that?

Mr. Tucker: — Yes.

Mr. Trippe: — As far as the attitude of the Turtleford constituency is concerned, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't make any difference to us. If you just leave us in the province of Saskatchewan we will get along all right. There is no contest up there except the contest for the Liberal nomination, and that is all there is going to be to that.

Personally, I am something like the Premier: I don't ask to be elected to this Legislature, and probably I have just about as much chance — and I don't have to come in as a private member, either. Probably I have about as much chance there. I don't think the electors have asked either one of us to run yet, so we are probably on even ground as far as that goes.

We will be very interested to see the revision of the 'Regina Manifesto'. We have heard quite a bit about that in this Chamber of late years, and I know that they revised and fixed it up; but we would like to know just how much of the old Marxian doctrine they have cut out, and what they have put in its place. I suppose sometime before the Session is over, we might get a copy of that and then we will know something about the intentions of the Government.

With regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Kelvington (Mr. Howe), the mover of the Address, there are one or two things that I would like to take note of. One of those is his inaccuracy about the payment for wheat. Instead of being \$1.40 when he got his speech ready, I suppose, it has got to be \$1.60 now; but that is a good thing for the farmers. Then, he also made something of the fact that the Britnell-Cronkite-Jacobs report recommended that they tax the farmers some more, and I hope he has spread that message in his constituency properly. I am sure that we will have a Liberal member down there if he does.

He seems to be sorry that some of the leading corporations in this country had good substantial profits; but then you take into consideration the fact of the 60 cent dollar that we hear so much about, and also the fact that replacements are very expensive, and that inventories are very, very expensive. I am sure that most of them are not making too much money. If they are, it is immediately pulled off by the income tax, so I do not think anyone, these days, is making away too much money.

With regard to the five-year pool, this is something that is about as close to none of the business of this House as anything you could find, and I am not going to make very many comments on it. It is the farmers' marketing agency set up at their request, and it is their personal business. If they are satisfied with it, why that is their business, and none of ours. As far as getting a payment on the 'have-regard' clause is concerned, my personal opinion is that we won't get it. We are not dealing with the same class of British Government as we have been used to dealing with in the past. I think those fellows will just keep whatever they can acquire over there, and I don't think we will get very much out of them. But, if the Canadian Government recognizes an obligation to pay something on that, if they feel that they should take up the slack where somebody else has not done it, why, that will be a good thing and we will continue to recommend that in every way possible.

February 15, 1951

Now this year's crop, which is also being marketed under a marketing agency, would be very satisfactory, I believe, if we got a yield. I do not hear the farmers kicking a great deal about the price. With what they are getting and with what they have prospects of getting, and knowing that, this time at least, they are going to get it all, the main complaint seems to be about a low yield — a very low yield and a bad wheat, and that is the case all over the country. So I don't know but what they feel, according to the grades they are getting, that they are getting paid quite well for it.

As far as figuring out a price on the wheat is concerned, as everyone knows, the elevators are full of it now, there is a great deal of it on the farms, threshed and unthreshed, so that nobody really knows yet what our wheat yield will be. I am pleased that the Government has taken it on themselves to make some provision for trying to pay, as close as they can, for this crop. Recognizing that the people are going to be quite hard up, they are doing everything they can to give them all the money they can on this crop before the end of the crop year. Now I hope they won't be accused of making some political capital out of this, because I do not think there is an election very close, and I suppose they will have to go and borrow the money, as they did once before when they made a payment, and I do not know just how that is going to be interpreted by some of the gentlemen opposite.

With this low grade wheat, No. 6 and feed, bringing 87 cents, up in the country where I live — if it is dry; I believe the farmers are well satisfied. With another 20 cents on top of that it is going to be \$1.07, and a great many of them have said to me: "Really, I do not know what they are going to do with this stuff. There is not an animal on the farm that will eat it, and I wonder what they are going to do with it. In fact one fellow told me he had this wheat that weighed 34 lbs. to the bushel. He said he had to drive pretty carefully to town so that it would not blow away on him. So, if they can find some place for this and find some use for it, I believe that that is going to know that this marketing agency is really a very good for marketing the farmers' wheat.

I would like to make a remark or two at this time, Sir, about the natural resources, the oil and minerals in particular. I am not satisfied with the promoters that go around this county and do this promotional business in connection with the oil and minerals. Some of them have secured for themselves a very decent overriding royalty, some kind of a grab that they can get for very little service, and I do not think that should be allowed. I would like to see legislation passed in this House to prohibit such a thing. I would like to see legislation pass that would invalidate any of the leases given under these considerations. All the representations in connection with them should be put in writing, and I would like to see a substantial royalty provided for the owner of land on which these minerals are found. Surely the person who owns this land, even if they do not have the minerals in their right, have some more claim to it than a promoter who goes around the country and just writes them up with some fairy stories about what they might get out of their leases.

Also, it would be good and equitable to supply adequate compensation for trespass, and have some kind of a farmers' body that could pass on this and advise farmers as to what they might be entitled to for trespass rights, in case they do come on there looking for these minerals. Then, having done that, if the Government would remove from their statutes the confiscatory laws that they have there, I believe that investors would have quite a bit of confidence in coming into Saskatchewan in a search for minerals and oil. I know they were put there, and kept there, I think, to appease the left-wing C.C.F.'ers; but while you are doing that you are not gaining very much confidence from the people who have money to invest, and the big oil companies who are liable to find this oil and can afford to lose the money looking for it. Then, if you take, after that, and throw the 'Regina Manifesto' out the window, why you may get some development in the oil business.

I would like to say at this time, Sir, a word or two about education. I have some figures here that were supplied to me and others in answers to questions, and I will refer to them briefly. Education, as, this government has said, is a Provincial responsibility, and I thought they recognized that and that they were not going to pass the buck and one thing and another; but that they accepted that as a Provincial responsibility. But we hear nowadays they are calling for Federal aid, and I do not see where those two ideas coincide.

Really it is not a question of how much money you spend on education; that has been ample, I believe. The question is the quality of education that you supply, and in that regard I am not satisfied at all. I have a table here that shows the supervisors put out in the districts and unfortunately, Sir, they are almost all rural districts. Some of these rural districts have been blessed with these no-teachers for just so long now that it is getting to be ridiculous. What do we find? We hear that education, and I'll say that it is progressive all right; but is it progressive in reverse. On October 1, 1949, we had 335 these "sitters" or supervisors in the school; and on January 1, 1950, this had risen to 418. Well, we naturally expected a little improvement, this year, so we asked the question again this year, and find that on January 31 of this year it has gone up to 497: 355 in 1949, 497 today. Well as an average as to how the units are doing out in the country, I take an average school unit, the only one that is entirely within my constituency of Turtleford. How is the Turtleford Larger Unit doing? Well, on October 1, 1949, the starting of that school year, they had seven. That was surely their full quota and all they needed; but, on the first of January, 1950, they had eight and at the end of January, this year, they have 13, so there is a decided increase there in something that is not very good — from October 1, 1949, 7, to January 31 of this year, 13.

I have heard that some of the school inspectors like these sitters and, if they do, I would suggest that they take them in the cities and send us out a few qualified teachers for some of these schools that haven't had them for a long time.

There is also, Sir, something that still seems to persist, and that is discrimination in the equalization grants as between schools within the larger school units and schools outside of the larger school units. So, this year, we asked the question to see how they were and we got the reply. To make a long story short, we divided this up and find that the equalization grants payable per school district in the larger school units work out at \$540, while in districts not in the larger school unit they work out at \$176; approximately, in round figures, \$540 and \$176. There is too much difference there. I believe these people outside should get just the same consideration as any other class of schools. I had a chance to go around amongst some of them and find they are very poor indeed in the matter of keeping their schools going, and the equalization grant is something that most of them never heard of at all. Now, there is a little variation in those figures. I expect I am going to be told by the Minister of Education that these figures are out, and that there have been some larger school units formed since that was the basis of computation. There have, and I have the figures for that, too, here, but it makes very little material difference. What you add to one you take off from the other, and the ratio comes out a good deal the same.

A few words about the Britnell-Cronkite-Jacobs report that we hear so much about and which is a matter that, I believe, we are properly entitled to discuss in this Chamber. The report is very voluminous, something to me like the Good Book. You can go through it and, according to your ideas, you can get different interpretations or almost anything you want to find. I submit that we looked it over and did try to see if we could be sure that there was going to be something done for the farmers, who are the principal class in this province, and we would very much like to have seen something recognized and going to be done for them. But, unfortunately, we cannot get the Government on record for that, so I suppose we will have to give that up. I know that, after this report was made up, certain groups went out and tried to tell the farmers that they were doing too good and they had not been taxed enough; but my information is that these people got more 'hot-foots' than the outfit that went out telling the Indians about all their troubles.

I absolutely reject the assertion in this report that the farmers are not paying enough taxes. You can arrive at computations by different sets of figures and by comparisons with other provinces or something like that. You may find that the rates by comparison are not as high as some other provinces, but when you consider that large areas of this province have not had a profitable crop for a long time, that is not the proper figure to apply in trying to see whether the farmers pay enough taxes. In the Turtleford constituency, I am going to tell you that it is very hard to pay the taxes, including the Hospital Tax and everything that a person has to pay. And in the 'thirties, when the taxes were only half of what they are now in one municipality that I am thinking about, people lost their land — very, very many of them. There were an awful lot of quarters went for non-payment of taxes and reverted to the municipalities; and even a mild recession with the tax load that they are carrying today, could cause an awful lot of them to lose their farm properties. The school tax, everyone knows, is up materially all over the country that I am acquainted with; the hospital tax costs them more than it did under the municipal

scheme; the Education tax was boosted in this Legislature 50 per cent last year; the gas car tax is the highest it ever was; the car and truck licences are up on the average; the Sanatoria tax is up, and I did hope (and do hope yet) as a relief to the municipalities, this Government will see fit at least to let them collect the Public Revenue tax or something of that nature for their own personal use. The municipalities have got in a position today where they are nothing much more than glorified tax collectors and remitters of the tax they collect. On account of the things that they have to remit, like debentures for hospitals and school taxes and things like that, whether they collect them or not, they sometimes find themselves in a very short position for cash.

Also, I note in this report that it is indefensible that the Crown Corporations do not pay taxes, and a thing that is indefensible should not take three years to right, I would suggest. Surely these Crown Corporations that are in competition with other businesses paying taxes, should pay their own fair share according to the same rates. These figures that we got here, the other day, about the Government property in different places is entirely misleading. We know the Government has property, and we will admit that when that property is for the common good, such as Post Offices and Court Houses and things like that, there is absolutely no use in taxing it. But when you set up a business that is supposed to make money, and you brag about the money it makes in competition with other businesses of a like nature, then I am sure that they should pay their fair share of taxes, or people who are close to them and trying to compete with them in business would not have very much show. I am sure that if there was some concession to some of the labour unions that supply the campaign funds for the C.C.F. Party, they would not have been very long putting them in: They would turn the law upside down, and they would put a political board in to enforce it. But they do not seem to be going to do that for the farmers.

I would like to say just a word or two on the matter that the Premier introduced, in here, the other day, in regard to the attitude of his Party on the war in Korea. Surely that speech will get the support of all the left-wingers in the country, from Uncle Joe down to the little brothers all over the place, and if there are any Socialist-pacifists in the world, that ought to please them. Well, it did please Nelson Clarke, the leader of the Communist Party in this province, because he immediately came out and endorsed it and I know that there are no hard feelings with Mr. Clarke, although he has had a rebuff or two. In the election of 1948 in the constituency of Pelly, he tried to run a candidate up there and did think that these people would give him a little chance to get a man in. He said the only difference between his people and these people in the C.C.F. Party was that they were Socialists on the crawl and his people were Socialists in a hurry. He said that he had helped the Premier out in Weyburn, and thought maybe he would give him a little show in Pelly; but apparently somebody wanted that seat badly, and they could not keep him out so they just ran.

Then, of course, the Red-inspired Peace Council were happy too. They came out in the press, and they are glad that this Government does not want to do anything about Korea, and they have a few people in their organization who are employees of this Government, I understand. And if they want to show good faith to the people, I would suggest that they

put a loyalty test in, and just see who they are and get rid of them.

There are a few things in which the Premier was in error in his speech, and one of them was that General MacArthur crossed the 38th parallel without authority. Surely General MacArthur has been hampered out there by the politicians about as much as any good general ever could have possibly been hampered. If they had let him go ahead, I think he would have had this matter cleaned up long ago. But they stopped him here and they stopped him there and they stopped him at the 38th parallel, and it was some weeks that he held his troops there while the other people got themselves all ready before he advanced. Then, about the matter of giving 'Red' China a seat on the United Nations, forty countries, including the Dominion of Canada, decided that they did not want them; but this Government has more good judgment than those forty nations, so I suppose they know what they are doing. And that they should not brand them as an aggressor. I do not know what they are doing. Our boys are out there fighting them today, and I do not know what we should do, whether we had better say we are going to support those boys or whether we are going to stab them in the back as they are facing the enemy. There is just one thing that we are going to do. The ordinary soldier, when he takes his oath of allegiance, undertakes to honour and obey the orders of His Majesty and of all the generals set over him, and I suggest that we, in civil life, should be prepared to do at least what the soldier will do in our defence. I do not like to see a very good man like MacArthur maligned. I think, as history is written, he will go down as one of our leading generals — one of the world's leading generals.

I think, with those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude, and I shall not support the Motion.

Mr. B.L. Korchinski (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my congratulations to those who have spoken before me, to the members who have already read their speeches.

In 1867, the Fathers of Confederation got together to establish the foundations upon which this great country of ours was to be governed. They divided the responsibilities of government up between the Federal Government and among the various governing bodies of the provinces; and so there was set up the Federal Government at Ottawa, and the provincial governments were to have their own organizations in the various provinces. In the British North America Act it was clearly stated what the various governments had under their jurisdiction, and if you read the British North America Act, you would find very clearly defined the phases and spheres of activity for each government. There are some things that the provincial governments have under their jurisdiction; the things they are supposed to look after and which they are supposed to govern are set out in the Act.

As soon as we came to this Legislature, about two weeks ago, we started a debate that is still going on, and I think that more than one-half of the discussion that has gone on has been on things that are outside of the provincial jurisdiction. I think that the Ministers of the Crown are the greatest offenders in this respect. Beginning with the Premier and down through the list, you will find that they are continually ignoring the provincial

issues and go out into the Federal or international fields. I do not know what the design behind this is, but it seems to me that they either have nothing to say to the people of Saskatchewan, they have nothing to report upon the business of this province, or they are trying to cover up something. I think that there is a design behind this to keep the discussion away from Saskatchewan, take it out anywhere, take it down to Ottawa or to Korea, or any place else, so long as you are not in Saskatchewan.

The hon. Premier had divided his speech into three parts. The first part was about provincial matters, I believe, and then there was a part about Federal affairs about the handling of wheat, and then there was the last dismal part about international affairs.

Mr. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — Dismal is right!

Mr. Korchinski: — Then we had the Minister of Public Health. I expected that he would give a report on his Department, but all we got was a discussion of the Wheat Board, the wheat policy, and things about wheat that happened in 1930 and before that, and from there on till today. I fail to see what connection this has with his Department or what control he exercises over the Wheat Board, or how he proposes to do anything about it.

His speech, and the speeches of some of the other hon. members on the other side remind me of some of the things that you hear about the old cars. Whenever they get up to speak they always remind us of the '30's — the hungry '30's. They have this "1930 mentality" which they have not been able to get over yet. They are just like an old car, a 1930 car — lots of knocks, lots of noise, lots of smoke, lots of stink, but no speed — and no oil.

Whenever you hear them talking about anything but the provincial matters, you will find that the purpose of this talk about anything else but provincial matters is simply to get away from the provincial matters, to cover up what is going on in the province. We are very anxious to hear the reports of the various Departments. I do not know when that is going to happen. Today is the 15th of February and we have not heard anything yet.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs, yesterday, read the report of the Prince Albert Board of Trade. It was a good reading — a little slow, but quite distinct; but I fail to see what that has to do with his Department. There was very little, in his speech, to give us any inkling of what is going on in his Department.

I would like to, now, Mr. Speaker, go into some of the things that were said by the Premier. I have before me a copy of his speech, and I am going to quote extensively from this speech and discuss some of the quotations. I am not going to deal with the first two parts of the speech, but with the last — the one that deals with international affairs.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy (Minister of Social Welfare): — Stay in Saskatchewan!

Mr. Korchinski: — I would like to stay in Saskatchewan, but since our Premier, like opossums takes us out into the trees and all over the

February 15, 1951

place, we have to follow him, and take up the battle wherever he goes; and since we were taken to Korea, we will discuss Korea for a while. I hope, in a later part of my talk, to introduce an amendment to the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, with the hope that this may pin down the Hon. gentleman to provincial affairs; but for now we may as well follow the Premier into Korean affairs.

Now as you know, Sir, there is now in existence what is known as the United Nations of the World. This organization consists of some 60 members from all around the world. Canada is one of those members, the United States is a member, most of the South American countries are members, and I believe that most of the countries that you find on the map are members of this group, with the exception of a few that have not been allowed entrance because they were not able to pass the qualifications for membership. Since this organization was set up, its main purpose, set out in its rules, was to preserve peace in the world. It is the main purpose of this organization. If you had listened to the speech made by the Premier, especially the part that dealt with this particular item, you could have come to the conclusion that throughout the entire portion of that speech, our Premier inferred that there was a possibility that the United Nations forces were being used as the pawn of a nation, or group of nations, which wished to foist discredited dictators on people who did not want them. The impression that I got out of this speech was that our Premier was now criticizing the United Nations, the organization to which we belong.

There was some proposal by him that there should be a 'Third Force' and there was bitter criticism of the activities of the supreme General of the United Nations — MacArthur. Now here are some of the things that were said, and I am quoting from the speech that was made by the Premier:

"First, he criticized us for advocating a Third Force in international affairs, as compared with slavishly following either the Soviet Union on one hand or the United States on the other."

Now those are the words of the Premier. From that we can infer that we are slavishly following the United States or the Soviet Union. It is not considered that the United Nations is a world organization, but as a set-up of two nations, and he considered that Canada slavishly follows (I suppose, in his mind), the United States. By this he tries to undermine the confidence that we have in the United Nations, because in this word 'slavishly' itself, the word 'slavish', means that we have no choice; that it was not the wish of our Government, it was not the will of the people, that we should be a member of the United Nations. We are simply slaves and we are following slavishly, this policy pursued by the United States.

Then, in another place in the same speech, and I quote again:

"My hon. friend wants us to take the position of whatever the United States says, or believes, we must blindly follow."

I have not heard anyone in this country express that position. It seems to me that this was purely an invention of our Premier, that we should

blindly follow what the United States dictates. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that that has been the case in any event. The Premier, further, said:

"While I am not prepared to do that, Mr. Speaker, I have great admiration for the people of the United States. I went to the University in the United States."

That is, he is not prepared to blindly follow the United States. Well, I do not suppose that anybody is prepared to follow blindly the United States. This is not the United States that we are talking about. We are talking about the United Nations, and there should be quite a distinction made. The United States is only one member of the United Nations, out of the 60. We are a member of that great organization also, and we have just as much to say in that organization as has the United States.

There was another idea advanced by the Premier and, listening to his speech, one would come to the conclusion that we are the aggressors, that the Chinese are all right, that the United States and Canada and the United Kingdom and all the members of the United Nations are the aggressors. Here is something that he said in this respect:

"We ought to ask ourselves whether or not we, in the western democracies, have contributed in any way to the present acts of aggression that are taking place on the Manchurian border. We have to stop and ask ourselves — what is it that makes a country like China do some of the things which it does now?"

Well, I can answer the Premier what it is that makes China do what it is doing now. It is the Kremlin! To me it seems that the Premier is not very well posted on world affairs. I believe that, when it comes to world affairs, he appears to be like the 'babe in the woods' — completely lost, because it should be known, and it should be clearly understood that China, today, is under the control of a group of gangsters who were trained by the Soviets. Take the leaders of China today. Mao Tze-Tung, Chou En-lei and all of these men, read about them, and study their history. Who are they? Are they not the people that went to Moscow to get their training? Are they not the people who, during the last war, said and boasted, "We are fighting this war, we are fighting 90 per cent Chiang Kai-Shek and 10 per cent the Japanese"? And right there they were laying the foundation of this conquest of China.

When we talk about China we must distinguish between the gangsters who hold China now in conquest, and the people themselves. We must feel sorry for the people that these unscrupulous men who terrorize with their secret police, with the pattern from Moscow, are delving against American and United Nations' guns. We must have that distinction. We must not criticize the Chinese people, but we have to see and point out to the world who these leaders are. It is the same kind of gangsters that, today, sit in the Kremlin and plan world domination; and we must line ourselves up either against them or with them. I am sure that no country in the world, that no sane person, would say anything, could do anything that would offer these men comfort, would approve of the things that they are doing.

Mr. Tucker: — The Premier does.

Mr. Korchinski: — Reading the speech of our Premier, one would come to the conclusion that the United Nations in some way have contributed to the aggression that is taking place now in Asia. Here is another extract from the same speech:

"We, on the other hand, must ask ourselves whether or not she has had some justification for feeling that under the guise of resisting aggression, MacArthur and certain other elements, particularly the United States, are not seeking to re-impose Chiang Kai-Shek and his discredited regime upon the people of China."

