

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Twelfth Legislature
4th Day

Wednesday, February 17, 1953.

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

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Monday, February 16, 1953, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mrs. Cooper for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity of congratulating the mover and seconder of the Motion. I can well understand that the C.C.F. Party has every reason to be proud and pleased with the acquisition they have in the junior member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper). She certainly made a very splendid impression on all the House yesterday, and I was wondering, when she emphasized the desirability of having more ladies in the House, whether I had missed the chance of getting a very powerful support in the person of another very charming and able individual, who is also a lady, into this House from Saskatoon. I am sure, after what the junior member for Regina said, yesterday, she would have come along and helped Mrs. Caldwell in her fight in the last election. In any event, even if we did not succeed in getting Mrs. Caldwell elected, I congratulate the C.C.F. Party on getting a lady elected and especially a lady of the calibre and ability of the junior member for Regina. I wish her a great deal of satisfaction out of her service in public life.

In regard to the seconder of the Motion (Mr. C.G. Willis), I also wish to extend sincere congratulations to him. I must say that both of these speakers, yesterday, did not show any of the signs of nervousness which is supposed to affect people speaking in an Assembly such as this for the first time, and I congratulate both of them very sincerely on the ability with which they presented their respective speeches.

I would like to join with the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Sturdy) in extending a sincere welcome to the members of the debating directorate from the University of Saskatchewan and to the members of the Parliamentary Forum from there who are with us today. It has been my very great privilege and pleasure to attend, I believe, five meetings of the Parliamentary forum since my election as leader of the Liberal Party in the province, and I have enjoyed them all very much indeed.

I think it was a very happy thought of the Minister of Social Welfare to invite the members of that forum to attend a session of a sitting of the Legislature, both from the standpoint of any advantage it might give them in seeing how business is conducted in our Legislature, and also as some incentive to take part in this important work at the University. I am glad that so many are taking a real interest in the Parliamentary Forum

February 17, 1953

at the University. Any members who are able to go I am sure would be very pleased at the great ability shown in debate in the Forum, and also the evidence that they give of a substantial interest in the public affairs of our country. At a time like this, when democracy is being challenged as it has not been for perhaps the past hundred years, it is most important that people should understand the workings of our democracy, and that they should take a real interest in making it work to the best possible advantage, and when the people who are attending University are taking an interest in that work on top of the other heavy duties that they have there, I think they are to be commended very highly and I think everybody appreciates very much the interest that they are showing. We hope that they will enjoy their visit and will benefit by it.

We are meeting now in the session which will precede the Coronation of Her Majesty, and it will be the first time that our Sovereign has been specifically crowned as the reigning monarch of Canada. It is very interesting to read the early debates in regard to Confederation and to see that Sir John A. MacDonald, the first Prime Minister, was very much in favour of Canada being named, at the outset, "The Kingdom of Canada", his idea being it would be understood from the start that we were going to be a nation and that the King of Great Britain would also be the King of Canada, as such. For reasons that seemed good at that time it was not done, and I am glad that it is being accomplished at this time. It will, I think, seek to emphasize that we are very happy to be a member of the family of nations, the Commonwealth, and that, also, we are a co-equal member with the United Kingdom and the other self-governing members of the Commonwealth.

It is also very interesting to think that our Monarch, when she is crowned, will be crowned and given a new title that has heretofore been unknown to British constitutional history, and it would never have been thought possible twenty years ago. That title is "Head of the Commonwealth." I say it would not have been thought possible even a short time ago that a republic should be a member of the Commonwealth and that they should, at the same time, be ready to recognize our reigning sovereign, not as their sovereign but as a link, linking together the various members of the Commonwealth. It is a matter for satisfaction, I think, in the midst of all our disappointments today in the field of international affairs – disappointments that things have not gone as well following the second war as we had hoped; it is one of the bright spots, at any rate, in the situation. It was certainly believed almost inevitable that if India decided to become a republic she would go out of the Commonwealth as Ireland had done, and it was really a great stroke of statesmanship on the part of the leaders of that great country (India) and the leaders of the other branches of the commonwealth who worked out a formula whereby India, while becoming a republic, would retain membership in the Commonwealth.