That is to say, that we in the United Nations have been conniving, we have been planning, aggression against China; we have been planning to impose upon China the undesirable Chiang Kai-Shek. Where is there any proof to that? This is a mere assertion. I understand that a person taking part in a debate has to have evidence to his statements. Where is there evidence that the United Nations, consisting of these 60 nations, have planned and aimed to re-impose Chiang Kai-Shek and his discredited regime upon the people of China? Where is this evidence? There has not been a shred of proof or evidence advanced by the Premier. This is simply an assertion which has no proof, and to me it sounds very much as if it was coming from the Cominform. It has the very same character; to discredit certain people.

There is another quotation here that I would like to read now, on this same idea — that the United Nations are the aggressors, and the Chinese are the 'nice boys' with whom we should sympathize:

"What is happening in Asia today is that you are having a great revolution going on. Millions — hundreds of millions of people who have been subjugated and exploited by the white man for centuries and who are now throwing off the yoke."

I want to stress the words "subjugated" and "exploited" and "throwing off the yoke", and by us "whites". That is to say, we have been continuing aggression in Asia for centuries, although, as far as I know it has not been centuries — maybe one century — that the white man has been in Asia.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak (Wadena): — Where in your history?

Mr. Korchinski: — If the Premier would brush up on history, he will find that it is so.

Premier Douglas: — May I ask my hon. friend what date the British entered India?

Mr. Korchinski: — If you wait just a minute I am going to answer all those questions. Just keep your shirt on.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Don't confuse the super-mind.

Mr. Korchinski: — I notice that our Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) is getting jittery about something. I understand that those two soldiers have gone back to Korea.

Premier Douglas: — I notice you are still here.

Mr. Korchinski: — The Premier was asking me some questions on history. I do not think that they are very relevant in this case; but I wanted to discuss this particular statement of his that we have been "exploiting" Asia for centuries, that we "subjugated" and "exploited" the people there, and that now they are "throwing off the yoke". Now it is a wonderful statement; sounds good. But let us examine the statement. Who does he mean? Does he mean the British in India: that they have conquered India, subjugated it, and exploited it for centuries? Very likely, because if it comes to any country that has spent time and money and energy in Asia, it is the United Kingdom.

Premier Douglas: — Took a lot out too.

Mr. Korchinski: — And, as far as I know and as far as we hear, India, today, is still in the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Due to a Labour Government.

Mr. Korchinski: — I notice that our Minister of Social Welfare is starting to speak up. I understand he was in the hospital not very long ago, and I will not take any responsibility for any consequences, so I would suggest that he restrain himself.

As far as I can remember the British were in India for quite a long time, and then, under pressure, they finally left India; but, today, India, as a republic, is still in the British Commonwealth of Nations, as a member — the same as we are today. Now, had they been exploited, as our Premier says, I cannot see why they should still be staying in the fold.

Mr. Tucker: — Of their own free will, too.

Mr. Korchinski: — It was all done by their own free choice and I think that it is an abuse to say that there was exploitation and subjugation done under the Union Jack. I think that is an abuse. I just wish that this great Union Jack could fly over the territories that are under the Soviet Union today. I just wish that those people — the Ukrainians, the Poles, the Hungarians — all these subjugated nations, would be subjugated to that 'severe and terroristic rule of the Union Jack. I would be very pleased. I assure the hon. Premier that the people whom I mentioned would be very pleased to have that opportunity to be under that flag.

Therefore, this statement, Mr. Speaker, that we have been exploiting Asiatics and that we have been subjugating them, holds very little water. This has been talked up and spread all over the world by the Soviets . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Communist propaganda.

Mr. Korchinski: — . . . and I am sure that it was not consciously that the Premier was repeating that statement because I would be sorry to think that he had anything to do with the Communists. I still have great regard for him, and I do not think that he really has anything to do with that bunch of gangsters; but he is just merely repeating something that was said same place else.

Going further about this 'aggressor' attitude towards the United Nations, towards the end of his remarks the Premier said:

"I do not want to see the young men of this country fight a war merely to impose Chiang Kai-Shek on the Chinese people, or to protect the holdings of the Standard Oil Company."

Mr. Tucker: — A shameful statement.

Mr. Korchinski: — The Standard Oil Company and Chiang Kai-Shek tied together! You know these Socialists have a very peculiar mentality.

Premier Douglas: — At least they have some.

Mr. Tucker: — Why don't you use it then?

Mr. Korchinski: — They claim that they are a Christian party, based on democratic principles, and listening to them, one would think that they are really the fellow who wrote the Bible. Now one of the main things in the Christian faith, I think, is "love thy neighbour as thyself"; but they have turned this around and changed it. They say, "hate thy rich neighbour as the devil", because whenever they speak, they never fail to attack the Standard Oil Company, the Imperial Oil Company, the Massey Harris Company, some great vested interest somewhere, and it is a very good thing to say to the people, "You are poor, you are hungry, your stomachs are empty, you are exploited. Look at the big bankers with the big stomachs! Look at those fellows enjoying the juicy salaries! Look at the bloodsuckers, see how they are exploiting you!" That sounds very good — but is it not true that they preach hatred to their rich neighbour? They say, "hate thy rich neighbour like the devil". That seems to be the fundamental belief they hold.

Mr. Tucker: — They tried to get them to go all over the country and search for oil.

Mr. Korchinski: — That is right. They would like to have them come up here and invest their gains so that we could get same oil so that the C.C.F. could prolong themselves in power, because they think (at least that is what was intimated here) that the Liberals are praying that there will be no oil discovered in Saskatchewan. That was, of course, an invention of their socialistic minds; and they hope that if they find oil they will stay in power on and on and on, in Saskatchewan. I wonder what makes them think so! I just wonder where they get that idea that if they discover oil in this province it is going to give them any credit. They are not looking for oil. It is all these different companies that are looking for oil; and if they find oil, I do not think that it will make any difference whether any oil is found or not. There is one thing that I was impressed by — the Premier has been putting over the air and in this House this 'on the verge' idea. We are 'on the verge' of great developments. We have been 'on the verge' for the last six years. On the verge of something! We have, in this province, a Socialist Government which is 'on the verge' of something — it is the government of tomorrow!

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tucker: — "Tomorrow never comes."

Mr. Korchinski: — I am very happy that that gives our friends across the House a little consolation, because they have been very glum for the last few minutes, and I am happy that I have contributed to their cheer a little bit.

Anyway, we are 'on the verge'. I can tell you what we are on the verge of. I can tell the Premier what we are on the verge of. The C.C.F. are on the verge of oblivion. I am sure that that is what is going to take place if there is an election called, whenever it is called.

Coming back to the speech made by our hon. Premier, I would like to deal with some other quotations. In one place he says:

"I don't like the ideology of Franco of Spain, Peron of Argentina, or Salvador of Portugal, or Tito of Yugoslavia, or Stalin of the Soviet Union, but we still seat them."

I do not think that is true. I looked up the members of the United Nations and I failed to find Spain as a member. I do not see how he has seated Franco in the United Nations; and I do not think that we seated Stalin — he is afraid to come out of Russia to United Nations' meetings.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You talk like a two-year old kid.

Mr. Korchinski: — But if you read the story about the organization of the United Nations you will find that Stalin was one of the original members.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You're just telling stories.

Mr. McCormack (Souris-Estevan): — You're telling, stories all the time.

Mr. Korchinski: — I am glad to see that some of my words are taking effect in the Cabinet. They are putting their heads together. The Minister of Education has to give some inspiration to the Minister of Agriculture, because he finds himself in a quandary.

Government Member: — We want to know the score.

Mr. Korchinski: — You want to know the score? The score is this, as far as I can see, that you are against the United Nations. That is what I am trying to tell this House. That is as much as I can gather from the speech by the Premier — that he is against the United Nations. Not only is he against the United Nations, but he also proposes to have something new organized in its place. It says here, and I quote again:

"We," (in the C.C.F., of course) "believe in collective security based on collective action. We believe that, ultimately, there must be . . ."

"Ultimately", Look at that word "ultimately" — there isn't yet! The United Nations is not yet an organization that can do it:

". . . an organization, a world organization of authority to maintain peace."

That is to say that there is not one yet. That is to say that he does not believe, and his party does not believe in the United Nations; but he believes in something "ultimately". I suppose it is something like his "on the verge". He is on the verge of something now, and he is on the verge of something in international affairs, too; that we are going to, ultimately, have something organized that will restore peace in the world.

The most peculiar thing about this speech was that there were quite a few contradictions. Here is a quotation that I would like to discuss again:

"It is true that China has committed an act of aggression by moving into North Korea."

He says it is true, and yet he says that we should not call them aggressors. If it is true that they have committed an act of aggression (and in one place he says that it is true, that they have committed an act of aggression), then his party goes on record saying that we should not support the resolution that brands them as aggressors. I consider that inconsistent and contradictory, and I think that the people of this province would like to know about it too — that in one breath the Premier says that China has committed an act of aggression, and in the next, he goes around organizing a 'third force' which is to tell the Chinese people that "you are not aggressors". Now, how does this thing stand?

Then there is the question of General MacArthur.

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — Are you going to solve that, too?

Mr. Korchinski: — Well, I do not admire our hon. learned friend from Hanley. He is mumbling something; I cannot get what he is saying.

Mr. Tucker: — He always is mumbling something.

Mr. Korchinski: — Well, I would advise him to be patient for a while, I am not going to take too much time. I am going to get through with this very soon. Here is what the Premier said:

"Did the United Nations authorize General MacArthur to cross the 38th parallel? Were the nations consulted?"

Those are questions. The answer is, yes! He did not know it, but that proves that he does not know very much about international affairs, because the answer is "Yes, the United Nations authorized General MacArthur to cross the 38th parallel." The answer is, yes. Were they consulted? Again the answer is, yes. They did not come out to consult our hon. Premier because he has nothing to do with this.

Mr. Lopton (Saltcoats): — That's where they made their mistake!

Mr. Korchinski: — Yes, I think that is where the mistake was made. They should have asked the hon. Premier of Saskatchewan whether they should cross the 38th parallel.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. If you will notice in yesterday's paper, the Prime Minister of Great Britain is complaining that he had not been consulted about the crossing of the 38th parallel.

Mr. Korchinski: — That is about crossing it now.

Premier Douglas: — He was talking about the crossing before, and the same thing is true again. Mr. Speaker, if this hon. gentleman here will stop mumbling — I am wiggling out of nothing. The Hon. gentleman has not proven that, at any time the United Nations, as a body, was ever consulted about the first crossing of the 38th parallel, or the approaching of the Manchurian border, or the turning of the Government of Korea over to Syngman Rhee.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, the Premier has no more right to get up and snipe into that microphone than any of the other members of this House.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I have a right to correct a statement.

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — But not to make a speech.

Mr. Korchinski: — There is no privilege as far as I can see.

Premier Douglas: — If the hon. gentleman will sit down I will be glad to state my question of privilege. Mr. Speaker, no member has the right to question another member's right to rise and correct a statement which is wrong. The hon. gentleman attributed statements to me which are completely incorrect, and I would simply exercise the right, which any member in this House has, to rise and correct a statement which has been wrongly attributed to him.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, the Premier saw that I made statements and I attributed them to him and they were incorrect. I got those from the speech by him which was published by his office. This is a speech "Debate on the Address in Reply, Premier Douglas, February 7, 1951."

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I am not quarrelling with the statements quoted from the manuscript. Those are accurate statements. I am objecting to inferences which my hon. friend has drawn, one of which is that I and the Party I support are opposed to the United Nations. As a matter of fact, I stated that we were in favour of the United Nations, but I claim the right to disagree with certain policies . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Premier Douglas: — My hon. friend's yelling won't make any difference. The little member from Melfort waving his arms does not intimidate me in any shape or form. I propose to raise my question and I have a perfect right to do so.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, I think that the Premier, to put it mildly, is going over the bounds of decency.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

February 15, 1951

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I will ask you to request the hon. member to withdraw that statement.

Mr. Tucker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I would like to know if you are conducting matters in this House or if the Leader of the Opposition is conducting them or the member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff).

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Will the hon. members remain quiet, please. When there are six or eight people speaking at once, I cannot hear. When there is a point of order, point of privilege, or whatever grounds they are rising on, I cannot tell when everyone is up at once. If you will let one member at a time speak I will rule.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. The hon. member said that in rising on a question of privilege I had exceeded the bounds of decency. I ask that that remark be withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: — If the hon. member said that when the Premier was rising on a point of privilege, which every member in this House has the right and the opportunity to do if I have any control at all, then I think the hon. member should withdraw that.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, the Premier has taken up about ten minutes of the speaker's time.

Mr. Speaker: — That is irrelevant to the question. As a matter of fact what is happening in this Chamber is this. There is, it appears to me, determined efforts on the part of some people to interrupt when other members are speaking over the radio, and that applies to both sides of the House, and I hope you will, in future, as I asked you the other day, at least carry on this Legislature in a manner which will give to the people who are listening in, an assurance that this Chamber is conducted in at least a decent manner. If the hon. member did imply improper motives to the hon. member, he should withdraw that statement.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, I cannot just get the point that the Premier is trying to establish. But, as has been said, he is taking up my time. I did not take up any of his time.

Mr. Speaker: — Did the hon. member make the remark that the Premier, in this House, had exceeded the bounds of decency?

Mr. Korchinski: — I do not think I did. I did not get what he imputes to my remark.

Premier Douglas: — My hon. friend said that my conduct exceeded the decency of this House.

Mr. Korchinski: — Now Mr. Speaker, if I have said that, I am sorry, I take it back, if I have said that.

Mr. Speaker: — Will the member who is on his feet continue his speech. Order! There will be an opportunity, before this debate

is over, for anyone to rise in reply. Let us follow out that procedure instead of this cross-firing continually.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that all of my time has been taken up by this mix-up in the House here. I will try to continue my argument. I am trying to establish that the Premier accused the United Nations, or at least he accused the General that is in charge of the United Nations . . .

Mr. Niles L. Buchanan (Notekeu-Willowbunch): — Of what?

Mr. Korchinski: — . . . of crossing the 38th parallel without any authority. I am going to quote again, because they do not believe me:

"Was General MacArthur authorized to go up to the Manchurian border, and to take hydro-electric installations on the Yalu river, that controlled the entire industrial life of Manchuria? No responsible statesman has said that they were consulted.

"Was General MacArthur authorized to turn the Government of not only South Korea but North Korea over to Syngman Rhee?"

Now the first question: was he authorized to cross the parallel and go to the Manchurian border? The answer, as I said, is, yes. On October 4th, there was a resolution adopted and General MacArthur was put in charge of the United Nations forces, and he did what in his mind he found was right. Whether the nations were consulted, each individually, no one has come out and said that they were not. No one has come out and said that they were, with the exception of the United Kingdom. The Rt. Hon. Ernest Bevin stated in the House of Commons that the answers to these questions were, "Yes, the British Government has been consulted."

Mr. Tucker: — How do you like that?

Mr. Korchinski: — Well now, there was some suggestion that instead of arming ourselves to face any eventuality we should take at least one-tenth of the money that we are spending on munitions and send it to China in the form of food, clothing, shoes and so on. As the hon. Premier is probably aware, there is already an agreement on this particular topic, where the various organizations are going to contribute and send aid to the needy countries of Asia. But what point would there be in sending any help today to China, when you may be quite certain that it would fall into the hands of the Communist regime, and instead of using it to help the poor people they would just use it for themselves and their armies, because it is a known fact, today, that something parallel to this happened during the second World War. We are sending aid to Russia. I heard eye-witness reports that the trucks, the jeeps, the clothing, the food, etc., that was sent to Russia, when they arrived in Russia, the "Made in Canada" was taken off and replaced by "Made in Russia" on most of the articles, and that the Soviet regime was using this as a means of propaganda to show how well they were progressing, and they were hiding from their own people all that we were doing to help them. Now that is a known fact, and that is what happened, and I suppose the same thing would happen now if we sent anything to China.

The Chinese people would not know they came from Canada. It would all go to the troops who are fighting our troops. What would be the point in that? I agree that we should help them when they are able to receive our help. I agree we should help India. I agree we should help those people who are not under conquest; but I disagree that we should help a country which is now under a terror rule of Communism, because I do not think that help would achieve its aim. This particular speech by the Premier, in my opinion has done a lot of harm to the cause of freedom. I honestly believe that.

Now I would like to go into some of the background of this whole thing, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will try to make it as brief as possible. I would like to go back to where this whole thing started.

We know that, today, the world is quite definitely divided into two opposing groups. On one side we have the U.S.S.R. with its satellites, and on the other side we can safely say we have the United Nations, because although the U.S.S.R. is a member of the United Nations, for as long as I can remember they have been doing nothing else but obstructing the work of the United Nations. This Communism came to the front in the first World War. It was then, in the first World War, when Russia was collapsing from the results of war and internal corruption, and there were various shades of Socialists working in Russia; and, in the first instance, the Socialists under Kerenski took over the rule; but, as they were not well organized, it did not take very long until the Communists, under Lenin, took over the rule in Russia, from that time on the Communism, as started in Russia in 1917 by Lenin his associates, has been spreading throughout the world.

We would like to take a look at what this particular organization in Russia was, and what it is, because if we want to understand the world situation today, we must understand on what it is actually based. We know that the Bolsheviks in Russia, at the earliest possible time, were able to control most of Russia, and then later on . . .

Mr. Kuziak: — Come back to Saskatchewan!

Mr. Korchinski: — I am coming back to Saskatchewan, later on, don't worry. . . . they embarked upon conquest of the various people that constituted the former Russian territory. Here is something that I would like to quote about the contemporary Russia. This is a quotation from a book called "Communism and Socialism", by Arnold Lund, and it is a book that is to be found in the Legislative Library. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that it was ordered on July 17, 1945, I think, and I had nothing to do with ordering this book, so you cannot blame me for that book being in there. This is what it says, and this refers to the ignorance of the set-up in Russia, especially ignorance by the Anglo-Saxons:

"Ignorance of contemporary Russian history has helped the Soviet to conceal from the world their brutal annihilation of the diverse nationalities which were included in the strange patchwork of pre-war Russia. The Ukrainian had his own language and had less in common with the Russians of Moscow than the Czechs with their Sudeten German. After the Bolsheviks seized power, the Ukraine set up its own government at Kiev, but Lenin, who had repeatedly pronounced in favour of sweeping self-determination for the different nationalities included in the Russian Empire, invaded the

Ukraine and instituted the pitiless reign of terror against the nationalists, and the records show that, in one month, there were as many as 3,879 Ukrainian executions in the year 1920."

That was the average for a month. They subjugated the Ukraine. They conquered the Uzbeks, the Kirghizes, the Turkomans. They conquered some sixteen nationalities, and today, for the purpose of propaganda, they say that this is the United Soviet Socialist Republic, but it is not any union of Republics. It is just one communist State and these so-called Republics are just to blind the world because Ukraine is not a Soviet republic, it is just a republic on paper — on the maps, to deceive the western democracies, because Uzbekistan is no republic because the Byelorussia is no republic. It is all one Communist empire. That should be borne in mind.

Now then, after the first World War, that is what happened. In the inter-war period, at the very earliest time, this consolidation of the Communist forces had been going on in the Soviet Republic, and while the world was in its difficulties in the hard times, the Communists at that time were planning the further extension of their power, because it is quite clear to us, Mr. Speaker, that they will either conquer the world or they will collapse. There is no road back for them. They have to drive ahead or they are finished, and that is the reason for the 'iron curtain'. But is it known to most of the world that this iron curtain has a purpose of keeping the truth and friendship of the rest of the world from the Russian people, that this iron curtain is to hide what is going on in Russia — that today there is an undeclared war going on inside of Russia; that today there are various nationalities fighting the 'underground war' against the Communists to gain their freedom? Is that known? I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that if Russia was a peaceful and organized country there would be no necessity for the iron curtain. I am sure that if this was the case you would have a chance to go and see what is going on in them — anyone would be able to go to Russia and visit this wonderful country; but we can't. We can go to the United States. We can go to Ireland. We can go to India. We can go to almost any part of the world except Russia. The only people that get into Russia today are their 'fellow-travellers' and their possible converts, and their agents — no common people have any intercourse with Russia. They cannot go in there. They cannot write to their friends, if they have any. We do not know what is going on: there is an iron curtain. What is the purpose of this? To keep away the truth from the Russian people; to keep away the truth from us going into Russia, from the rest of the world.

Having conquered these diverse nationalities that were once parts of eastern Europe, as I said, the masters of the Kremlin were planning further conquests, and we all remember the 1939 proceedings. Someday people will be able to distinguish, and to notice and to weigh and judge what happened in that year. And we remember, also, the pact that was signed by Nazi-Germany with Communist Russia. Now what was the purpose of that pact? The design is becoming clearer and clearer today, that the purpose was to plunge the world into war because Communists have the belief that the horrors of war and the chaos existing in war are the things on which they can thrive. Their belief is that if the world is exhausted by fighting and hunger, they can thrive. So their design was to plunge the world into war, and I think that they well succeeded, because they know that if they assured

Hitler that they were not going, to attack him from the back, from the east, that he would likely attack the west and then, while Hitler was fighting the west they would build up their strength, and when the whole world was exhausted they would come over and take over everything.

Of course you know what followed from there on. We knew that while the war was on, while we had the Soviet as our allies, they were plotting and planning against us. I do not suppose that anyone has forgotten about the spy rings that existed in our country, and perhaps exist still today; and, mind you, the information that was obtained during these various trials pointed to the fact that while Russia was supposed to be our ally, Russia was spying, trying to dig up information, trying to plot against this country and against the United States. It is not strange that this was going on, because their supreme aim is world domination.

While there is so much talk of the "discredited" Chiang Kai-Shek, who, by the way, I think, is in some way related to Dr. Sun Yat Sen, who, as far as I remember, had something to do with establishing the Chinese republic and overthrowing the reactionary regime of the Manchu dynasty; this particular Chiang Kai-Shek was somehow related, possibly as a son-in-law, with Dr. Sun Yat Sen, who is the national hero of the Chinese, now is so much discredited. Chiang Kai-Shek was fighting the Japanese. We have not forgotten that part of the history. He was fighting the Northern Chinese warlords, and while this was going on, the Russian Communists were seeping into China. They were training Mao Tze-Tung, and Chu En-lai and these other gentlemen who are in command of Chinese Communists today. The Russians were training them during the war, and, as I said in one part of my speech, this Mao Tze-Tung said, "We are fighting this war against Japan on this basis — 90 per cent Chiang Kai-Shek, and 10 per cent the Japanese." That is, they were more concerned in taking control of China while the opportunities were good than to expel the invader from outside of China.

So, today, we have established in the world a gigantic Communist organization. There is in Europe, the Soviet Republic and its satellites. These satellites have been conquered; they did not join the Soviet Union, as is supposed by some people, of their free will. There is Poland; there is Czechoslovakia; there is Hungary; there is Rumania; there are all these others; and on the eastern side in Asia, the Communist regime now covers most of Asia with the exception of the southern part occupied by India and Indo-China and so on. It is a gigantic set-up, there is no question about it, and today there is the question: is this set-up, this Communist regime, going to spread out to the world, or is it going to be stopped in its tracks? You know the story of the United Nations — that as far as we can see, they have been pushing out; the Communist regime has been pushing out either its satellites or its own agents, further and further in all directions. They are so-called "pressure points", and one of those points was Berlin, where the Communist is pressing, and you know what happened there — the blockade. Another point is facing Yugoslavia. The Communists have come in and would like to get the Communists of Yugoslavia out of the way, because this Communism of Yugoslavia does not see eye to eye with the Communism of Moscow. They are a dangerous spot in the Communist set-up, with the Communists of Moscow, because Stalin and his men feel that there may be some other Titos, who may follow his example. They would like to get Tito out of the way; so there is another pressure point there. There was a pressure point facing Greece and Turkey and Iran. There are now pressure points facing India and Burma and Indo-China and Korea. And when the

attack came on South Korea, the United Nations said, "We have to put a stop to this. We have to come to a decision. We have to stop them sometime. If we do not, this thing will spread further and further," and the final showdown came in Korea. That was the final showdown.

Now, as you notice, the Communists of Russia would like to win wars, but they would not like to fight them themselves. They would like to win the war with somebody else's hands. They would like Hungary or Rumania to attack Tito; they would like the eastern Germans to attack the western Germans; they would like the Chinese and the North Koreans to attack the South Koreans, and perhaps to infiltrate into Japan. They would not like to engage themselves in a war because, I suppose, if they did, the world would recognize where they stand in this picture; so that there is this particular set-up.

One of the most important of the weapons they are using today is propaganda. It is something that the western democracies have not yet realized that they are facing, and how they should combat this particular giant, psychological warfare, that the Russian Communists are carrying out now against the western democracies. If you examine it, it is quite evident. They have a centrally-organized Cominform which accumulates and distributes information to their agents. There is no country on this earth where there is no organization for Communists. In every country, in every free democracy there are Communists. We have them in Canada. We have them in Saskatchewan, we have them in Regina. We may even have them in this particular legislature. They are found in many places, and they masquerade under various names; for example, in Saskatchewan . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member is not wanting to leave the impression that any other hon. member, who is a colleague of each of us in this House, might be an agent of the Cominform. I am sure he is not trying to leave that impression.

Mr. Tucker: — He just said there "may be".

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I understood my hon. friend to say that there might be a member of this Legislature, in this Chamber. If I misunderstood my hon. friend, I am sorry.

Mr. Korchinski: — No, no, I did not say that. There are other people, in this Legislature, outside of members.

Premier Douglas: — But, Mr. Speaker, this Legislature is the membership of this Legislature. The people in the galleries are not the people in the Legislature.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, I did not say there are; I said there may be. We have not found a machine yet to discover what is in people's minds. Shakespeare said in one place that there is no way that anyone can tell what is in a person's mind by looking at his face.

Mr. Speaker: — I did not take it that the hon. member was accusing anyone in the Chamber, particularly . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, my Hon. friend has now clarified exactly what I thought he said, and he is now saying, as I understand

it, that there may be a member in this Legislature who is an agent of the Cominform. He says you cannot tell by looking at people's faces, but it could be. I am sure he does not want to do any damage to the reputation of the members of this Legislature. If any member of this Legislature is to be accused, then he ought to be accused specifically, by a member, and investigated by the members of this House; but surely an insinuation or an innuendo cast out like that could apply to any member, and it could be flashed all across this country. I certainly take very strong exception to it, and I am sure the hon. member would not want to leave the impression which he has left at the present moment.

Mr. Korchinski: — I believe that the statement spread by the Premier is a little far-fetched.

Mr. Speaker: — Would the hon. member repeat what he said? I thought that he did exclude members of the Legislature. What did you say?

Mr. Korchinski: — I cannot remember. I am not reading my speech from any notes, and I cannot remember my exact words; but I do not think that what the Premier is trying to say that I said is so.

Mr. Tucker: — What the Hon. member said, and I followed it very closely, is this: that it is hard to know where you may find the Communists. He said you may find them in all organizations. He said there even may be people who are of that view in this Legislature, or something to that effect. Now then, what he is saying, Mr. Speaker, is that these people have infiltrated and nobody can be sure where they are. He is not saying that they are here or he thinks they are here. He is driving home his point, that you cannot tell where these people are. Now then, surely that is a fair statement and a true statement. I sat in Parliament with a man who turned out to be a spy, and he was a Member of Parliament. He was reporting secret meetings of our House of Commons to Stalin. We did not know that he was a traitor to our country at that time, and surely when the hon. member said these things may happen, he is not out of order.

Mr. Speaker: — I am convinced that the member was not imputing that any member of the Legislature was a communist.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, the Cominform has its agents in all countries. It is waging psychological warfare against the democracies. It is using all possible means to undermine democracies. Now, as I have said, these agents are scattered in various parts of the world, and they employ all kinds of subterfuge, all kinds of modes of propaganda; they go under various names. I do not think that anyone would disagree with me when I say that, in Saskatchewan, we have an agent of the Cominform in the party of the Labour-Progressive Party. All you have to do is follow their various doings and statements — what they say, and what they do. I do not think that anyone would disagree that they are fighting a psychological warfare in all parts of Saskatchewan. I was heartened to see a report in the press, I think it was yesterday or the day before yesterday, of what happened at one of the meetings of some of the unions in the city of Regina, where one elderly gentleman got up and stated his point very definitely — "red rot". You have seen that report. I cannot quote it, as I have not got the report here; but there is a sign that in that union there is somebody waging a psychological warfare against democratic principles. There is someone that is doing work for the Communists. You will find that even in Church organizations; you will find it all over.

We have to take a definite and clear stand on this. We are either going to fight them on their own terms and defeat them on their own terms, or we are going to be defeated. If we win the psychological warfare, if we all realize what this implies, if we fight the Communists wherever they appear with their own propaganda, we can defeat them, and there need not be any fighting war, because, today, there is a war for man's minds on all the fronts. The Communists have been trying to terrorize the world. They blockaded Berlin. They sent a horde of Chinese to Korea, and they have been trying to intimidate, to frighten, to terrorize the world, because when they started their propaganda machine and saw that it was not getting anywhere, that is their second step — to confuse the world.

Now what do we find? We find that the things in Korea, as they are happening now, their agents misrepresent throughout the world. You must have seen, yourself, where they claim that it was the South Koreans that attacked the North Koreans. It was not the South Koreans who committed the act of aggression. They are trying to confuse the thinking in the democracies, because, it is quite plain, you can confuse, you can divide and you can conquer, and that is their tactic; so what do we hear and what do we see? We see their agents going around saying that it was the South Koreans who attacked the North Koreans, and the Chinese are the volunteers — "an army of volunteers." General Lin Piao is the general who leads this northern army; it is the largest Communist army. According to the latest information this army has 800,000 men, and General Lin Piao is in charge. Now they are "volunteers."

The Americans and the other United Nations forces were not defeated by the Communists; they were defeated by the cold, by frostbite. That is the statement by some of the agents; that is the kind of stuff that they spread around in our communities. They try to shake our faith in the United Nations because there has been continually this particular obstruction going on. How many times have the Russians used the veto in the United Nations? Now I think we have lost count — perhaps 48 or 50 times. They are always right and nobody else is right — everybody else is wrong.

Now then, this particular psychological warfare is going on, and we are to take part in it whether we want to or not. We have to take a stand on it. They are getting the best of us because they are trained in this particular warfare, and it is centrally directed. We have no such centrally directed command for psychological warfare. We have no central bureau that gives out information. We are free people. Each one of us is left to make his own decisions and his own opinion, and that is where they have us at a disadvantage. They have this source of information, this source of propaganda, and they slowly and subtly spread their propaganda around the world. In Saskatchewan we have their agents, in Canada we have their agents, doing the work.

Now then, where do we stand in this? I do not say that the C.C.F. Party is a Communist party. I would be very, very sad to hear that. But I am afraid that they have become the dupes of the Communist Party in the stand they have taken on this particular issue. I do not think they have realized what they were doing. I honestly think that they have been fooled by this propaganda, because, as far as I can see, no sooner did our Premier take a stand on this particular thing (and I think he was honest about it) — we all want peace, no one of us wants to see anybody go to war and get killed;

February 15, 1951

there is no one that would suggest that. No sooner did the Premier take his stand in this House than we have Nelson Clarke come out with a statement in the paper saying that he was happy, that he was pleased, that now the thing had been placed where it belongs.

Premier Douglas: — In 1945, he was supporting the Liberals.

Mr. Korchinski: — They would support anyone in the polls if they could get what they were looking for. As I said, they get into church organizations; they get into everything, and, as our hon. leader said, they were in the House of Commons.

Premier Douglas: — They were the political allies of Europe.

Mr. J. Walter Erb (Milestone): — And you were glad of it, too.

Mr. Tucker: — Everybody laughs at that, after your speech and the comment of Clarke.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Korchinski: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am glad of this interruption because it gives me a little rest.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — It gives us one, too.

Mr. McCormack: — You will be getting a nice long one in a few years.

Mr. Korchinski: — Well, Mr. Speaker, here is what you find in the paper, printed in this city: "Peace Council speaker lauds Premier's stand" . . . "Dr. Endicott, speaking in the City Hall auditorium, Thursday night, lauded the courageous stand taken by the Premier." And further on, in the same report, he is reported as having said: "He claimed South Korea had planned the war, that she had attacked the North and that there were no hordes of Chinese in the fight." Now he is supposed to be the national president, I think, of what is known as the 'Peace Council'. I am sure that in this Peace Council there are many good, earnest people. I would not say that the Council is an agency of Communism; but I would say that, according to what I hear Dr. Endicott say, he is an agent of the Cominform. If he can come out and say that the South Koreans planned the attack, committed the aggression, and that they were not Chinese troops — except the "volunteers", I do not see how else you can judge him.

On the same page and on the same date, there is another very peculiar news item:

"Mr. Clarke hailed the Premier's speech as his most important political pronouncement, which placed the issue of war and peace right where it belongs, directly in the centre of Saskatchewan politics. Premier Douglas has correctly estimated the sentiments of the people of Saskatchewan."

That is what Nelson Clarke said, and I consider him to be an agent of the Cominform.

Now this is the sad part of it, that the C.C.F. Party takes a stand that seems to give comfort to these people; who are planning world domination. The Premier was talking about a 'Third Force' that we should not be attaching ourselves either to the United States or to the Soviets, that we should plan a Third Force. That is exactly what the Communists are looking for — this Third Force. Divide and conquer — that is their purpose, so you just fall right into their hands. If you follow this particular idea of the Third Force, that is exactly what they want, because if they see solidarity of the western democracies, if they see that those democracies are putting up a stand, we have nothing to fear, either of Communism or of war, because Russia cannot afford to fight a war on account of the internal situation in the country itself. Not very long ago news was received on this continent — I always refer to the Ukrainian 'underground' because I am of that descent, and I suppose you will realize why I would be referring to the Ukrainians; but not very long ago we received news that the commander of the 'underground' that is fighting Communism in Ukraine had been executed by the Russian Communists.

There is, going on right today, a warfare in Russia against the regime. We will make the biggest mistake if we blame the Russian people for what is happening in the world. We have to distinguish between the gangsters who are controlling the country and the people themselves. I do not know much about the Russian people themselves, but people who have contacts with them tell me that they are very friendly, very good people. Now you must realize that it is a very small percentage of these people who are Communists and who control this vast country, and we must always realize that we have nothing against the Russian people themselves, but we absolutely do not agree with their high command.

Now then, while this is going on we have this strange stand taken by the C.C.F. Party — the national party and the provincial party. It has gone so far that the Premier of the province even said that he is ready to call an election to test public opinion on this issue — where we stand. Now that really is something. I think that there must be a great happiness and joy among the Communist ranks that things in Canada have come to that state of affairs where we have a country built of 10 provinces, and each province is going to decide the foreign affairs and policy of this country. We are going to have, very likely, 10 different policies. We would have a Saskatchewan C.C.F. foreign policy, an Alberta Social Credit foreign policy, and so on along the line. Can we be more divided in facing the world than by having so many foreign policies? I think this is a time to stand united, to recognize this movement, this monster, that is trying to overpower the world.

I fail to see the reasons behind this particular stand taken by the Premier in this province, and the Party of which he is the head. I was trying, in my mind, to figure this out — why? Why did they take this stand? And in all frankness, I do not accuse them of being Communists. I do not think they are. But were they trying to confuse the public issue; the provincial affairs? Were they trying to detract people's attention from the maladministration of this province? Maybe. Or were they trying to be different? They are priding themselves on being first in everything: were they trying to be first with this idea? Well that may be a possibility; or is it that the Socialists have something akin, and that they feel sorry for their brother Socialists, and they are trying to line up with them; because, as far as they can see, they admit it themselves, they confess here, and did last year — that they are

Socialists, and that is shown in the Regina Manifesto. They all stood up and were counted, and they said that they were Socialists. Now, Soviet Russia is a socialist country; the United States are not Socialists. So was it that they, from the love of Socialists and hatred of capitalists, took this stand? Maybe. It may be also that that was in their minds — either they wanted to be the first in taking this stand, or they wanted to confuse the issue, or they were trying to give comfort to their brother Socialists. There is no other reply, because this idea of the Third Force seems to be momentous, because there was such a force, or forces, before Hitler started the second World War.

My hon. friend from Canora (Mr. Kuziak), does he want our Premier to take an umbrella and fly down to Peiping and appease Mao Tze-tung? Would he like our Premier to take an umbrella and go down to Moscow and bow before the mighty Stalin and say, "We do not want war, we are a peace-loving people. We do not want to see the mothers of our country shed tears over their killed sons." "We are a peace-loving people, we do not want to fight." Is that what he wants him to do? I do not think so. But that is exactly what they are doing — with their great desire for peace, they are getting the opposite, because as I have said, if we do not stand united, this thing will bring on a world war — a shooting war. If we can repel the psychological advances, if we can take a proper part in the psychological warfare, we will defeat the enemy; but if we succumb to their warfare, we are finished. So, why this particular stand?

Then there is still another answer that seemed to come to my mind. I remember, last year, there was some talk of "Lower Slobovia" and it came from the Government side. Was that in the minds of the Government at that time — that they were planning and organizing a Lower Slobovia in Canada here? Were they going to organize the People's United Saskatchewan Soviet Republic? I can visualize that republic. I even had a map of it here somewhere. Yes, here it is: the SUPSR — Saskatchewan United People's Socialist Republic. In short, it is called Lower Slobovia. Nelson Clarke will be appointed the Minister of Interior — the Communists always get this post, because they have to liquidate the co-ops. Our farmers here are the co-ops, so they will have to be liquidated. 'Mahatma' Endicott will be in charge of information and public relations. Well, I do not know if I should go on with this because. . . 'Generalissimo' T. C. Douglas will be the Secretary General of the Party, the 'father of his people' and the shining sun of Regina.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I am sure the hon. member does not wish to make this Chamber subject to ridicule. I do not think it is in very good taste to caricature members of the Assembly.

Mr. Korchinski: — I am sorry, Mr., Speaker, I will take all that back.

I want to deal, for a few minute, with some of our provincial affairs. This has to do with the land-holding policies of this Government.

I do not agree with their land-holding policy in Saskatchewan. They have new a law in this country which states that they are not going to sell to anyone any of the Crown lands in this province . . .

Premier Douglas: — What law is that?

Mr. Korchinski: — I should have said "policy". That is the policy, I think, of the Department of Agriculture. I think that was issued in a

certain circular, and I do not think that that is a good policy. I do not think that this 33-year lease is a sound thing for Saskatchewan. I think that our people in Saskatchewan would like to own their land — most of them do — so it is not right for us to deprive that group of people who would like to own their land from doing so. I do not think it is right that there should be people who have large tracts of land in their own name, and yet for those who are beginning to farm, who want to buy a little parcel of Crown land, that they should not be able to do so. I do not think that that is a good policy, and I am against it. I think that most of the farmers of Saskatchewan are against it, and I think that that should be debated in this Legislature. I think that that question is a question of great importance. This idea of giving people land and saying it is only on a 33-year lease would lend itself to abuse. I think that quite often, perhaps, the friends of the Government would be getting the land, and perhaps they would have to toe the line if they held the land. I do not think that is a good idea. I do not say that that would happen, but there is always a possibility of such a thing happening.

Mr. Walker: — It would, if the Liberals get back.

Mr. Korchinski: — I do not know about that. I do not think that your party is so 'holier than thou'. You pretend to be, but I know that in some respects this party that was supposed to be the up-and-coming thing is even worse than the old parties were. If you look up some of the appointments you do not have to go very far — some of the defeated candidates, or most of them, have been finding a refuge with this Government, in one way or another — you cannot deny that. There is no way that you can get around that one.

Premier Douglas: — I deny it when you say 'most of them'.

Mr. Korchinski: — Well, I have not checked on that one yet so I will have to take that back.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman has not checked, he has no business making the statement.

Mr. Korchinski: — Could I ask the Premier a question? How many former C.C.F. M.P.'s are holding jobs with this Government?

Premier Douglas: — If my hon. friend wants to put the question on the Order Paper, he can get the answer.

Mr. Korchinski: — There you are.

Premier Douglas: — I am not refusing you an answer. I am saying my hon. friend's statement was that no one denied it. I am denying it, and denying it right now. I am calling my friend's bluff. I am calling his bluff right now. Give me the names!

Mr. Korchinski: — Anyway I do not think that is a good idea — the land-holding policy that you have established in this province, that you are going to rent the Crown lands to the people. Either take them all over and rent them all or have them all under the system we have today.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Would my hon. friend permit a question? Do you think it is a good idea for the mortgage companies to own a lot of

the land and to rent it out at one third share of the crop?

Mr. Korchinski: — No, I do not believe that is a good idea either. That seems very intelligent.

Government Members: — Who are you talking about?

Mr. Korchinski: — We do not want a government here in this province with a 1930 mentality, we want one with a 1951 mentality; so stop talking about what happened before you got into power. It carries no water. Stop talking about Federal matters. We are in a land of plenty. Look at the mountains, look at the forests, look at the fish! Yes, you can enjoy all that.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Korchinski: — I have very wonderful support for my beliefs here, and I am very thankful.

Now, as I said, I am not in agreement with that landholding policy and, therefore, I would like to see it debated, and, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment to the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, seconded by the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), that the following be added to the Address:

"but that this Assembly regrets that the policy of Your Honour's advisers in regard to the settlement of vacant Crown Land suitable for agricultural purposes is that all such land will be allocated on a 33-year lease basis with no provision for the settler over having the right to obtain title to any such land settled on by him."

I will support this amendment and I will be voting against the motion.

Mr. V.P. Deshayé (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, I would like, this afternoon, to present to the Government some of the recommendations that I was proposing, and if I am not on the air, I will be able to make these recommendations in an informal manner.

I, first of all, though, want to repeat to the Government a few things about the constituency which has sent me here. First of all I wish to point out, and I presume . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Might I point out, before we get into this debate, that you are now dealing with the amendment. It left a lot of latitude, but I think that, if we want to expedite the business of this House, we all have to be a little more strict in regard to this.