The same, of course, applies to Pakistan. It is a matter, I think, for real satisfaction of all of us that these great Asiatic countries should have felt well enough disposed towards the other members of the commonwealth that they should want to remain members of the family. I was very pleased to see that one of the last contributions that our late leader, Mr. MacKenzie King, made to, I think, world peace and the development of good relations between the various nations in the world was his bringing such influence as he had to bear upon the leaders of India and Pakistan, at the last Commonwealth conference that he attended, to remain within the Commonwealth. I hope that the older members of the commonwealth will at all

times be prepared to show that they appreciate the desire of these older countries, India and Pakistan, to remain members of the Commonwealth by concrete co-operation. I think the Colombo plan is a very splendid scheme not only from the standpoint of doing what we should in regard to helping our fellowman in other parts of the world who are not so fortunate as we are, but it is also some concrete evidence of the brotherhood which should prevail within the family of nations known as "The Commonwealth."

I have to thank the Saskatchewan Branch of the Parliamentary Association for enabling me to attend the meeting in Ottawa, last fall, of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. It was a very happy experience so far as I was concerned. I have always taken a very deep interest in the development of the Commonwealth, and it was a wonderful experience to see people from all parts of the Commonwealth, of all different religions and different racial origins, at different times testify to their belief in the contribution that the Commonwealth could make towards the welfare of mankind and to the preservation of peace. I think some of the most moving and most eloquent speeches were made by representatives who were of different shades than ourselves – some of them from Africa, and some of them from India and Pakistan. It was a great experience to be able to meet these people and hear something of the problems with which they are concerned, and also to realize that they felt that something was to be gained by working together with us in regard to attempting to solve them.

We are also meeting for the first time under a Governor-General who is a native-born Canadian. I think many people were pleased that, for once, a native-born Canadian was made the representative of the Sovereign in Canada. When the representatives always came from Great Britain it was possible for those who did not agree with our form of government to pretend that, in some way, he was a representative of the British Government and was, therefore, an indication of our inferiority to the United Kingdom. When the personal representative of the Sovereign is a person of Canadian origin, it seems to me that it should absolutely wipe away any thought that arose out of the fact that heretofore the representative of the sovereign has been somebody from the United Kingdom.

I believe that this is "Brotherhood Week", and I certainly want, most sincerely, to commend the people who inserted the advertisement in the daily papers in regard to Brotherhood Week. They, in that advertisement, set out that the purpose of Brotherhood "Week was to encourage the feeling of brotherhood as between people of all races, all religions, and all classes, and I feel that anything that goes toward promoting those ideas is very worthwhile in our country and in the world today.

It is too bad that those ideas cannot be propagated all over the world today, and that instead of love of one's fellowman being propagated steadily and as a devout object of the leaders of society, we now have in various parts of the world, hatred being propagated. It is most unfortunate. Insofar as the free world is concerned, the people who strive to promote brotherhood between people of all races, religions and classes, are to be commended. So far as I am concerned, I am particularly interested in any movement like this, because it has been my good fortune to live all my adult life, practically, in the Rosthern community, where the people are of very mixed racial origins, but where they live together in the greatest amount of concord and friendship, and where they co-operate together in a way that, I think, is very typical of Canada and makes one very proud to be a Canadian.

February 17, 1953

Now we have just come through a general election and I wish to deal with some of the events of the last year, and some of the stands that have been taken, and so on. In regard to the last election, I think it was quite clear that the Government, at a very early stage and, in fact, before the election was called, had come to the conclusion that it would be very wise to divert the attention of the people of the province away from their record, away from their failure to carry out the promises on which they were elected in 1944, and to endeavour to get the people to feel that it was more important that they should indicate to Ottawa that they were not satisfied with everything that had been done, than to decide on provincial issues. It was a very clever manoeuvre because I am one of the first to admit that we, in Western Canada, always feel that it takes a while to get the rest of the country to agree to do some of the things that we think should be done. There is a feeling that sometimes our views are not accepted as readily as they should be; that convincing the rest of Canada sometimes takes longer than it should.

so it would be hard to find any westerner, no matter what Party he belonged to, who was completely satisfied with any Government in Ottawa, and if it is put on the ground that your vote is going to be taken as a sign that you are completely satisfied with the Ottawa Government, if that could be made the issue of the election, well, of course, that would enable the Government to escape from answering for their failure to carry out their own programme, and from answering for their own record, or having to meet the programme which we put before the people. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that has been the attitude of the C.C.F. Government in this province for some time, and I think it was really those tactics which enabled them to do as well as they did in the last election.