Mr. Deshayé: — I will not go too far afield, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Tucker: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, on that question, I moved an amendment that had to do with the municipalities, and the

Premier then got up and made a speech in which he did not refer to the municipalities, which was the subject of my amendment — to the very outside for more than one-tenth of his speech. The rest of his speech had to do with the main motion. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know on what grounds you let the Premier go ahead and discuss the main motion at great length after an amendment has been made, and let other members do the same before we had a vote on that amendment. Now another amendment has been made, and I do not know how you feel that you have to apply different rules to this amendment. I know Your Honour wants to be scrupulously fair in this matter, and I have seen nothing in the rules that indicates that a different attitude should be taken towards a second amendment to the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne from the first one, and Your Honour knows very well that the Premier made his speech after I moved my amendment. I would suggest to Your Honour that, while strictly speaking, what you are seeking to do in regard to limiting the debate strictly to this amendment may be within the rules, then of course it seems to me that in the same debate, you should not, at one time, apply the rules strictly and another time not apply the rules at all. What we want from Your Honour is just the same treatment on this side as you extend to the Premier and the members on the other side. That is all we ask for, Mr. Speaker, and if there is anything in the rules that justifies discrimination between one amendment and another, well then, of course, I am not familiar with it.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, what I was trying to do is expedite the business of the Assembly. We still have the main motion before us. If it is understood that anyone speaking to this debate has exhausted his privilege on the main motion too, I think you are perfectly right — if that is understood. My thought was to expedite matters a little by confining ourselves to the amendment and then going on to the main motion.

Mr. Tucker: — As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that any member's hands can necessarily be tied, but I do agree with Your Honour that if, in this Throne Speech debate, there is not an attempt to apply the rules too rigidly in regard to amendments and the Speech as a whole, I really think we will get through with it more quickly than if there is an attempt made to restrict members, because then they will be forced into making two speeches. I would urge Your Honour to follow that rule, which I think has worked out very well.

Mr. Speaker: — It has been the custom. You are quite correct; but I think it should be understood that, if in the course of the debate on this amendment, they couple it up with the Speech from the Throne, they have exhausted their right to speak on the main motion. I want that understood, because if we do not, everyone who has spoken on the main motion will have the right to speak again. So if we are going to open up the whole field of debate, everybody in this Chamber can speak again, and that is the situation I think we should try to avoid. If you want it that way, well, I am in your hands.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, the only answer I can make on that is that there is a rule, a very salutary rule, that Your Honour can object to repetition in debate; and if a person were, on the amendment, to deal with a subject and then attempt to deal with it again on the main motion, Your Honour could draw to his attention that he was being guilty of infringing

that rule of repetition in debate. I am sure that none of us would object to Your Honour drawing that to the attention of any member.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, that is agreed then. You may go on.

Mr. Deshaye: — Mr. Speaker, I will speak on the amendment for the time being anyhow.

With respect to the amendment, as submitted by the hon. member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski), I support the amendment for the reason that I feel that everyone should have the right to own land in their own name in Saskatchewan, and at this time I think it is very unfortunate for this Government to come in and say that they will no longer sell Crown lands, when there are so many veterans in the province who are trying to get established. This applies, in particular, to the northern part of the province where there are still a lot of Crown lands that are available to be sold to veterans, if the Government so chooses. I think it is unfortunate that the Government should consider preventing veterans from owning property of their own which they can develop and establish and in that way better our province, because, unless you sell something to a person they will not improve it the same, even if it was leased by them for 33 years. Therefore, I would suggest that the Government adopt the policy of at least selling to veterans the land that they have in the name of the Crown.

There is also a suggestion that, in other parts of the province, particularly in the southern parts where we have Crown lands known as school lands, that these lands, if they are not sufficiently good and fertile for agricultural purposes, be made into small district community pastures for the residents of those areas. There are many farmers today who would like to raise more stock but cannot find enough pasture for the stock, and that would be the purpose of the Crown lands in the southern areas of the Province — those sections which are reserved and known as school lands.

Now, Your Honour has permitted me, I believe, to branch out, to some extent, from the amendment, and I would like to point out that in the Melville constituency, as I said last year, we have land that is not particularly favourable, and looking at the map provided by the Department of Agriculture, it shows that much of this land is sub-marginal. At the same time, our people have made very good progress in the Melville constituency. We have farmers there, and stock ranchers, who have made a very good name for themselves. They have won prizes in Chicago at the Chicago International, and the Toronto Royal, and at various exhibitions and fairs across Canada and the United States.

Now I say that our people have progressed that way on land that is not too favourable, through the co-operation of the Federal Government with P.F.R.A., and their Prairie Farm Assistance, and we are grateful to the Federal Government for this assistance. I might say, too, that we are grateful to the Saskatchewan Provincial Government for what they have done, and I wish to take this opportunity to compliment then local Agricultural Representative, Mr. Ernest McKenzie. Mr. McKenzie is very well regarded in the area that he covers. He resides in Melville. I know him casually. I have attended some of the agricultural functions he has sponsored, and I know that Mr. McKenzie is a great asset to us in the Melville area; and he is, I can assure the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, a great asset to his Department. We are grateful —

the farmers are grateful, and I, as their representative here am grateful, to Mr. McKenzie and his Minister for the great work that they are doing there. I am sure that a lot of it is due to the particular Representative we have, and for those things we want to show our appreciation.

I also want to take this opportunity, while I have the time, today, to congratulate the "father", shall I say of the town of Balcarres. His Honour the Lieutenant Governor proclaimed Balcarres an incorporated town as of January 1st of this year, and I think that the people of Balcarres deserve to be congratulated for this step forward that they have taken. That is something that every village looks forward to and that shows the progress of our times. Balcarres deserves the congratulations of the people of Saskatchewan for reaching the status of a town, and it also deserves the congratulations of the people of Saskatchewan for their other achievements there. They have built, in the last few years, a remarkable new community and Legion hall. They have built a very fine new hospital; they have added a wing to their school, and they have now commenced construction on a new Federal building. I think that proves the progress of that town in the Melville constituency, and I repeat again today, as I have so often repeated before, that the progress of these towns and villages anywhere in Saskatchewan is dependent on the progress and success that the farmers have, because we are all dependent on the farmer, regardless of what our occupation may be. Therefore I express again, in this House, to the Government of this province, that we should do all that we can to encourage the prosperity of the farmer, and that is why I say to the Minister of Agriculture that he has one of the most important posts in the Government of this province. I hope that he will do his utmost to see that the farmers prosper.

At the same time, the Government itself has a tremendous influence on whether or not the farmer prospers. If we are to overburden the farmer, then we will find that he will leave the farm and go into the urban areas, and I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that today we are reaching that stage where we are getting off-balanced in this province. We are having a change in the electoral divisions, I hear; in the representation. We are told that the representation is being increased for the cities and the admission is that there has been a movement, or an increase in urban populations since 1938 (I think the date is) up to today. That shows, Mr. Speaker, that there is becoming a greater population in the cities than in the rural areas, and I, myself, feel that that is a dangerous position for the province of Saskatchewan to be reaching. We are primarily an agricultural country. Agriculture is the basis of our economy and for that reason we must see that our people remain on the farm lands. Therefore, it is very important that our Government do everything within its power to see that our farmers remain on the farm and do not move into the urban centres, and for that reason I propose, in the course of my discourse, to give a few suggestions of my own on how we can help to keep the farmer on the farm, and how we can help him to prosper as a farmer.

One of the things I would like to recommend is that we take into consideration something with respect to the reduction of the compulsory insurance, as far as farmers are concerned. We have statistical reports now, and I am not ashamed to say that they were brought down by the Wawanesa Insurance Company, who have collected, I believe, very accurate statistical data of the accidents in the province of Saskatchewan, and that company has seen fit to insure rural-owned automobiles at approximately one-half of what urban auto-

mobiles require. Now I think they based those figures on their statistical data of the number of accidents that occur to automobiles owned by country people and those owned by city people.

I suggest to the Provincial Treasurer that he could at least give the farmers this break, and I say that in all sincerity. I do not think there is any politics attached to that at all. I think that if he feels that if the farmers are paying an insurance premium that they should not be paying, then I am sure he would concede that they should enjoy a reduction in that fee.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. gentleman a question, since the remarks have been addressed to me? Due to the fact that, this year, we were approximately \$200,000 short of having sufficient revenue, it would be necessary then to make this up. Would he suggest, then, that we increase the rate being charged the people in the towns and the cities to make up for the loss in revenue from reducing the country rates?

Mr. Deshaye: — Mr. Speaker, before I answer that question, as to my own opinion; the statement does not quite sound consistent with what the Provincial Treasurer pointed out before Orders of the Day, today.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — On the compulsory insurance there was a loss of \$200,000.

Mr. Deshaye: — Yes, I do think that the premium should be proportionate to the damage. I do not think that the farmer should be obliged to pay for the accidents of the city-owned automobiles. If the Provincial Treasurer finds that he is \$200,000 short of paying the claims for the year 1950, then I think he would be obliged to raise the premium on the city-owned automobiles, but I do say to him that he is not obliged to raise the premium on the country-owned automobiles. As a matter of fact, the thing should be figured out according to statistical figures and apportioned accordingly. That is the way the Wawanesa Insurance Company sees fit to do it, and I am sure that they have been successful insurance managers throughout the term of their operations; and I am sure that the Provincial Treasurer and his manager, Mr. Alore, would agree that they should do the same. I submit that for his consideration.

There is also the question, which I do not think is quite as flagrant, whether or not the farmer should be obliged to pay the same license fee as the city owner of an automobile. After all, a chap in the city drives his car all year round — 12 months of the year; but you have so many farmers who have their automobiles tied up for four or five months of the year that it is just a question whether or not they should have to pay the same license fee as the man in the city does. The old Liberal Government, I believe, had a policy — I do not know if it was cancelled by them or whether it was cancelled by this Government, though I believe it was cancelled by the old Liberal Government; but they had a policy that a farmer, after the month of August or November, if he could not use his car any more, could send in his license plates and get a rebate for the balance of the year, when he found that his car would be tied up and would not be used again. I personally think that that was a good policy. I think that we have to give a little more consideration to the people on the farms of our province, because, as I said at the beginning of my address, I think that we have to do something more than we are doing to keep the farmer on the land. I know that, in my own town, although we are a

railroad centre, without the prosperity of the farmer we feel it very much in that town. I am sure that every town and village and the cities of Regina, Moose Jaw, Saskatoon and Prince Albert feel it the same way — that without prosperity on the land and the farm, the man who has the production of the basic industry of this province will not have prosperity in the other fields of activity in this province. For that reason I make that suggestion.

Now I want to take this opportunity, before it is 6 o'clock, to thank the Minister of Highways for at last realizing, and his Government at last waking up to the fact that No. 10 Highway, which leads through Melville in the Melville constituency, required reconstruction. We are very pleased in the eastern part of the province, and in the north-eastern part of the province and in the eastern part of the Melville constituency, that this highway has been reconstructed. It was long past needed. This work should have been done three or four years before it was actually commenced. I believe that the Minister of Highways finally realized that unless this work was done very soon, there would be no outlet from this capital city into the north-eastern part of Saskatchewan. Therefore the highway was rebuilt; they are doing a very good job and we are very pleased with the road out there. I would be negligent in my duty to the constituents of that part of the constituency if I did not express our gratitude to this Government for that road. I hope they continue construction, and I understand they are going to continue construction, and I also hope that, within a year or two, that road, which is one of the most important roads in this province and I daresay carries as much traffic as any other highway in this province, except possibly the road from here to Moose Jaw, will be hard surfaced. Now, I have communicated with the Department of Highways and they have assured me that this road will be black-topped or hard-surfaced just as soon as their programme will permit. I do hope that that is very soon.

Now, Just before calling six o'clock I want to bring . . .

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but did I understand him to say that he has a commitment from the Department of Highways that we were going to black-top that road immediately?

Mr. Deshaye: — Yes, I have a letter — my letter was written to the Minister of Highways. It was not answered by the Minister of Highways, but it was signed by his Deputy Minister, saying that that road would be hard-topped just as soon as their programme permitted, or something to that effect. I have the letter and it is on your files, and I hope, Mr. Minister — I am sorry that you look so surprised. I was hoping that that would actually be done, and I think you will have the co-operation of the Provincial Treasurer, because that road brings your buses a lot of revenue, and that all works back into the provincial treasury, so I do not think you are going to be out very much by hard-topping that road as soon as possible.

There is just one more point that I would like to bring out at the moment. This is directed also to the Minister of Highways, and he also knows about this because I have a reply from him dated very recently. But again, this morning, I received a telephone call from Cupar about No. 22 Highway which this Government, two years ago, stopped building within half a mile of Cupar. They reconstructed the road from Lipton to Cupar, then when

they got to within half a mile of Cupar, they all at once stopped work. Now Cupar is the centre for the doctor, all these other places where the people of the district must go. Cupar, as we all know, is a very important village just north of Regina. Why the construction of this highway should have been stopped within half a mile of the junction to Cupar nobody knows; but there is the situation, and the people of the district cannot get into Cupar in the spring except with horse-drawn vehicles they tell me, nor in the winter-time owing to the snow-blocked road on this particular portion. Actually the road should be completed to No. 6 Highway at Southey; that is, complete the whole stretch. This situation is like building two spans of a three-span bridge and leaving the other span unbuilt. What good are the two spans if you are not going to finish the rest of the bridge? That is the situation that exists at Cupar.

The Minister writes me back and says that he has other places to put his money and that he cannot complete this portion of the road. I know he has a lot of places to put the money and I am not going to get sarcastic about this part of it at all; but at the same time I want to impress upon the Minister the importance of finishing that road, at least into Cupar, which would be a very small proportionate cost. The people there are demanding it, and the Minister knows it, and they need it very badly. I am very certain in my own mind that the Minister would have spent much more money in other places where the roads are needed much less than this particular piece of road, at this time, and I urge him to give that his consideration once again. Although he has rejected the petitions made to him already, I ask him to reconsider building that piece of road from a half-mile east of Cupar to the junction of No. 6, and if he finds that impossible to do, at least spend a few dollars and build that road to the junction of Cupar so that the people of the district can get into Cupar and get medical attention and the other things that they need. With that, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Premier Douglas: — No, no we are not adjourning the debate, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deshaye: — Well, I can go on. I can go on all night. I can go on, if he wants to go on.

Mr. Tucker: — He has made a motion, let's have a vote on it! There has been a motion made, Mr. Speaker, and the Premier, without letting the Legislature vote, says there is going to be no adjournment — the dictator — no vote, no permission to Your Honour to put that vote. Now everybody knows that that is true; that Your Honour was not even permitted to put that motion for an adjournment, that the hon. Premier got up and said 'there will be no adjournment'. Where are we, Mr. Speaker? Now I hear another adjournment being moved.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! The hon. Premier made that statement but that did not stop me from putting the vote. Why I did not put the vote was because the hon. member said he was prepared to continue, and certainly this cannot be adjourned without the consent of this Chamber, and no one is going to arrogate to themselves my functions.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. May I simply say my statement was that we would not agree to an adjournment. The Whips have already agreed on the speaking list for each day and for some reason best known to themselves the Opposition have decided to put on speakers, which is, of course, their right and their privilege; but if they want to

change the speaking order of their own speakers, that is perfectly right; but I simply said that we, or the Government side, were not prepared to agree to an adjournment.

Mr. McCormack: — Mr. Speaker, the Premier has referred to the fact that the Whips had an arrangement. We have had that arrangement during the Session and it has worked very satisfactorily. I told the Whip on the other side of the House, with whom I have had the most cordial relations, that we were going to move an amendment; I told him that yesterday. I intimated as much the day before. There may have been a misunderstanding — our record was that the hon. member from Canora (Mr. Kuziak) would adjourn the debate today. I did not appreciate the fact, probably, that he did not want to speak on this amendment, and that may be the only small point of misunderstanding. If that is right, the hon. member from Kelvington (Mr. Howe) can say so. However, it was also understood between the Whip on the other side and myself that there would be no night sitting this week, at least . . .

Mr. Speaker: — That would be decided in this Chamber.

Mr. McCormack: — I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, but as I say it was my understanding that the Government side and this side of the House would try to abide, as much as possible, by the arrangement, and the only way we can conduct the proceedings in this House is by mutual understanding between the Whip on the other side of the House and the Whip on this side.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, on the matter of the business of the House. The understanding which the Government has from the Whip, with whom my hon. friend has had such cordial relations, is that, today, the member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) and the member for Turtleford (Mr. Trippe) were to speak, in reverse order; and the member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) would adjourn the debate. It was also agreed between the Whips that the vote would be taken tomorrow on this motion. Now if the Opposition are departing from that, and going to throw in other speakers, then the whole agreement will have to be dropped; that is, if the Opposition are going to throw in other speakers — which they have a perfect right to do — then we shall have to depart from the agreement not to sit nights. If we are going to put in other speakers other than the ones who were originally put on the list, then we shall have to sit. I see no other alternative but for us to sit tonight, sit tomorrow night, and clean up the business. After all, the House has now been sitting for two weeks, and I do not think we can protract this debate on the Speech from the Throne endlessly, for two and three hours a day. Now the original agreement was that the vote was to be taken tomorrow. If that vote is not going to be taken tomorrow, and it can't be if we keep on throwing in extra speakers, then I suggest that the only thing to do is sit tonight, and sit tomorrow night and clean this debate up.

Mr. Speaker: — The House will decide that question. It was never intimated to me that there were going to be no night sittings.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, might I speak on a question of privilege. The hon. member said that there was an agreement to have this vote tomorrow. Now if there was an agreement to have this vote tomorrow, it was entirely unknown to me; it is absolutely news to me, Mr. Speaker. Now then, why are we in the situation we are in right now? We are in a situation now whereby other speakers have been put in because the hon. Premier said there

would be no adjournments. Then, of course, if we are going to go on with this matter there had to be people speak; but I do suggest that we have alternatives before us now. The hon. member who is just speaking now (Mr. Deshayé) can cede his right to speak and speak later on when this amendment is disposed of and finish his speech on the main motion, and I suggest to Your Honour that, in order to carry on by arrangement, which is so necessary for the broadcast part of the proceedings of this House, the hon. member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) adjourn this debate and get air time tomorrow, and by Your Honour's ruling, he can have just as wide a range, speaking on the amendment, as he could have speaking on the main motion. Then we will get back to where the arrangement was between the Whips — and if we are not to agree to that and if we are to be forced to sit tonight, well then, of course, we think, can find people who will carry this debate on; but it will be quite clear to us that there is no desire to co-operate. Then, of course, this intent to allocate air time and so on is going to be very difficult. I do urge the Premier not to take a stand in this matter that is going to make it difficult for the Whips to carry on, and I do suggest that . . .

Mr. Walker: — You are the one who is taking the stand.

Mr. Tucker: — No, we have a right to move these amendments and there are other people that have a right to speak in this House, and, as far as that goes, having moved the amendment — the Whip for the C.C.F. was notified definitely that we were moving this amendment today. There was no suggestion at that time that we would be forced to sit tonight. In fact, the Minister of the Crown stated in the Committee, this afternoon, that there would be no sitting tonight; he intimated that. Now then, to attempt to force the debate on, they may think that we are not prepared — well, perhaps we not prepared; but I do suggest to Your Honour that this sort of thing is not going to make it any easier to allot this air time. The fact is that, if it were not for this business of the allotment of air time, then of course I would not care about it; but I also suggest, that the hon. member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) be permitted to adjourn this debate and have the air time tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: — Might I inform the hon. members that, as far as the conduct of this Chamber is concerned, it is not going to be controlled by the Whips. If the Whips make agreements between themselves, that is all right; they can co-operate with each other. As far as my position is concerned, I have absolutely no knowledge of what the Whips have done, and the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Deshayé) has asked leave to adjourn the debate. I take it that the 'No's' had it.

Mr. Jacob Benson (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, if you do not mind, I think that this whole matter arose because the Premier called for the vote. Now, someone had to get up and speak or the vote would have been taken, and I think this is a pretty important question. I do not think that any member should be expected to get up and speak on an amendment that he has not even had a chance to read; and I do not think that any member in this House has had a chance to read this amendment. We have heard it read, that is true.

Mr. Speaker: — Might I bring to the hon. member's attention that no one has been denied the right. I certainly have not denied anyone the right. The question before the House is, has the hon. member for Melville the privilege of adjourning the debate?

Mr. Peter A. Howe (Kelvington): — Mr. Speaker, as Whip for this side of the House I think I should have the privilege of saying a few words on this matter.

Mr. Speaker: — I would like to draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that it is past six o'clock.

Mr. Howe: — I know; but since it is after six it does not make an awful lot of difference, but my experience with the Opposition up till now has been very good. I always enjoyed working with Mr. Culliton when he was their Whip and I have certainly enjoyed my association with Mr. McCormack, and we had agreed on certain things, and Mr. McCormack has stated that, and the only thing that has upset our plans, this year so far, is the amendment that was moved by the member from Redberry. Now that is something I knew yesterday, but we never knew it was not a part of their plan at all, that another amendment would be saved, and I want to say in reply to the hon. member for Last Mountain and for the benefit of the members of this House, that the reason that the hon. member for Canora refused to get up to speak on the amendment is because he was not intending to speak on the amendment in the first place. The whole arrangement was that Mr. Kuziak would adjourn the debate tonight on the main motion, but the one thing that upset the whole plan is the amendment moved by the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker: — As far as I am concerned, the Whips can fight it out themselves. As far as this House is concerned — the question before the House now is: Is the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Deshaye) allowed to adjourn the debate.

The adjournment motion was negated on division by a vote of 28 to 20.

The Assembly recessed until 8.00 o'clock p.m.

The House resumed at 8.00 o'clock p.m.

Mr. V.P. Deshaye (Melville): — Before continuing my remarks with reference to highways, I should like to add my congratulations to those already received by the mover and seconder of the motion for the Address and to all who have preceded me in this debate. I think that the hon. member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) deserves our sincere congratulations for the excellent job he did this afternoon.

Now, I am not a chap for wandering very far from home. I like to stick around my own constituency. After all, I feel that those people who were good enough to send me here sent me only for the one purpose — to look after their interests. And if I talk a little more than I should about the Melville constituency I am just concerned about the people up there and try to get as good a deal from this Government as possible for the people in the Melville seat. Therefore I am going to return to talk about roads for a while more. I may appear to the Minister — he is not here at the moment and I am sorry for that, and I hope that somebody will convey these requests to him, because these are requests that come from the people of my part of the province. I was going to say that it may appear that we are making too many

requests about highways, but we need them up there and they are highways that are important to all the people of the province. For instance, I was going to ask the Minister of Highways if he were here, to try and construct the linking portion between No. 9 Highway and No. 14, that is from south of Yorkton to Bredenbury. That is not a highway that is in my constituency, but that is a piece of road, Mr. Speaker, that is desired very much by the people of your constituency as well as the people of my constituency. That is a piece of road that is very essential to all of the people living west of No. 9 Highway. Any of those people who are going into Manitoba or going to Bredenbury, Saltcoats, Churchbridge or Winnipeg, are diverted or have to go to Yorkton and back south again, a distance of approximately 60 miles extra. And for a matter of building 18 miles of road, all this extra travelling would be saved, and I think instead of building long stretches of road sometimes for the benefit of the tourists who are not taxpayers in this province — I do not think we should not encourage tourists. I agree that we want tourists here; but at the same time I agree with one of the speakers who spoke the other day, that we should not be overspending for the benefit of tourists. Let us look after our own ratepayers first and then they can travel along the road that we have built that will best accommodate our own people and then I think we will have performed the service to which the legislators of this Legislature have been sent here. I do not think we need to worry too much about providing tourists with the most direct road to Waskesiu Park or anywhere else. Let's build the roads to suit our people, and then the tourists will find their way to wherever they want to go and fish. I wish to associate myself with the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) in urging the Government to build that 18 miles of highway. That is not going to cost very much, as I said, but it is going to perform a service to the people not only in Melville constituency, but of Touchwood constituency, and a lot of other people in that part of the province.

I am only going to make one more request about highways and that is that we would like to see Highway No. 47 reconstructed and constructed south of Grenfell to the south, so that the people will have a more direct route to the International boundary and to those towns south of the Qu'Appelle river. That highway leads through Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, the Cannington seat and the Weyburn seat, and I think that that is another road that needs to be built.

Now, as I said before, these may sound like too many requests, but at the same time I wish to point out for the benefit of the members of this House that, as far as the Melville constituency is concerned, it is the most heavily populated constituency of any excepting the cities of Regina, Moose Jaw and Prince Albert. It surpasses in population, in the number of names on the polling list, the city seats of Weyburn, Yorkton, and The Battlefords, and it surpasses in number of names on the polling list any rural constituency that we have. I would not be a bit surprised to have heard from the other side of the House, "Well, we're going to fix that for you when the Bill comes up, by rearranging the seats"; but at the same time what I am trying to point out, Mr. Speaker, is that this portion of the province is heavily populated and deserves the attention of the Government in these different matters and especially roads. That is what I am trying to put over, if I may.

I spoke briefly before the supper hour about motor licenses. The Provincial Treasurer is not here, but I would like to have conveyed to him

this further thought. It occurs to me that the farm trucks are carrying a lot of the load of the compulsory insurance for commercial trucks. I would not be too sure about these figures, but it seems to me that I have read that there are about 55,000 trucks licensed in Saskatchewan of which about 40,000 are farm trucks. I do not say that these figures are correct, but it seems to me that that is about the proportion. Now, of the accidents that are occurring on the Saskatchewan highways, I believe that the majority of the large accidents, on which the bulk of the money is paid out of the compulsory funds, are of commercial trucks and that the farm trucks are carrying the load of paying these claims. I think it would only be fair to this Legislature and to the people of Saskatchewan if the Provincial Treasurer would request the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office to make a breakdown of the loss of the revenues or the different types of licences and the different classes of vehicle and also a breakdown as to the losses paid, and then, as I made the humble recommendation before the supper hour, charge premiums according to these losses, so that every type of individual will carry his fair share of the burden.

I am not speaking against compulsory insurance. I have my own ideas on that, but I am not expressing them at the moment. What I am speaking of is, I think it is most unfair that one group of people should carry the load for another group. I also think that that should be taken into consideration, and I think it is a great deal on the licences. You have a heavy petroleum truck, which is a heavy revenue-bearing machine for the owner, whether it be Imperial Oil or a private owner who owns a fleet of trucks. That machine is on the highway making revenue and at the same time that heavy machine carrying a large number of tons is doing much more damage than a lot of farmers' trucks. And I think it is right, and I have no objection, and I have defended this Government for it on the hustings as you might say, for charging these heavy commercial trucks heavy licences. But, at the same time I think it is wrong if you charge a farmer too much for his truck for the use that he gets out of it. We must not forget that these heavy petroleum trucks are on the road day and night, probably running 20 hours out of the 24 and paying, a licence of maybe \$400. At the same time you have a farmer's truck on which he pays \$40 or \$60 or \$80, and he only runs one-fiftieth or one-hundredth as much in miles of distance as the heavy petroleum truck does. I leave that for the consideration of the Provincial Treasurer.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my hon. friend would permit me to ask him, did he notice in the report of the North Dakota committee which made an investigation of the compulsory insurance plan that in their opinion (I cannot vouch for its accuracy) the commercial vehicles were carrying a heavier share of the load in relation to their incidence of accident than were the other groups?

Mr. Deshaye: — I presume you mean in Saskatchewan.

Premier Douglas: — In Saskatchewan.

Mr. Deshaye: — It may be so, Mr. Speaker. It may be right and I am not questioning his statement at all. I did not read the report. I do recall having read in this report that the farmers were granted a 15 per cent reduction in North Dakota; I believe probably you have seen that as well. I personally do not think that is enough. I may be biased in this,

but at the same time I think that could be remedied if this summary or statistical data could be produced to show the comparison, and then charge each according to their lot. I think that is the fair way. Possibly I over expressed myself in this thing, and if I did it can soon be corrected by having this report brought down. At the same time I hope that I have expressed my thoughts on the matter.

There is one further thought that I have about this subject of farmer's trucks. So far I hope that I have not infringed on the public revenue, because I know that every time we talk about something on this side of the House, the Provincial Treasurer becomes worried about reducing the public revenue — and quite properly so. I am not criticizing him for that at all. But I think that there is something here that will help our rural economy, and at the same time possibly increase our public revenue by not too large an amount, and that is that I know of a number of cases where farmers have old trucks lying around the farm and during harvest time they start to use those trucks and some of them use them after 12 o'clock when the police are in bed because they do not like to buy a licence for two weeks of the year. A lot of them buy licences, 99 per cent buy licences, they have to buy them for the whole year; but they do not buy them until harvest season and they pay a full year's licence and they complain to beat the band. They think that is wrong and I agree with them. I suggest, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that a farmer — and I would restrict this to the farmer — be permitted to buy a half-year licence after August 1st, in order that he may have this old truck, and there are many of them lying around the farm, to help him take off the harvest in the fall. There is a rush around the combine; you need an extra truck; the commercial truckers are busy. The farmer uses his old truck, and he complains bitterly to have to pay a whole year's licence to use it for two or three weeks or maybe a month during the harvest. I do think that, regardless of whether he complains or not, it is most unfair to the farmer to charge him a full year to licence for that short term of time. I do not think the public revenue would be decreased if the Provincial Treasurer saw fit to grant this because, as I said, there are a lot of farmers who just use this truck in the yard, whereas if they could buy half licences and haul the grain to the elevator, a lot of them who have these trucks that they are not buying licences for and just using off of the road into the fields and back to the granary and yard, would buy licences and use them on the highways and on the roads. In that way, I believe that the Provincial Treasurer's revenue would be increased.

I have spoken at considerable length about giving the farmer a break on his licences. Now, I might suggest something on which the Government might spend a little money to help the farmers. I would suggest that the Government, amongst its grants to the municipalities, would include a grant towards half the cost of rural snowplows. Tell the municipality that, if they will purchase a snowplow to be used to open up their rural market roads, the Government will grant them half of the cost of that equipment. I do not think that needs to run into very much money. The Government can make a little investigation in the Department of Municipal Affairs and the Department of Agriculture, and tell the municipality that they can buy some type of snowplow that is not too expensive to put on the front of a tractor and keep their market roads open. By limiting the grant, I think they could control the thing pretty well, and would be doing a great service to the farmers of the province. I might say that I think the situation is a little different

today than it was in the old days. It might be said, 'Well, they used to get to town in the old days with their team and sleigh.' But the situation is a little different today, especially in those districts where the Department of Highways has built these big new modern highways, and I say that the highways today are improved, and I say that with all sincerity, but at the same time I say to the members of the Government that they do not need to feel too proud about that. You gentlemen or, that side are not driving the same automobiles today that you were in 1938 and 1940. You are driving a better automobile, a faster automobile, and an automobile that is much superior in many ways. At the same time the Government today has at its disposal equipment to construct highways that is altogether different than the Government had prior to the war. In the old days there was not the big heavy caterpillar tractor, and the big dirt mover to build highways with. I remember the day in my own age, when I was watching highways being built with the donkey and dump wagon. Things improve as we go along, and we expect those improvements and I say that it is a much easier job to build highways today than it was before the war.

Mr. Kuziak: — (Interruption)

Mr. Deshaye: — Well, I do not know, if my friend wants to know how his Government is building highways, that is all right. I am trying to compliment him a little bit but apparently he does not appreciate it. He criticizes his own Government; well, that is all right with me, but I think we are entitled to expect a little more in highways today than could have been expected before, and I say that it is time that this harping about what the Liberals did not do should quit. I agree with you that the Liberals did not build the same standard of highways that are being built today, but I also say that people did not expect the same standard of highway in those days as they expect today, and the reason is in the equipment available to build those roads, and also in the fact that the revenues are increased today. When the government talks about the amount of money that it has spent on the highways, I wish to congratulate them, but at the same time, for various reasons for which I do not blame the Government, I do not think that they are getting as much highway per dollar out as the old Liberal Government got out of each dollar when they built roads.

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — That's politics.

Mr. Deshaye: — All right, you tell your people that.

Well now, this afternoon there was one more town in my constituency that I wanted to congratulate that I overlooked, and that was the town of Neudorf for the hospital that they have built there, and I want to thank the Government for whatever contribution they made. I believe the Neudorf authorities asked for \$8,000 and the Government granted \$5,000 and it was matched by the Federal Government to the same extent, so that there was \$10,000 available to the Neudorf people for the construction of their hospital. It was a bitter disappointment that they did not get \$8,000 as they felt they were qualified for it, which would have meant another \$3,000 from the Federal Government and a total grant of \$16,000 instead of \$10,000. In this age, when we need hospital beds so badly in this province, it is regrettable that our Government is not (and I think it is a fact that they are not) matching dollar for dollar the money available from the Federal Government for construction of hospitals.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Is the hon. member aware that we have more beds per thousand population in Saskatchewan than in any other province in Canada?

Mr. Deshaye: — I wish to point out to the Minister of Public Health that regardless of what he said, we have not enough hospital beds in Saskatchewan for the requirements that we have here. In this very city I know of two people, at least two that I know of in the one hotel down town, who are staying there desperately ill, waiting to get into hospitals in this city. Now, if the Minister of Public Health can stand up there and say we have enough hospital beds in this province, then I challenge him to do so. And when we can get additional moneys from the Federal Government today if this Government will only match it dollar for dollar . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Why didn't they match it in the first place?

Mr. Deshaye: — I did not get the question. He is talking something about matching grants. I don't know what I will say to the Minister of Agriculture, if he knows as much about the Department of Public Health as the Minister of Public Health knows about the Department of Agriculture, as was exposed the other day, well, then, he does not know very much. But I still do not know what he meant there. I might say at the point where the Minister of Agriculture got on his feet reminds me of a chap downtown I met the other day and he says; "Gosh," he says, "that wasn't a very good speech Mr. Nollet delivered today" — (I think it was last Friday), I said, "I don't think Mr. Nollet spoke." "Well," he says, "I'm sure it was the Minister of Agriculture." As a matter of fact, it was the Minister of Public Health's speech on Agriculture that he was referring to, so that I think if the Ministers would stick to their own departments probably everybody would be better served, But nevertheless, what I am trying to point out, Mr. Speaker, is that there is money available, I understand (and I know that it is a fact) that has not been used that the Federal Government is prepared to match with the Saskatchewan Government dollar for dollar for building of hospitals and providing hospital beds in this province, and that money is not being utilized by this Government and I say that it is a shame. I do not know why they are not utilizing this money. Whether or not our Government does not have the money to match dollar for dollar or what the reason is, I do not know; but I do say that it is regrettable that that money is not being utilized when we are so sorely in need of hospital beds in this province, and I know that nobody can deny that statement.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — You should have been here when we had the Liberal Government.

Mr. Walker: — Would the hon. gentleman permit a question? Is he aware that the Federal Minister of Health promised the House of Commons that Saskatchewan would not be discriminated against because she had proceeded faster than the other provinces in hospital construction?

Mr. Deshaye: — I do not say there is any discrimination, but I say, Mr. Speaker, and if the hon. member for Hanley would understand, that there is money available at Ottawa to build hospital beds in Saskatchewan if our Government will take advantage of it. Now, where there is any discrimination there I cannot see.

Mr. Walker: — I don't know if he knows what he is talking about.

Mr. Deshaye: — My friend says he doesn't know what he is talking about. I hope he is casting no reflection on me.

Now, we had better go briefly into the Attorney-General's Department. That is one department, Mr. Speaker, that we do not hear spoken of very much in this House, and I think it is a department that functions very efficiently and very well. We all appreciate our genial Attorney-General. I do not think there is a better person in this House and I think that he has a most efficient staff. He is very genial and as far as I know and I have had quite a bit of experience with his department, he has very efficient staff and they carry on excellently.

I would like to make a few suggestions to that Department, however, and again I regret that the Attorney-General is not here. For one thing, we of the Melville constituency, the Canora, constituency, the Kelvington constituency and the Yorkton constituency, have for some months now not had a resident magistrate. We have been forced to fall back upon the magistrate in the city of Saskatoon, and that is not the best for a district. I submit that, in order that we carry on the best democratic way of living that we have, we should have our magistrate or police services carried on as efficiently as possible. It has been reported to me that we have had to bring in these districts, too many cases for unqualified justices of the peace, and these things do lead to unjust convictions. I wish to repeat the recommendation I made last year, that justices of the peace should be paid for acquittals as well as the right they have to collect on convictions. I think we should take the monetary interest out of convictions as far as the justices of the peace are concerned. I think you are aware of the fact that today, if the justice of the peace tries a case, if he convicts he gets his fee out of the person convicted and if he acquits his labours are for nothing. I am not throwing any question on the integrity of our justices of the peace; but I think if they sit on a case they should be paid, and they should not only be paid if there is a conviction and I think that that may lead to an injustice in this.

I also suggest, that in every conviction there should be some depositions taken and remitted to the Attorney-General's office to be reviewed, particularly when cases are tried before a justice of the peace. I wish to refer to this House a conviction of which I have personal knowledge. It is not serious, but was a conviction under The Vehicles Act for driving in excess of 45 miles an hour after sunset. Now, if you recall, up to 1948, I think, it was an offence to drive over 45 miles an hour after sunset. Well, in 1949 this man was picked up by a constable for driving over 45 miles an hour. He was convicted and paid his fine. Some time later, this man was involved in another accident in which he was perfectly innocent, and this conviction came upon the record to be held against him. Now, there is where it became important but at the same time, this man should never have been convicted. He was innocent of any charge because at that date the statutes had been amended to read that he could drive up to 50 miles an hour after sunset. Therefore he was convicted of something which he should never have been convicted of, and that is the reason I say that, depositions should be taken and remitted to the Attorney-General's office and in that way they can review the case very quickly. The men in the Attorney-General's office are experienced; they know

what they are doing. They could review these things very quickly, and either O.K. them or pass them back and say this man is not guilty. In this particular case, I might say that an application was made to the Attorney-General's Department for a refund, because the man was convicted of a crime that did not exist. Of no crime was he convicted, but for some strange reason the Attorney-General's Department refused to grant him a refund, or refused to clear his name. He was granted a blue licence, which was an injustice to him. There was no crime. How could he be convicted? But he was. He was granted a blue licence, fined, the money went into the Provincial Treasury of this province and the Department refused to refund him the money. Now, if the Attorney-General was here I would quote him the file, but we are not quarrelling too much with that; it was not a large amount. I say the principle of the thing is there. Whether it is \$5 or \$5,000, if a man has paid a fine that he should not pay, he should be returned his fine, small as it is, and his licence should be reinstated to the proper colour. There is a recommendation that I would make; that these depositions should be taken and sent in. I think that, if people are going to be convicted of crimes that they did not commit, that is one of the things that is going to undermine our democracy.

I started to speak about not having a magistrate in the districts of Melville, Yorkton, Canora and Kelvington, I understand that the Attorney-General's Department tried very hard to obtain the services of a qualified magistrate, but they cannot, and the reason is that the salary is too low. I quite sympathize and agree in many ways with the Provincial Treasurer trying to economize and keep the budget down, which we are criticizing quite severely, and I include myself in those criticizing the extent of the budget. But at the same time, I think that, if we are to have proper administration of justice in this province, we must pay sufficiently to induce qualified men to take those positions. The salaries of magistrates today, I understand, are in the vicinity of \$3,000 or \$3,600 and those of district court judges, I understand, are in the vicinity of \$6,000 or \$7,000.

I just want to point out to the Government an extract that I have here from a British newspaper, which says that stipendiary magistrates (which is the same as police magistrates in this province) are paid exactly the same as county court judges in England, who are the same as district court judges here. I am not suggesting that our magistrates should be paid \$7,000, but I am suggesting that to get qualified men to do the proper job and carry the heavy burden of responsibility that is vested in our magistrates the position of a magistrate should carry possibly a salary in the vicinity of \$4,500 or \$5,000 rather than in the vicinity of \$3,000 to \$3,500. I say that, gentlemen, not to try to deplete the treasury of this province. I say that so that we can get qualified men to handle a responsible job.

I think the record of our magistrates in this province is excellent. We were very sorry to lose the magistrate that we had there. He had a wonderful record. He was a man who had never been a Liberal, he had never been a C.C.F.'er, but he was a happy-go-medium fellow as far as politics were concerned. But Mr. Potter served this country well, served this province well, and everybody in the north-east part of Saskatchewan was very sorry to see him resign on account of his health. I might say to the hon. Premier that I saw the letter of gratitude that the Premier wrote to Mr. Potter for his services, and I can assure the Premier that that was most welcome and kept

dear to Mr. Potter, who is presently residing in Toronto. Those things, I can assure the officials of the Government, are appreciated by the people they are sent to. They may not take very long to dictate and send out, but they are prized by the people who receive them, and I can pass the message on to the hon. Premier that this particular magistrate, Mr. Potter, regards highly the letter that was written to him.

I make those recommendations and I hope they reach the Attorney-General's Department. I do not think there is very much else that I wish to add to this impromptu speech that I was called upon to make, and this whole business came as somewhat of a surprise; but, nevertheless, I am very glad to have had the opportunity of being able to get up here this afternoon and this evening, and to pay the respects of my constituency to the House and also to extend to my constituents the good wishes of this Legislature.

I might say in closing that we are still very proud in my home town of our Melville 'Millionaires'. I might also tell the Premier that while we get crowds of 3,000 people at the games in Melville, we are very disappointed that, when the Melville 'Millionaires' went to Weyburn to play the team that his city sponsors there, we heard that 106 people turned out to see the game. I think that sport is a very, very important thing in this province, and I have mentioned that before in this House. I often think that if our younger generation takes an active part in sports and religion regardless of what church or religion it might be, they will become good citizens when they grow up. I do not know whether they should go into politics or not; but, to make good citizens nevertheless, I think sports are very, very important, and we in our town pride ourselves on being probably the most sport-minded town in the province of Saskatchewan. We also have, in the constituency of Melville outstanding curlers in the towns of Cupar, Lipton, Balcarres, Lemberg and Neudorf, as well as our town of Melville, and all I would add is that when the Premier goes back to Weyburn at any time during the winter and our hockey team happens to be playing down there, see if you cannot round up or scare up a few more people in Weyburn there and get 107 out next time. I do support the motion.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — In rising to take part in this debate I would first take great pleasure in complimenting the hon. members for Kelvington and Elrose who moved and seconded the Address-in-Reply. As my seat-mate has told you here, I kind of had his sentiments. He said that he realized they did not have much to work on, and I certainly realize it also. But, nevertheless, especially one of them, the hon. member for Kelvington (Mr. Howe) has been in this House for some considerable time, and he made a very good speech. I know that he has seen first-hand the things that have gone on in this House for a good number of years, and when he gives an address such as he gave here, at least there is something that we younger members can pick out of it and see what the members who were here before have done for maybe their party and maybe themselves.

I too, want to congratulate my Leader and the speech he made in this House. Some people have accused him of talking a little too long. I only wish that I were able to speak half as long as my Leader did and say half as much. If I could do that then I am sure that I would be doing a just job to the people I represent.

If any hon. members over there have a question, I hope they will stand up and ask it because I am quite prepared to answer; but if they have not got a question, then just sit down and be quiet, because I do not interrupt very much and maybe if I do it is only a little smart crack or something. I think that this interrupting has gone too far in this House, Mr. Speaker, and I am not casting any aspersions on you. I know it is very difficult to control people who yap out of their seats and do not stand up on their feet.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate you on being elected as the Speaker of this House and I would also like to congratulate you on being chosen to represent the Parliamentary Association on your trip to New Zealand, last year. Just this afternoon, I believe it was at lunch time, I was talking to Mr. Speaker on the way down to dinner and I happened to know a little of New Zealand also, though I have not been as fortunate as Mr. Speaker to visit that country. But I might say that, during the last year, I served with a good number of New Zealand boys and consequently I learned a lot of their country, of their habits, and of the New Zealand people as our first cousins. I have a great respect for them, and I am looking forward probably as much as anyone in this House to the remarks that our good Speaker will have when he tells us of his trip to New Zealand last summer.

I, too, at this time would like to congratulate Chief Justice Culliton who has left our ranks on this side of the House. We miss him very much and I think that the hon. members on the other side of the House also miss the former member for Gravelbourg very much. He was a great tower of strength to this side of the House, and I am sure that the people on the other side of the House realize that he was a tower of strength in the criticism he rendered during the last two Sessions of this Legislature.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a little in regard to my own constituency. There is a great deal of talk in this Legislature about the "hungry '30's", "seed-grain debt", P.F.R.A. and P.F.A.A. and something or other. Well, down in the part of the province that I happen to represent, have had the good fortune of being in the position, the majority of us in that seat, that during the '30's and since the '30's have not had to turn to either P.F.R.A. or P.F.A.A. or the Provincial Government or anyone else for help. I know that, perhaps, a great part of the credit should go to the powers that be who blessed us with rain and who has given us good land. We in the Moosomin seat, probably according to the survey carried out by the Minister of Agriculture in his Department in the classification of soils, are not classed among the better soils of this province. But, Mr. Speaker, you must remember that the best soil in the world would grow nothing if there was no rain. But if you have a fair- soil and a fair amount of moisture, most land in this province will produce a crop. So the Moosomin constituency is chiefly made up of rolling land, and we have been blessed with rainfall, even throughout the '30's, even if it was not very much; but we did get enough to produce a crop and, consequently, to be able to look after ourselves without too much assistance from either the Federal or Provincial Governments.

We, in the Moosomin seat, this last year I might say, Mr. Speaker, had some 40 inches of rainfall and that is a tremendous amount of rain. I was rather struck, today, when someone on the other side of the House remarked on the condition of No. 1 Highway during the past year. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that No. 1 Highway was not fit for a horse and wagon during this last

summer, and I am not complaining so much to the Minister of Highways about this, because I realize that No. 1 Highway was built many years ago, over 20 years ago. There has been a tremendous amount of money and work put into that road in endeavouring to keep it passable, and the thing is that today the old No. 1 is being replaced by the now Trans-Canada Highway. So I am, therefore, not blaming the Government or the Minister for the conditions of No. 1 Highway for the last two years. But for any member to have the audacity to stand up in this House and try to tell me what condition No. 1 Highway was in, I think it is, well, I am not going to say what I think it is. I might relate that for the last four or five years there have been weeks on end when No. 1 Highway in this province has been impassable. I myself have pulled out hundreds and hundreds of cars and trucks on No. 1 Highway, pulled them out of mudholes, where if you did not have a track-type tractor it would be impossible to even pull them out. I just wanted to say that I am not so much criticizing the Government or the Minister in charge, because I know, and he knew himself, that this road was going to be re-routed and rebuilt. I just wanted to make it clear that No. 1 Highway certainly is no golden road.

I want to say a few words, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the land-use system that has been set up by this Government. I happen to be a returned man and a farmer, and I am also settled on land under the Veterans' Land Act. We hear a great deal from the other side of the House with regard to the way the veterans of the First World War were treated, with respect to those who went on land. I know it maybe was not very well. The Government of that day had little or no experience. This thing was dropped on them all of a sudden, and I do not think they even realized the number of people returning from the first World War who wanted to return to the land. But the Federal Government profited by their experience, and I want to say now, and I would like to go on the record, that any young man who returned from this war and took advantage of the Veterans' Land Act certainly got a good deal. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I was probably very fortunate. I came home from the war a little early. I got out ahead of some of the other boys, probably a year, and I was able, at that time, to purchase land that bordered my father's land, and good land, And I say I was fortunate. But the thing is, Mr. Speaker, that for boys who returned at the end of the war, or a year and a year and a half after the war ended, there is no land available for them today as private owners. There is a lot of land in the northern part of this province which these veterans, I am sure, would be only too pleased to buy, but they have not got the option to buy. I know a lot of these people personally whose only desire in life is to become a farmer, maybe a half-section farmer, to buy that land and to own it, and they have not got faith in this administration, they have not got faith enough to take the lease with them. They are not content with that. They want to own land, and I do not blame them. I wanted to own land, and I know that these people want to own land and I know from some members on this side of the House and some people in the north-eastern part of this province that there is good land there, good land, that should be made available for these veterans and should be made available for them to buy — not to lease, but to buy. I was rather taken back . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — May I ask a question, Mr. Speaker? Is the hon. member not aware that the 2,000 veterans, who incidentally have been settled on provincial Crown lands, and which incidentally represents more than has been settled by all the other provinces in the Dominion put together, that those veterans are entitled to purchase their land?

Mr. McDonald: — Will you sell land to veterans today?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Certainly, under similar agreement. And if an agreement entered into with . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Will you give a returned man the option to come into your Department today and lay down a cheque for a half-section of land; will you give him title, today or tomorrow? No, you won't; it is ten years. What I am objecting to, Mr. Speaker, is because these people will not give the veteran, and not necessarily a veteran, the chance to buy. Why should he have to be a veteran in order to purchase land? Why shouldn't any young man who has attained the age to go out on his own and farm not be able to buy Crown lands in his own name, that he should have that security? It is the greatest security that any farmer has — to own his land.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the speaker's statement is entirely erroneous because it was V.L.A., Ottawa that imposed that 10-year waiting period before the veteran could purchase his land. They were the ones who inflicted that.

Mr. Kuziak: — The Liberal Government.

Mr. McDonald: — That is a long question. I do not know what the answer is to that one, because I do not think there is any question. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, when, I think, my hon. friend for Redberry was speaking with regard to this land-lease policy, someone on that side of the House — I am not sure whether it was the Minister of Agriculture or not, but I think it was — mentioned something with respect to the mortgage companies on the land that they owned in this province, and wanted to know if my hon. friend was in favour of the mortgage companies lending this land out on a third-crop share basis. Now, I have had some dealings with mortgage companies that had land in this province, and any mortgage company that I ever dealt with were only too willing to sell land. They would sell land at the first opportunity if they had any guarantee that they could get their money for it. But under the laws that have been put on the statute books in this province by this present administration, they have no guarantee that they can collect their money and, therefore, they are preventing these mortgage companies, these "huge capitalists," these "vermin", from selling their land, and there is nobody more responsible for it than this present administration in this province. I know individuals who have land for sale today, and because they are bound to the legislation which this administration has passed, they are reluctant to sell their land for anything but cash. Well, no young man today, with the price of land what it is, with the price of machinery what it is, can go out and buy land for cash. If he pays one-third down, he is making a big payment. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am very much against this land-lease policy. I think that any man who wants to go out and to own land should be given the opportunity to do so, should be encouraged to do so, and he should be given assistance by the Provincial Government to do so.

I mentioned at the outset of my remarks a little with regard to highways. I would now like to add a little more. There is a spot in here where this last government was called a "do-nothing" government or something, and my friends opposite have often laughed about the roads that they built. So I would like to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that prior to 1944

when this administration came into office, they were also hiding under disguise. They are not hiding anything, it is a natural fact — they say themselves that machinery was hard to obtain between the years 1944 and 1946. We all know that, and we all agree with it. But, prior to that, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government which preceded this administration also had very much difficulty in purchasing machines. You could not buy them. From the beginning of the war they were unobtainable. The war broke out after one of the worst depressions the world has ever seen, not only the Dominion of Canada, but the entire world. We went through a period there when you probably could have bought machinery if you had anything to buy it with; but they did not have it, the revenues of this province were down around \$20 million a year. It was unobtainable. If you have no money you cannot buy machinery and you cannot build roads, and I think if we go back to the beginning of the depression, the end of the late '20s, that our roads were in good shape in this province. I know down in my constituency we had some good roads. We had far better roads there in 1929 than we have today. I want to say that. It was the same all over. I will agree with that. I know, I worked with the Department of Highways before I went into the Service, and I know what the roads were like.

Premier Douglas: — You should drive on them.

Mr. McDonald: — The Premier is in the same class as the other people I was speaking to a moment ago. If he wants to speak let him get up and say it. With regard to the Trans-Canada Highway which they are building through my constituency, there is quite a story actually. I think the Hon. Minister of Highways will remember here, I think it was the Session of two years ago, when I asked him something in regard to the specifications of this new highway he told me that it was going to be the same specifications as the highway in Manitoba. So I asked him at that time . . .

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I made no such statement, because the Manitoba highway is built with a 44-foot top, ours is not.

Mr. McDonald: — That is right. I agree with the hon. Minister, Mr. Speaker; but at that time, two years ago, when I asked him what specifications they were going to follow, he told me they were going to follow the specifications as laid down in Manitoba. Now, if you will let me finish . . .

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, he's got to take my word, I made no such statement . . .

Mr. McDonald: — . . . and at that time, Mr. Speaker,

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — The records will show that I made no such statement . . . Mr. Speaker, have I the floor?

Mr. McDonald: — All right, go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I made no such statement because we had no wish to comply with those specifications. We were not willing to pay for the top, and we were building to a much higher specification so far as the base was concerned. And if my hon. member knows anything about roads, he will know that . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. McDonald: — I am going to continue with what I was saying. At that time I sent a pageboy across to the Hon. Minister with the specifications of the Manitoba highway. I think the Hon. Minister will agree that I did send that across to him. And I was trying to find out . . . I beg your pardon?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — You didn't send the specifications over.

Mr. McDonald: — I sent the specifications that were laid down by the Department of Highways of the Manitoba Government across to you by a page in this Legislature, because the hon. Minister intimated to me that the specifications of the portion in Manitoba of the Trans-Canada Highway were the same; for instance, I think it is No. 39 runs out here and down to the International Boundary.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, at that particular time we did not know what the specifications of the Trans-Canada Highway were going to be. They were not laid down until April of 1950. That is simply ridiculous.

Mr. McDonald: — Anyway, what happened, Mr. Speaker? I know he did not know what the specifications were and that is what I was worrying about. He goes down to my part of the province — that is where the Trans-Canada Highway started in the province, I think, down on the Manitoba border — and he constructed a road of similar construction to, I think, it is No. 39 that runs out here down to Weyburn and . . . this was a 38-foot top and rolled around a bit here and there; but this road was not passed by the Federal Government, by Mr. Winters or his second in command, I don't know who came out here to inspect . . . but anyway it could not pass.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Winters' engineers were prepared to pass that piece of road; I was not. And that was built before anything had ever been signed with the Federal Government.

Mr. McDonald: — Well, then, I might suggest to the hon. Minister that had he constructed this road the way he wanted it constructed in the first place, and not built it one way and then go back and build it over again, he would have saved this province a lot of money. I know that the Minister ran into a lot of difficulties down there, and I can appreciate that just as well as anyone in this House. I know we had, as I have said, a lot of rain in that part of the province and it was a problem of moving mud not dirt, and that even made the situation worse because, this year, when they came down to widen the roads, what happens? They have got an old grade there and they have got nothing but mud to put a foot on each side of it, to cut some of the hills off and fill some of the hollows. I do not know who made the mistake, but there was a mistake made and it was the responsibility of the Department of Highways in this province.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — There was no mistake made.

Mr. McDonald: — Well, there must have been a mistake when you built the road to one specification and then came back and changed it. You don't do that unless you make mistakes. However, Mr. Speaker . . .

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Trying to switch from the Tory Party to the Liberal Party now?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. McDonald: — However, Mr. Speaker, I feel sure that in another year or two, we will have a road built from the Manitoba boundary to Moosomin, anyway. We have got two years there now, I do not know whether any of it has been completed now, or whether they will go back and tear it all up again, next year. I don't know. But I do know that we certainly need the road and we will certainly appreciate it. I am only concerned about the thing, because I really believe in my own mind that we are spending too much money there. This fall, they came in and put gravel on. I sincerely hope that next fall they will not come back and put dirt on top of the gravel.

When the hon. member for Hanley was Speaking in this Legislature a few days ago, he seemed to be rather concerned that during the last Federal redistribution of seats in this province, Saskatchewan had lost one seat. Well, I am just going to tell the hon. member now that if the policies of this Government are not changed, we will not lose one seat by the time the next Federal election comes along, we will lose four or five probably, because the people are leaving this province, Mr. Speaker, to go elsewhere.

At this time I would also like to associate myself with my seatmate, the hon. member for Melville when he was expressing his views with regard to truck licences in this province. I might also say something with regard to car licences. As we all know, the majority of us have the privilege of representing rural constituencies. We know there that the average farmer may operate his car for four months, whereas the average individual who lives in the large towns or a city operates his car for 12 months of the year. And I can certainly agree with the hon. member for Melville that I do not think it is fair that a man who operates his car for four months, compared to the man who operates his for 12, should either pay (a) as much licence fee, or (b) as much insurance, because after all, he is not using the road to the same extent.

I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, a few words with regard to oil. I never got very enthused about oil until somebody happened to dig an oil well only about 13 miles from my farm, and he happened to get oil. Then I got very enthused about it, and I began to wonder maybe if they would dig a well on my farm. But there is rather a peculiar situation down there, Mr. Speaker. I happen to live within 2 miles of the Manitoba boundary, and I note that in buying oil leases from the private individuals, the oil companies seem a little reluctant to pay as much for a lease in Saskatchewan as in Manitoba. I do not know why. But I note that they are travelling the boundary there and they are paying 10 cents in Saskatchewan and \$1.00 in Manitoba. This was before the oil well was built. Now, it has gone up considerably since that because the leases have moved in there since I came to Regina, and I have been unable to follow what is going on today. But it seems rather odd to me why an oil company would pay 10 cents on one side of the road and \$1.00 on the other, when there is only a road allowance between them. I do not know what the reason is, and perhaps when the Minister of Natural Resources speaks he will tell us.

There is one other thing I would like to mention and that is rural electrification. The Minister in charge and I had a very enjoyable evening

Moosomin, this early winter, when they opened the automatic telephones in the town of Moosomin. I want to thank the Minister for seeing fit to install the automatic telephones in our area, and I know that all the people down there appreciate it. I think one reason for it was that it is heavily populated area; there are a lot of telephones and the old system was terribly congested. I know there is an improvement today. But for the same reason, Mr. Speaker, that we got the automatic telephones, I think that we should be getting into the class who are receiving rural electrification. We are a heavily populated area; the farms are small; there are many towns that have not electricity, and I would certainly like the Minister to give due consideration to some rural electrification in that area, not only for the people on the farm, but for two or three towns to the south of me. I think actually they are in my Hon. friend from Cannington's constituency.

I noted yesterday, when the Minister of Municipal Affairs was speaking, he mentioned something with respect to schools and cited the mill rate for schools in the Wallace municipality in Manitoba. Now, the Wallace municipality is the municipality directly east from Maryfield, the municipality in which I reside. Well, I was rather taken back, because probably the Wallace municipality is one of the best off municipalities in the province of Manitoba. It, and the municipality which lies north of it, without a doubt I think that their bank accounts would be the envy of any municipality possibly in Western Canada. Now, the municipality of Wallace, I submit, Mr. Speaker, can afford to pay a large mill rate to their schools because the municipality of Wallace have a tremendous grant from their provincial government with respect to roads, and the municipal tax for roads is very small. In the municipality of Wallace they have a good many all weather roads, a good many roads that are gavelled, a good many roads that are plowed in the wintertime and kept open. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that is one thing that we must do in this province, in order to keep our rural people on the farms. We have got to give them (a) telephones, (b) power and (c) roads, and I do not necessarily mean in that order. I think first of all the most important is roads, all-weather roads, on which they can get out summer and winter. There is a tremendous area of this province — I'll venture to say the vast majority of the rural population of this province, are not able to get into their local town for mail more than four or five months of the year; that is, with an automobile. I think that if we are going to keep the rural people on the farm, we must immediately give them some assistance either directly or to the municipality to help build their roads.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two with regard to the situation in Korea. I know that, when the Premier was speaking in his address in this Chamber, he intimated, as a matter of fact I think he said, that the soldiers in Korea, the soldiers, sailors and airmen, were fighting there to defend the corrupt governments of Chiang Kai-Shek or the Standard Oil.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, a question of privilege. I said no such thing. I at no time said any such thing.

Mr. McDonald: — Well, I certainly took it for that.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am not responsible for what my hon. friend took it for. I am saying what I said. I did not make that statement.

Mr. McDonald: — Well, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, if I put it this way: that he did not want our soldiers, sailors and airmen to fight in Korea for the protection of Chiang Kai-Shek and his corrupt administration, or the Standard Oil. I think maybe that is right.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Do you want our soldiers to fight for the purpose of maintaining . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I am as concerned with the soldiers of this country as any member on that side of the House, and probably more so.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — And a lot more than some of them on that side.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. member to withdraw that remark.

Mr. Speaker: — He should.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said he is just as concerned as any member on this side of the House with what the soldiers are fighting for. I said, "In my opinion he is a lot more concerned, that is the member for Moosomin, in what the soldiers are fighting for than a lot of the members on that side of the House are."

Mr. McDonald: — Well, Mr. Speaker, shall we say that I am just as concerned as my colleagues on this side of the House are with what our soldiers, airmen and sailors are fighting for in Korea. And, Mr. Speaker, I think our soldiers, sailors and airmen know what they are fighting for. I do not think for one moment that they went into the armed service for glorification. I do not think for one moment that they went in there for the pay they get, because if they did, it will be something like politics, they will be sadly mistaken. I think that they went in, Mr. Speaker, because they felt they had a duty to perform. I think that they felt that they owed that responsibility to the people who had fought before them in other wars. I think that they felt that the life we lead in this country and in all the free countries of the world, was the life that was worth defending. Mr. Speaker, the way I understand the situation in Korea is this. I understand that the United Nations and their forces went to Korea with the express purpose of defending the world from Communists; I mean that they are trying to prevent the spread of Communism. But they did not go to protect the island of Formosa just to keep the Chinese out of Formosa. They went there to protect the rest of the world from the ever-spreading tentacles of Communism. I believe that it would be more fitting if the Premier of this province would go out and back a blood campaign which is now taking place in most of the provinces throughout the Dominion of Canada. And that is a campaign whereby the people of this province and the people of the Dominion of Canada are going to get, and trying to build up, a blood bank to send to Korea, so that our boys over there, whether they be Canadians, Americans, no matter who they may be, may be administered blood in the time of battle. Now, I know, Mr. Speaker, and you probably know as well as I do, that a great many lives were saved during the last war by the blood which was donated by the citizens of Canada and throughout the free world. Therefore, I sincerely hope that the Premier will get behind this campaign, do everything possible to further its activities and to save as many lives as is humanly possible in this struggle in Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken a little longer than I intended to, but there were just a few things I wanted to mention at this time. I sincerely hope that I will be able to give another address in this Legislature at a later date. As for the amendment, Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment and oppose the motion.

Mr. J.G. Egnatoff (Melfort): — Mr. Speaker, in rising at this time, I want to assure all hon. members on both sides of the House that I will confine my remarks entirely to the amendment that is before us at the present. I feel that this amendment is of such tremendous importance to the present and future development of land in this province that I should express my feeling on the matter. This is a problem on which I think every member of this House should make himself very clear. Every hon. member should state whether or not he is in favour of the Government policy of allocating all new land only on a 33-year lease basis. The people of this province are entitled to know where the members of this Legislature stand. The hon. Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Sturdy) said, a few moments ago, when he interjected that it is possible to buy outright, Crown land from the Government which he represents. Either the Minister of Social Welfare does not know exactly what he is talking about or else the policy as explained by the Department of Agriculture on June 12th, last, is not correct. One or the other is not correct, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) will take part in the debate on this particular amendment. I am sure the people who have elected him to the legislature will want to know whether he is right in the pamphlet which his Department issued, or the Minister of Social Welfare is right.

According to the pamphlet to which I just referred a moment ago, we find these words:

"A realistic and firm allocation policy for the allocation of new land has now been established."

It goes on to elaborate the general policy of eligibility which will be applied when dealing with applications for new land. I think every member of this House should acquaint himself with those conditions and I am now reading from this document, which I think should be authentic, signed by I.C. Nollet, Minister of Agriculture, A.L. Thompson, Director of Lands and M.E. Hartnett, Deputy Minister of that Department. And I quote:

"The following general policy of eligibility will be applied when dealing with applications for new lands:

1. In the fringe areas of settlement, local eligible farmers will necessarily enjoy a preference, after which preference will be given to other eligible persons with basic agricultural background, who are residents in the vicinity of available lands and whose need for agricultural establishment is evident. In view of equipment costs, special consideration will be given to applicants interested in operating on a co-operative basis."

Before I quote any further, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that giving preference simply on the basis of whether or not a person is interested in

operating on a co-operative basis on the farms is a discrimination against those individuals who want to own their own piece of land and operate it as they see fit. I wish to quote further:

"2. A continuous connection with farming will naturally carry a preference as against an intermittent farm back ground.

3. In all cases where eligible applicants are dealt with, all other things being equal, veterans will receive a preference. After the land in an area has been inspected for disposition, it will be advertised, applications will be invited and eligible applicants dealt with as far as possible on an area basis. The final allocation will be decided by a land allocation committee which will, wherever practicable, hold local sittings to make disposition."

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Any objection?

Mr. Egnatoff: — If the hon. Minister of Social Welfare has not understood my position thus far, I want to reassure him that, as far as I am concerned, there should be no discrimination in the allocation of new land against people who want to own it outright. And the land policy which the hon. Minister of Social Welfare espouses — co-operative farming — as a result of which one such farm has been named after him, the "Sturdy Farm", up in the Carrot River area; I want to state definitely that there are many people in that area who do not believe in the use-lease land policy which the Minister of Social Welfare espouses.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — May I ask the hon. member a question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Egnatoff: — By all means, if you will not make a speech I will be glad to answer your question.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — You are making all the speeches in this Session, my boy. Of the little over 2,000 veteran farms allocated by this Government, how many of them are co-operative farms?

Mr. Egnatoff: — I would suggest the hon. Minister of Social Welfare if he does not know the answer to that question, that he put it on the Order Papers in the usual procedure.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I have not had an answer to my question.

Mr. Egnatoff: — I do know, Mr. Speaker, that most of our people in Saskatchewan believe in private ownership of land and that most of the people of Saskatchewan would not approve of this policy. I will be very glad, Mr. Speaker, to have the hon. Minister of Agriculture take a whirl at defending this policy any time. What is more, Mr. Speaker, I will be very happy to have the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture call an election in this province on this one issue alone, and as soon as that is done you may rest assured that the hon. Minister of Natural Resources will not be able to hold the constituency of Tisdale.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Will you take even money on that, Johnny?

Mr. Egnatoff: — Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the very chummy disposition of the hon. Minister of Social Welfare. First, he referred to me as "my boy", and now he is referring to me across the House as "Johnny". I do not know how much further the hon. Minister of Social Welfare wishes to go.

I think that this is a policy, a long-term policy, adopted by the C.C.F. Government which should have been considered on the floor of this Legislature before being imposed upon the people of this province.

We sometimes talk about increasing farm production. One of the best incentives to increasing farm production is to assure people that they can receive a title to a piece of land. As a matter of fact, it would also be an incentive for people to remain on the farms. Mr. Speaker, the land policy of the present socialistic Government of Saskatchewan, to which we are objecting in this amendment, is just a definite indication of the ultimate objective of the present socialistic Government. It is going to get closer to the socialization of land. It simply proves that you cannot be "Just a little Socialist"; either you are a Socialist or you are not; either you stand behind the Regina Manifesto or you do not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that this land policy of the present Government merely bears out a policy which they talked about back in 1933. I have in my hand the "C.C.F. — Saskatchewan Farmer-Labour group, a handbook for speakers compiled from reports of conferences held in Saskatoon and Regina, January 7th, and February 11th, respectively, 1933."

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, might I ask the hon. member a question? Is that the one the C.C.F. printed or the one the Liberals printed?

Mr. Egnatoff: — Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the hon. Minister of Natural Resources, who was quite happy about defending the exploitation policies of the fishermen and trappers of the North, and who now would extend that socialization policy to our people who wish to live on farm lands . . .

Premier Douglas: — Be careful you don't bite yourself.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Coming from the Premier of this province, I appreciate such quips. This afternoon we have had a great demonstration of how not to behave in the dignified position of Premier.

To answer the hon. Minister of Natural Resources' question — incidentally, I am prepared to talk here, Mr. Speaker, until I will have said what I intend to say, even if it takes me until 11 o'clock, at which time I will be ready to resume tomorrow afternoon.

Premier Douglas: — I shudder at the thought.

Mr. Egnatoff: — I am sure you would.

I will answer the question of the Minister of Natural Resources regarding this handbook. I want to assure him that it is an authentic document, signed by C.M. Fines, President. I presume that is President of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, Saskatchewan Section, the Farmer-Labour group.

With regard to their Provincial policy, which is related to this land policy, on page 22 we find this:

"In the opinion of the organized Farmer-Labour group in Saskatchewan, the present economic crisis is due to the inherent unsoundness of the capitalistic system, which is based on private ownership of resources and the capitalistic control of production and distribution. Objective — the social ownership of all resources and the machinery of wealth production, to the end that we may establish a co-operative commonwealth in which the basic principle regulating production, distribution and exchange will be the supplying of human needs instead of the making of profit.

"In order to facilitate the attainment of the above objective, we propose, if elected, to enact immediately the following measures:

1. The establishment of a planned system of social economy for the production, distribution and exchange of all goods and services.
2. Security of tenure to be obtained by institution of perpetual use-hold on home and land instead of package or Torrens title."

Mr. Tucker: — Applaud that one.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Now, I am not through reminding hon. members . . .

(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker: — I have asked hon. members before to refrain from comments from one side of the House to the other. If you keep on that way we will never have any decorum this House.

Mr. Egnatoff: — As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it does not bother me a great deal.

Mr. Speaker: — It bothers me.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Getting right down to the land policy, we have these words in the form of questions and answers:

"What method would you adopt in dealing with land when a certain amount of agricultural land is socialized and a certain amount is not?"

The answer is this:

"The essential thing about farming is not the land itself but the production. You want to prevent the possibility of one man obtaining control of production and profit out of his neighbour. You set up a state marketing board; every farmer is treated the same,

whether he holds the land under lease or not. He produces for use and not for profit. You stabilize the price of produce and, in this way, the farmer receives his remuneration."

Another question taken from this same handbook:

"Can you give an explanation of clause 2 of our Provincial economic policy, security of tenure? Is security of tenure to be obtained by the institution of perpetual use-hold on home and land instead of package or Torrens titles?"

"A substitution of perpetual use-hold for home and land titles, when and if requested by the present registered owner or dispossessed owner who now occupies under a lease."

Further on in this same pamphlet — as a matter of fact, one should really remind the hon. members on your right of the entire content of this handbook that they used; but quoting just another excerpt from it:

"We propose that land socialization shall be voluntary. Those who have Torrens titles and wish to hold them do so. If a man has a small mortgage against his land and thinks that a Torrens title would be superior to the title we propose, then he may pay off the mortgage and retain his title. Many cannot do this, so we have to put forward a scheme for security of tenure. This scheme may take some little time to work out. This is the one direct pledge we make that if the Farmer-Labour government is returned to power we will immediately place on the Statute Books all legislation necessary to give security of tenure in land and home to our people."

I presume, Mr. Speaker, that the land allocation policy of the present Government is its means of providing security to the people who wish to settle on new land. "What's the matter with it?" an hon. member asks. There is just one thing wrong with it. The people of Saskatchewan do not like that policy. It is not in keeping with democratic rights of citizens. On your use-lease basis, it is the security of tenure that people do not want.

I think it might be well to put on the record of this House our own Liberal policy with regard to the present Socialist Government's policy, and I wish to quote from the resolutions passed at the convention of the Saskatchewan Liberal Party held at Saskatoon, November 13th and 14th, 1950:

"Abolition of the land-tenancy policy of the C.C.F. Government and restoration of the fundamental right of the individual to acquire ownership of the land. A farm settlement scheme to provide assistance to prospective

farmers and particularly young farmers in taking up farming. A survey of the northern parts of the province to decide what areas are suitable for forests or for agricultural development. Areas suitable for agriculture to be cleared and opened to settlers chosen without political bias. A programme of assistance to settlers with the aim of providing for their security and their ownership of the land."

Now there is much land available in north-eastern Saskatchewan that should be opened up, land to which people should have the right to acquire title.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Could you give the House any indication of the size of the area of new land that would be immediately available for settlement?

Mr. Egnatoff: — I am quite surprised, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture has not at his finger-tips such information.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I am asking you. You are doing some talking about it.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Ask your Deputy. He might know if you don't.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You don't know.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to you from a letter signed by the secretary-treasurer of the Carrot River-The Pas Route Association, dated February 8, 1951, I will not read the entire letter to the House because that would be time-consuming. However, I do wish to read the parts that are relevant to our present amendment:

"The feeling is becoming increasingly general that our Government is just not fully aware of the circumstances and possibilities of this area, particularly not aware or concerned about the requests emanating from the Carrot River Valley."

Leading further from this same letter:

"The fact, of course, remains that the arable area is of considerable proportions. One quotation based on a careful estimate made by a resident who has checked the area back and forth for many years, is that about 200,000 acres adjacent to the proposed route could be brought under cultivation with little or no drainage problem. Estimates of the total area of first-class farming land seem to average somewhere between a million, a million and a half to two million acres. In any event, there can be no argument, that the possibilities are terrific."

Reading further from this letter:

"Only yesterday, I had the opportunity of driving to the Red Earth Indian Reserve, which is 50 miles east of Carrot River, and I was particularly impressed with

the heavy clay which predominated throughout the whole 50 miles. There was not a trace of any muskeg in any area adjacent to the road. The road was in good shape but, of course, it will have to be built up to withstand summer rains. There would certainly be no problem in finding a solid roadbed."

Then he goes on from here to talk about the proposed road which they would like the Government to construct in that area, but I will not read it because it is irrelevant. The people of north-eastern Saskatchewan are so impressed with the possibilities of that Carrot River triangle and the area to which I have referred, that they had in Carrot River not so very long ago, a meeting of almost 400 persons, and that meeting devoted its entire time to a discussion of the development of that particular area. I will venture to say that, if a consensus of opinion had been taken there, the great majority of them would have been opposed to the present C.C.F. Government's policy with regard to the allocation of land only on the 33-year lease basis. As a matter of fact, they feel, and very rightly so, that the policies with regard to the allocation of new land in this province is throttling agricultural development in the northwest.

I do not wish to take up any more time of the hon. members except to say this, Mr. Speaker. I hope that each member will, on this occasion, take his own personal stand with regard to the Government's land policy, regardless of the party to which he happens to belong. I will say again to the hon. Minister of Agriculture and to the Premier that any time the Government wishes to call an election on its land policy — that is its policy of allocating land only on a 33-year lease basis — I, for one, am ready to fight the issue.

Mr. J.G. Banks (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, hon. members of the Legislature, I wish to join with the others who have gone ahead of me in congratulating the member from Kelvington (Mr. Howe) and the member for Elrose (Mr. Willis) on their excellent speeches in moving and seconding the Address. I would also congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on the splendid address he made and the Premier on his reply. I want particularly to congratulate Mr. Speaker who made a trip of ten thousand miles across to the other side of the world. At 70 years of age, he surely should be thankful that he has the constitution to do it. I did not know, as a matter of fact, that he was away until he told me since I came to Regina.

I remember very well, when two years ago, certain words were expressed here by the hon. member from Canora (Mr. Kuziak). We have not heard much about them since that time; but one or two little things which came up in this Session reminded me of them. The "God-forsaken" town. Well, Canora has improved a little since then, and I want to congratulate the hon. member for the fine new rink they have put up. It certainly stands as a monument of the progress of this community, and I believe he had a large part in the erection of it. Whether or not he took the words I uttered here to heart — I believe he did; but in any event, there is another thing that happened there which struck me very much, and that was the magnificent vote that was polled by the Liberal in the last Federal

election when, according to the returns, that seat which our hon. friend has the honour to represent gave the Liberal candidate 900 majority. I think that will do him for a while insofar as his socialist policies are concerned.

Just by way of interjection, I had never heard of these extremely large farms until I came to the Legislature. We have half-section men. Actually we have the larger farms; but I believe that there are a lot them centred in the Cut Knife district which is represented by the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Now, I had heard him speak and read his writings about these large farms, and he told the people of Saskatchewan and the people in the north that the day of the small farm in Saskatchewan was gone. This was some three years ago. He said that eventually all farming in Saskatchewan would be on a large scale; that modern machinery made it that way, and that the man with the quarter-section and the half-section, his days were gone. Now, I have heard some history. As a matter of fact, we hear a good deal about those constituencies that are represented by C.C.F. members at our Liberal Conventions. They come down and talk to us, and I must say that I got a lot of information about Cut Knife and I would ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture, when he addresses this Legislature if he could explain to this House just why there are so many very large farms in that Cut Knife district. Land in our district is too expensive. But I have not heard as much lately about those large farms. Well, I do not agree with it. I believe that this is going to be a province of small farms. You may have it in those other countries where there are large tracts of land where they get four, five and six bushels to the acre, but where we live and get 25, 35, 40 bushels to the acre and raise 100 bushels of oats to the acre, we are not in the mood to go into the large farming at all. I would not like to see it for very many reasons, because when men retire they have got to have somebody to take their places — and who is going to be able to go up and buy these? It just means that if you are living in an area where there are nothing but large farms, you have to sell out to one of the larger farmers, and that makes it that much bigger.

I want to get possibly the unpleasant part over right away, and it is with respect to certain statements made up in Yorkton by the hon. the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines). These statements were made on the 19th day of October, and I am going to briefly refer to them. That is in my area, and I understand the hon. Provincial Treasurer visited Yorkton at that time. This is the headline of the report, "People betrayed by the Liberal Government." I did not know, attending this Legislature, that the Provincial Treasurer was an ordinary 'soap boxer.' He is very dignified in the House, and I never heard him speak . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Thank you.

Mr. Banks: — But by reputation I know that where he does speak the C.C.F. candidates are all defeated; so possibly, he is trying to improve his technique, and set about this in Yorkton. These are the words he said: "It is little wonder the farmers of Saskatchewan . . . I am confident that if a federal election were held today not one Liberal member would be re-elected in Saskatchewan."

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Don't you agree?

Mr. Banks: — Now, here is another thing. Among the many things he said was that due to the reduced price for wheat the farmers will lose \$100 million in a single year. I was wondering where the Premier heard that. Who gets this \$100 million? That is the reason for the speech by the hon. Minister of Public Health. He said something about elevators. He was able to talk away back to 1933, -34, -35 and tried to work out some scheme that would establish to the people that the Premier was not against the Wheat Board. He knew the seriousness of that statement — not when he made it, but he knew it afterwards; and he knew that if this Wheat Board lost \$100 million a year the farmers of Saskatchewan would soon quit. So we have them all trying to straighten that away.

Last fall, I was right in the thick of this agitation about wheat. The farmers up there started forming unions. These farmers' unions were carried on by a bunch of people. They gathered together, discussed these things and they discussed, this year, the question of the frozen wheat. There was nothing left untouched. And they discussed it and talked about it and met at meetings until they finally came to the conclusion that the wheat really was no good, that it was frozen and that commercially it was worth very little. Well, this question of the loss of \$100 million was very important at first. They thought: "Oh, well, there is some good wheat here. It looks all right, it weighs 55 pounds to 56 pounds, so, therefore, it must be good; but by the time these groups of farmers — and they know a great deal more than a lot of you do here — had read that statement that was given out by the hon. member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Wellbelove), they came to the conclusion that they were not abused at all and that they had received a very, very handsome price, and that they were glad it was not the Grain Exchange because they figured that if that had been put on the open market in mass amounts they might have received 25 or 30 cents a bushel.

Now, that was the thing that was hot and people were thinking about at the time that this hon. Provincial Treasurer said: "Why, you have lost \$100 million". Well, so much for that.

I would just like to follow up my friend, the hon. member from Melfort where he left off with this question of socialization of land. You will recall that he stated that much of the land is mortgaged. Those valuable quarter sections up in this north-eastern part all have mortgages on them. As a matter of fact, there were many that were in arrears. They got so badly in arrears that when there was a good crop they would pay up to two or three years taxes and a couple of years interest then, in a year or two, fall behind again, so that this became such an important question the people were talking about it a great deal. I have had them come into my office, 20 or 30 of them to ask what could be done. You recall that statute that was passed by the former Government and held ultra vires by the Privy Council. There was no such thing as debt adjustment in the Province, and we were in bad shape in a great many ways. But I am going to just start right back at 1933. Now, here are the two views at that time. There were not very many Socialists, but they said, "Here, your lands are so badly mortgaged you will never be able to pay for them; where are you going to get the money? You owe other money; this is a first mortgage.

Now, if you will transfer that land to us or give the control to us, we will pay the mortgage companies." That was their idea. That was the beginning of the Socialist idea of socialization of land. They said at the same time, "We will give you a lease in return. We will give you a lease that will entitle you to possession as long as you live and are in occupation." Well, that sounded good enough, I suppose, to some people, but the C.C.F. Government was not in power and they could not do anything about it. All they could do was talk.

Now, just one thing here. I think the Minister of Public Health will remember that in 1935 there was a Liberal Government in power, and he will recall (although he did not tell us the other day) that there was just about a billion bushels of wheat owned by this Wheat Pool — just about a billion bushels in 1935. They had that tremendous amount of wheat which they had to sell.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Did you say a billion bushels?

Mr. Banks: — Just about.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Oh no, it was not more than three-quarters of a million.

Mr. Banks: — But I am talking about the surpluses. Those surpluses had not been sold.

What happened? Our Government at Ottawa amended that statute. It was known as the Farmers' Creditors' Arrangement Act. They amended that, and they appointed boards throughout Saskatchewan, and they told the farmers, "We will cut your debts down. We will make it so that you can stay on the land. We will reduce these debts till you are able to pay for them." Well, they went to work. Remember, the hon. Chief Justice Brown? I think he stayed for ten years and he made such a job that people stayed on their land, paid off their mortgages, and this is what we have today.

Now you have the one on the other hand where people are living, owning their land, and I venture to say there is not one of those farmer members across the Chamber that want this, or that have, this leased property. I do not expect you have one — or anyone that wants it either. But the amount of wheat was gradually put onto the world market; the money came in, and under the careful supervision of that Board of Review, and with the Farmers' Creditors' Arrangement Act, the picture was changed completely until we came up to 1938-39. The surplus was gone; wheat gradually came back in price and had it not been for the war there probably would have been dollar wheat. Now, I am not going to enter into these petty little disputes as to the farmers going to Ottawa and demanding all that, but I want to say this about it, that, from and after that date, the Wheat Board was established it is there until this day.

I am just going to say a word or two about these United Farmers that we have up in our part. I believe that easily 80 per cent of the men who are on the land belong to the United Farmers. It is an experiment. It is this: they can get out and discuss their own affairs. I hope it will succeed. I think they have a right to discuss their affairs, act on this, pass resolutions, send them in here, then we will know what they want.

But remember this: they are quite in earnest. They figure they have some thing ahead, and they hope to keep it active, and they hope that they will be able to influence somewhat the affairs of this province insofar as it affects the farmers. I could not help but be impressed a little with a statement by one of the farmers this fall, when he said this:

"We have had plenty of farm organizations in Saskatchewan, oh yes, (he said) many, many farm organizations, and the thing I do not like about it is this, they perpetuate themselves from year to year although we never have any authority to re-elect them or give them new authority, and they hold that authority when they have no actual authority from the farmers' organization."

Now that seems to me to be very important, and I was impressed by it, and I think their policy is that every one of their officials must be elected from year to year.

I do not know whether you have to have hard times to elect a C.C.F. Government, but it seems to me you have to have hard times to sow the seed. We have that here. Ever since I came to this Legislature three years ago, all their arguments and all their speeches are built up from the 1930's and, of course, that is getting old now. Instead of having the '30's now they have to get right down to business, and I cannot say how long that will go on, but I do not think it will be more than a couple of years.

We have had difficulties with our roads up there. We have not had any money to speak of. The way I figure it out, we should be getting over \$100,000 a year spent in the constituency if the money was distributed equally; but we do not get it. As a matter of fact, my hon. friend from Canora has had three major bridges — and I mean by that bridges that cost \$45,000 to \$50,000 — and we have had one cement bridge. Well, that is the way these are being administered. Now, we had a good piece of highway built — 12 miles — just to connect up another piece of highway; but that is the extent of what we have had, and road grants are so bad that we have had very little work done on the roads. As a matter of fact, I have been applying for bridges here for three years, and I was never successful in getting any. I guess that applies to most of the constituencies represented by Liberals here.

Now, with respect to the redistribution. I wanted to make a little statement about this because I think it is important. I could not understand why the redistribution had been brought up at this Session, because next Session the new census report will be available. Today, you would have to go back to 1946 if you pass this Redistribution Bill at this Session, and I have secured here the figures for the Federal seats, and I think they would apply to the other ones. They were all down — this is between 1936 and 1946 — and I will just give them to you. This is between 1936 and 1946: Assiniboia, down 3,462; Humboldt, down 6,554; Kindersley, down 7,622; Lake Centre, down 6,830, McKenzie, down 3,501; Maple Creek, down 9,308; Melfort, down 1,638; Melville, down 5,696; North Battleford, down 10,241; Qu'Appelle, down 4,586; Rosetown-Biggar, down 7,605; Rosthern, down 6,778; Swift Current, down 7,958; The Battlefords, down 6,952; Weyburn, down 3,978; Wood Mountain,

down 8,327; Yorkton, down 7,397; Moose Jaw, down 1,218; Prince Albert, down 87. Now, the cities are up, Regina was up about 7,000 and Saskatoon up about 4,000. Now, I believe that there has not been this loss of population in the last two or three years. We have possibly gained a little, and if we take advantage of the census coming up we will probably have a true picture to apply on the Redistribution Bill. Then, in view of the fact that apparently there is going to be no election held, as it stands, we are going to be away back again if this Bill is passed this year. I do not risk to say any more tonight — we have some other speakers that are going to — but I will speak again when the budget is brought up.

Mr. W.T. Lofts (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, I will assure you that I am not going to overtax you on the few remarks I am going to make. First of all, I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder and also the Leader of the Opposition. I would also like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker. I quite realize that you have quite a task to perform, but I'll make it my easiest — do my part of it so you will not have to bother with me.

In speaking on this amendment regarding the land that becomes available, I will speak of the Meadow Lake constituency mostly and only. I have had considerable correspondence with our good Minister of Agriculture, last winter, regarding land, and I found him quite co-operative in every way, shape, and form. He was willing to assist me in everything I asked, and I think the land which was allotted up in that constituency was allotted fairly and squarely. But getting back to it, I still think and I am sure that the people of the Meadow Lake constituency want and always have wanted it so that they buy a piece of land they can obtain title to. I am sure that is the feeling, Mr. Speaker, in the Meadow Lake constituency. I know it was my feeling when I was old enough to get hold of a piece of land, and I am sure it is the feeling of every farmer in the Province of Saskatchewan. In fact, I have a small fractional part that has become dried up right adjoining my land. I have not applied for a lease. I have not even tried to buy it; but if I could buy it and get a title I think I would buy it. I had inquiries from a gentleman, a farmer who has been in the country for last 25 years, and he happened to have some land on both sides of the lake. This lake is now dried up and there is a small portion of land which is only good for grazing purposes in between these two parcels of land, and he would like to buy it, but the only thing he can do is rent it. That is the attitude I think most of my people in the Meadow Lake constituency would take.

Now since the Minister of Highways has given us this book with the Annual Report of the Department of Highways, I would like to express my views with regard to our constituency and set them out. We would like to congratulate him on what he has done. He gravelled seven miles in the Meadow Lake constituency, this year. I think that is right. And I would also like to congratulate him on the good job of snow removal he has done in our constituency this winter. I do not think anybody can complain of it. They have done a very good job and I would like to congratulate the engineer, Mr. Stephenson, who takes care of our particular district, including Meadow Lake and a few other constituencies. But we really have had a good job on the snow removal. But I sure cannot congratulate him on our No. 55 Highway. You will remember that during the closing hours of the Session last winter, I approached

the Minister of Highways very kindly in regard to completing No. 55 Highway and I think you will almost all remember that he said he would do his best to build it a distance of some 14 miles that would take it close in to Mildred, as No. 55 Highway is the link between Prince Albert and Glaslyn and Meadow Lake. For some reason he saw fit to do only about four miles of that highway. It has not reached my constituency yet; but I hope next year he will have better luck and it will reach my constituency. Our good member from Shellbrook there (Mr. Larsen) — that is where they have been working for the last four years, so they will get into mine pretty soon, I hope.

Another thing I would like to dwell on for a few minutes is this rural electrification. I think also my good friend from Shellbrook may be interested in that, and I know our Minister (Hon. Mr. Darling) has had requests from the towns of Spiritwood, Shell Lake and all those towns requesting power. The power can be brought in from a distance of very many miles. I think it is at Canwood now, or will be there soon; we think it would be a wonderful thing for that neck-of-the-woods if we could have the power extended right along No. 55 Highway. There are some good towns there. If we can get the highway built up and the power line, we will be doing well.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the attitude I take in regard to this land. I think a veteran, if he has the money to put down should be able to buy that land and obtain a title, and so should anybody else. If land is available I think they should be able to obtain title.

Mr. A.G. Kuziak (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in this debate, I would like to first congratulate the mover and seconder of the reply to the Speech from the Throne. They did a very good job on that, and may I again congratulate the other members of this side of the House who took part, on their speeches. I should probably also congratulate the Opposition. Their speeches again, this year, have been very similar to what they have carried on in the past two years in this House. I had always thought before I entered the Legislature that the Opposition used to be called "His Majesty's Loyal Opposition"; but, sitting here for the third year in a row I have come to the conclusion that it is "His Majesty's Disloyal Opposition". I had understood all the time that that is one reason why they called it, Mr. Speaker, "His Majesty's Loyal Opposition," because they would criticize the Government and after each criticism they would lay down certain suggestions to the Government to follow. They should say to the Government: give us certain suggestions and probably tell us of the days when they used to rule in this province, tell us how they used to do it, so that we may follow in the footsteps of that great Liberal Party. But I see, and in the last two to three weeks all I can see, is that the criticism of anything that the Government does is always bad. I have noticed in the past two years that, for example in the Throne Debate, they will criticize the Government for not spending enough on highways — we want more highways, more bridges, more grants for education, more everything. But when it will come later on into the Budget Debate, they will criticize the Government continuously for spending too much. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but they were asking us to reduce taxes at the same time. Now, they might be a bunch of magicians over there in the Opposition. They may be; but when I checked the record of the past Liberal Government in the Province of Saskatchewan, those magicians were not there, in fact, as far as I am concerned I do not think that they had a policy at all.

Now, before I go into my speech I want to check over a few notes I have made of especially the battery of Opposition speakers that spoke here this afternoon. I see that the first one down is the hon. member for Turtleford (Mr. Trippe). He told us, for example, he approved the Prairie Farm Assistance Act, he approved the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, the Mothers' Allowance Act and so on, and then immediately after that he went on a tirade against Socialism. I would like to point out to the hon. member for Turtleford that these are socialistic Acts, Acts that, I would say all those, the first two pertaining to the Dominion Government, were forced out of the Liberals or the Ottawa Government by the powerful opposition of the C.C.F. and the United workers and farmers of this province. One other point that the hon. member for Turtleford brought up was when he said, "Due to Federal policies we have had prosperous times". My, oh my! And they would not give any credit to the C.C.F. Well, I am going to tell you where I have always placed that credit, the prosperity that we have lived through in the past years and are even living today. I am a young man, it is true. I have done a little economic studying too, probably not the books that the hon. member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) reads.

Mr. McCormack: — God forbid!

Mr. Kuziak: — But I have read a thing or two also. And then I have lived for a number of years. And I find out that every time there is a prosperous period under our economic system, the economic system

that we call capitalism, that some of us are giving a little nicer name, 'free enterprise', but I still call 'dog-eat-dog'; the only time that we have a prosperous period is in time of war or immediately after the war. Or else, if we can follow through with a pretty good 'hot-and-cold' war after that, we can keep the economy rolling a little. And so, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to give credit either to the C.C.F. for those prosperous times; I am going to give credit to Adolf Hitler.

Mr. McCormack: — Joe Stalin, too?

Mr. Kuziak: — Those were prosperous times due to war, how, one other point that the hon. member for Turtleford mentioned, and that is redistribution. You know, people always do, Mr. Speaker, judge others by themselves. You will see the press in the past two or three weeks is loaded with redistribution, "gerrymandering" — no I did not even know, but I forgot that that is a Liberal term, that is what they always did, gerrymander, when they brought down a Redistribution Bill. And so they are judging us by their past record. They are expecting that we are going to gerrymander that Bill, too. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Opposition is going to be surprised when that Bill comes down. Yes, they may be disappointed. The gerrymandering will not be there, and I am sure that there will not be any member who will be elected with 500 votes or so and then another one will have to have 10 or 15 thousand votes.

Mr. Tucker: — Are you announcing the policy?

Mr. Kuziak: — That is all right, you wait and see, Now, I want to go down further just to point out their contradictions. I find out again the hon. member for Turtleford says, in connection with the wheat pool that the farmers are getting paid pretty well. Then he goes a little further, you know — taxes this time; becloud the issue! Why, he does not think even that the Cronkite-Britnell-Jacobs report is right, because it is something that they have been saying and trying to fool the people; confuse them. They try to tell us that the taxes in the other provinces are lower than ours. And so, speaking on that, after he had made the statement that his farmers are being paid well, and it looks as if they are really well off over there; but when it comes to taxes the poor fellows could not pay them — they are hard up now. Then he goes on and he says the taxes are up, car taxes, car licences, truck licences.

I would like to point out to the hon. member for Turtleford that he should probably compare Saskatchewan with some of the other provinces where they have Liberal administrations at the present time, and see what they are doing, see some of the taxes they are piling on today — and they are piling it on today because the Liberal Party at Ottawa has followed a decontrol policy and the prices of everything have skyrocketed, and, therefore, even the poor Liberal provinces throughout Canada have had to up taxes. Take, for example, British Columbia. A Liberal administration had to put on a three per cent educational tax although they call it, I believe, the "Social Services Tax," right across the board. The automobile licence plates in Saskatchewan have remained the same as they had been under the Liberal administration, \$15 per plate on the Ford or the Chevy.

Mr. F.M. Dundas (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Oh, oh!

Mr. Kuziak: — Now don't "Oh, oh". It is true. Check some facts, my boy! . . . while that in British Columbia has risen to \$35 for that same automobile under a good Liberal administration that believes in reducing licences and taxes. Before the hon. member speaks about Saskatchewan, he wants to check the truck licences also in British Columbia.

Now, I come to my friend from Redberry. Well, I am going to tell you before I start, Mr. Speaker, do not associate me with his ideas. He made mention that he is of Ukrainian descent. So am I, but I do not want to associate myself with his ideas. A man who got up and gave us the long speech, told us that we should remain in Saskatchewan and talk about our province, and I noticed that he only used three minutes in Saskatchewan and then away he went, as usual. Why, I believe in the last Session he spent the greater bulk of his time in Czechoslovakia, Poland and the Kremlin. Well, I am not interested in the Kremlin. I am interested in Saskatchewan and Canada, and then the outside world as far as it affects us directly. Yes, he went off, I believe — where was it now? — on to New York, the United Nations, the Kremlin, China, Ukraine, Poland and then, of course, he wanted Great Britain to take over the Ukraine and Poland. And the whole speech consisted of hate, drumming up the hate in humanity as if we have not enough of it today. This is the only kind of hate that brings on wars, and I am glad that there are not very many of the members that could really drum up the hate amongst the people as the hon. member for Redberry would.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — What about the millionaires?

Mr. Kuziak: — Oh, yes. How he loves the millionaires! He loves to bow down to them. Then, of course, I believe that he did in this House try to insinuate that we on this side, or members on this side, may be of the Communist Party. Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, this is a gag, if I remember rightly, the Liberals used back from 1932. I remember in their campaigns that they always charged the C.C.F. with being Communistic, a bunch of bolshevikies, that if they got into power in the province of Saskatchewan they would burn the churches down and drive out the preachers; freedom would be gone forever. Yes, I remember year after year they kept that up, and as the depression came on and the mortgage companies of the province of Saskatchewan started 'socializing' the farmers of Saskatchewan — yes, they really socialized and socialized them right! And then, of course, the grand old wheat policy of the Liberal Government when you had to tow in a load of wheat and get nothing for it. And when they started telling this very same gag to the farmers at that time, some farmer would rise up, you know, in public and say, "That's fine. They can have my wheat. Today I have to haul it in, and if they take it away all the better; I will not have to haul it."

Finally they cut out those stories. They could not scare the people any more with those stories; but some of them think that they can get away with it yet. I remember in an Ontario election after the C.C.F. won a fair number of seats in the next election they had Liberal workers

over there who would come into small towns and villages, come in with a grip, with a torn pair of overalls on, and they would walk into a real estate office or a rural municipal secretary-treasurer's office (yes that is the gag they used), and what did they tell him? He wants to buy a quarter of land, and the secretary-treasurer or the agent over there would ask him — you know, he looks at him, a stranger; he knows everybody in this little village or town. "Why," he says, "I am one of those poor Saskatchewan socialized farmers. Do you know that those bolshevikies over there in Saskatchewan have taken over the land? I am one that fled. You should actually see the highways out of Saskatchewan into Manitoba; they are plugged with trucks and automobiles of farmers fleeing from Saskatchewan." And, Mr. Speaker, they won that election in Ontario. That is the same kind of a story as the member for Redberry kept on all day today. People do not fool so easy, today. Yes, you know when I sit and listen to some of the speeches over there, my, they must think that some of the people of Saskatchewan are ignorant . . .

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — And you must think we are!

Mr. Kuziak: — . . . and their memories are very short.

The next point that was brought up, I see, is the 33-year lease, and, I believe the amendment that is being brought up. I would like to reply here to one of the speakers and then the hon. member for Melfort, and I would like to read an article from the "Farm and Ranch Review". I believe it is also a paper as good as the "Leader-Post", as the "Star-Phoenix", and, I believe a fairly good Liberal paper. I am going to read it to you, Mr. Speaker. This is in connection with co-operative farms, farms that the hon. member from Melfort criticized; and then again I recall some time ago when Mr. Danielson really raked the C.C.F. over the coals for a couple of hours on this "communal farms" — Communist. Well, that is only on one topic. But I will read, and read from one of their capitalist papers, what they have to say in connection with co-operative farming and farms in Saskatchewan.

"It may very well be that most of these co-operative farms are C.C.F. seedlings. It can hardly be denied that the co-operative farm is one of the C.C.F.'s better projects in Saskatchewan. But all this is beside the point. What is important is that the co-operative farm represents the most constructive step that has yet been taken by any prairie government to solve the vexing problem of populating our land. By the use of the co-operative technique it has been possible for several hundred young war veterans to establish themselves on the 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" (thanks to the Liberal Government).

"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 of only their strength and their character to go farming, there is disaster ahead for the West. What do we want in the West? A vast stretch of land, 8 or 15 sections, farmed by absentee owners living in Saskatoon, Edmonton or Winnipeg? Or do we want the same area farmed by 20 or 30 families

living on their farms? To us, what matters is not the political colour of governments but the efforts they make to tackle this problem. The C.C.F. Government in 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 that effort."

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one constructive statement made by, I say, an opposition press, as to remedying the situation of keeping the farmers on the land. But if I recall rightly, one member this afternoon thought, "Well, you could keep the farmers if you decreased the insurance on the automobiles". My goodness, that would keep an awful lot of farmers on the land.

Premier Douglas: — They want to go out to California.

Mr. Kuziak: — Why, Mr. Speaker, we reduced the automobile insurance rates on automobiles. The farmers used to pay for a package policy in the old days anything from \$40 to \$100, and we have brought it down to \$28.50. Yes, one of the members I believe it is my friend, the hon. member for Melville who made that statement. But there is one thing I will give credit for and that is he at least gave a few suggestions; for the first time I heard criticism and then a suggestion. And one of his suggestions was to reduce the insurance on the automobile plates and that will bring the people out on the farms. And then again, while I am on the hon. member for Melville, I see he wants more roads, more money spent for roads — reduced truck licences, cancel the Public Revenue Tax. Oh, yes, more money for municipal equipment. But one thing, if they could at least agree, Mr. Speaker. I notice that the 'Leader-Post' is continuously claiming that we should not spend more money, that we should not extend services, and so on. Then the Liberals in the House want more money for roads, for services; throw off the Public Revenue Tax. But I am pretty sure that next week, when we run into the budget debate, they will be telling us to reduce the budget, cut everything down.

I noticed, too, that the hon. member for Melville gave congratulations to Balcarres, a village, I believe, that has been incorporated into a town. You know, there is a little progress in the province of Saskatchewan. For the last three weeks from the Opposition we have heard of nothing in Saskatchewan but decay under the C.C.F. Government: everything is coming slowly to a standstill. And then he turns around and, of course, he congratulates Balcarres and tells us what a wonderful town it is. It is a wonderful town, Mr. Speaker. We are going ahead in Saskatchewan. At the same time, he also congratulated the people of Neudorf for building the Neudorf hospital, and then again the Provincial Government for giving the aid that they did give. But, of course, he also castigated us for not using more money that the Dominion finally granted. Why did not the Liberals wake up in the time when, for example, back in 1944 and prior to that, in north-eastern Saskatchewan, in my end of the constituency, there were only 2.4 beds per thousand population in that area? They did not do anything. Yes, but when those Socialists showed them up — what a mess they were doing! And again let me repeat, I believe that it was the pressure of the C.C.F. in the House of Commons that brought that Federal assistance. Yes, I will have a thing or two to say in connection with Federal matters yet. But now

they are coming through, and some of the backward Liberal Governments of other provinces of the Dominion of Canada are only now waking up to extend and build hospitals. Well, the province of Saskatchewan is the leader in the whole of the Dominion of Canada, and we used our funds.

There is one other thing, Mr. Speaker, that I want to point out, and it is that, in 1944, the Liberal Government of that day, I believe, had a budget of \$30 million. Ours today is close to \$60 million. And as I asked many a time, "Farmers, let's go back to 1944, and what could that \$30 million buy in goods in 1944 compared to the \$55 million we are spending today, or \$60 million?" I said, "Let's chop off the millions and say 30 cents and 55 cents." And I would ask a farmer, in 1944 if you paid 30 cents for an article, what would you have to pay today? The average one says a dollar, but I say let it be only 55 cents. Therefore, today the buying capacity of our budget is not any greater than the budget the Liberals had in 1944. We could, today, buy so many hundred beds in the province of Saskatchewan, or buildings, on our budget, I see, with equal buying capacity. What did they buy in 1944? Zero. Let us take highway construction today. Highway construction in that day, and I believe that they could have bought just as much dirt in those days for that money as we could buy for the money today. Where are the roads? There are not any. The bemoaning that goes on in the Opposition over there over roads! We could see that they did not build anything, but they expect, in five years' time on a budget (I say again) with equal purchasing capacity, they expect us to build all the roads where they did not build anything. Mr. Speaker, we will take, for example, Power expansion, and I say that with that budget in 1943 or 1944 they would have bought just as many posts as we could buy with our budget today, and electrical wire and electrical equipment of all kinds. We have them. Wherever you drive through the province of Saskatchewan today you see power lines, farm rural lines, cities and towns lit up. If you drove in the days when the Liberals were in (and I still say, had a budget with the same purchasing power) what did they do? Well, the poor boys had no policy.

Now, I will go back to my friend next door to me over there, my neighbour, the hon. member for Pelly. I believe he bemoaned too, that he did not have enough bridges, not enough construction. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, how decent we are. I will take the figures for 1944 to 1950, and I would like to point out that in 1944 there was a C.C.F. member in the Pelly constituency, and the total expenditure on highways and bridges in 1944-45 was \$20,000; in 1945-46, \$40,000; in 1946-47, \$49,000. In 1950, we spent there \$58,000; more than the C.C.F. member received — and yet he wants more. I am going to turn around again to the Minister of Highways. I want to point out that Pelly for years was represented by a Cabinet Minister. Certainly, Pelly with a Cabinet Minister should have at least built some bridges and some highways during the time that he was there, and he was there for years, up until the C.C.F. came in.

I would like to point out again and refer, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this Assembly, to the Canora constituency, which had members during the Liberal regime that were other than Liberals. I would like to point out that when the C.C.F. took over the reins of this government in 1944, that we had eight miles of gravelled highway. I wish I had brought that pamphlet along — some member by the name of Hamilton, a Cabinet Minister, I believe, back in 1926 (yes, I have one of those old pamphlets) made a direct promise in it that if they were elected in 1926, Highway No. 9 from Canora

would be built on to Sturgis. Well, Mr. Speaker, you know when it was built? It was built by the Minister sitting to the right of me now. The Liberals promised it back in 1926 in writing, but it was built by the C.C.F. in 1945, and gravelled, and today I am proud that Canora has 126 miles of gravelled highway, built mainly by this Government, while during the same 30 years of Liberal-Conservative administration, we wallowed in the mud. So I say that before the Minister of Highways will go to these other parts of the province and rebuild roads he had better finish off all the highways within the Canora constituency.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the time is getting late. I beg leave to adjourn this debate.

The Assembly adjourned at 11 o'clock p.m.