One of the things that we are always very much interested in is the price of wheat, and that was seized upon by the C.C.F. Party to raise as much trouble as possible. The Premier made a broadcast speech, which was reported in the 'Commonwealth' of October 18, 1950, and which that paper faithfully reported with black headlines as follows:

“FARMERS LOSE \$100 MILLION – DOUGLAS PLACES BLAME
ON LIBERALS’ DOORSTEPS”

and the Premier is reported to have said, in regard to the initial price of \$1.40 which had been announced:

The Federal Government announced an initial payment of \$1.40 a bushel, basis Fort William, which is a drop of 35 cents a bushel, or a reduction of over 20 per cent. On the basis of the estimated crop, this year, this means a reduction in the income of the Saskatchewan wheat-growers of about \$100 million. We might as well face the fact that if our Saskatchewan farmers receive \$100 million less for their wheat than they would have received had last year's prices prevailed, then every last citizen will feel the effects in terms of less business and reduced purchasing power.

“Liberal speakers often criticize the amount of taxes which are levied in this province. The fact remains, however, that the 4100 million which the farmers are losing by the reduction in the price of wheat would pay all the provincial, municipal and school taxes for the entire province for one year. In other words, the drop in the price of wheat has taken more out of the pockets of the Saskatchewan farmers than the Provincial Government, the Municipal governments, both urban and rural, and all the school boards collecting taxes for a whole year.”

There was the statement of the Premier that this \$100 million had been lost to the farmers – not delayed in payment. I hear somebody on the Government side saying “hear hear” again. I cannot think of any worse attack upon the Wheat Board than to suggest that, because they give an initial payment of \$1.40, the remainder of the money is lost. I do not know of any other way of more successfully undermining the Wheat Board than to do that. That is exactly what the representatives of the Grain Exchange are saying – that, by the Wheat Board method of handling grain, large sums of money are lost to the farmers; and this was put out by the Premier.

The Provincial Treasurer added his word, and of course, speaking as Provincial Treasurer, I suppose somebody may have paid some attention to what he said. He said this:

“By dropping the price to this extent, the farmers will find they have taken a reduction, or a loss...”

He wanted to make that very plain, Mr. Speaker —

“...they took a loss of \$100 million.”

And then he said:

“That is why I say what we spend is peanuts...”

Sixty million dollars is just ‘peanuts’ to the Provincial Treasurer.

“We get \$8 or \$9 million from our Education and Hospitalization Tax. That is just one-tenth of what you farmers lose in this reduction in the price of your wheat alone.”

Now that is the way it was. These terrible Liberals, by administering the Wheat Board and making an initial payment of \$1.40, had lost the farmers \$100 million!

The Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) entered the picture, and here is what he said:

February 17, 1953

“When you receive the initial payment for your grades of frozen wheat, you have ‘had it’, in my opinion.”

That was just to encourage everybody and make them feel that a big bungle had been created in regard to handling the wheat through the Wheat Board.

Now then, what was the record? The initial price was \$1.40 in accordance with established Wheat Board practice. On August 1, 1950, a further 20 cents: February 1, 1951, a final payment of 25½ cents, a total payment of \$1.85½. In other words, it was 10 cents more than the C.C.F. tried to mislead the people into thinking was lost – 10 cents a bushel more than the 35 cents they said the Liberals had lost them!

Of course, this sort of thing serves its purpose. It arouses animosity against the Federal Government – but at the expense of the Wheat Board!

It is very interesting to read what somebody said about these tactics of pretending that the Wheat Board loses the farmers millions of dollars. Here is what one gentleman said about it, fairly recently:

“When I hear some of the advocates of the open market trying to convince the farmers and the public of Canada generally that orderly marketing, guaranteed prices and long-term agreements have resulted in the loss of millions of dollars to the wheat producers, I ask any person who can remember the days of the open market to try to visualize, for a moment, what would have happened to the price of wheat on a speculative market, if we had had production like we have had in the past five or six years.”

The man who thus ridiculed the idea that this way of handling wheat was losing millions of dollars, suggested that the people who do that are advocates of the open market, and I know everybody will be surprised to hear that it was none other than the Premier who said that, just last fall, when he was talking to the Wheat Pool. I wonder who more openly and loudly suggested that hundreds of millions were being lost than the Premier himself. Then, when the elections are safely over, he comes along and says that the advocates of the open market are doing this, and ridicules the idea.

I suppose the Premier must think to himself, “Well it worked anyway.” It did work, apparently. He is back here with an increased majority, but I say to the C.C.F. Party, this business of bringing in doubt the Wheat Board, which is so valuable to our farmers, in order to gain some votes, trying to get some more members in the House, does not seem to me to be in the best interests of the farmers of western Canada, even if it does get some more members into this Legislature.

That was one example of the attempt made to arouse prejudice. It was done in the election campaign, quite openly. The groundwork had been laid. The Premier is reported to have said in a speech on June 7, 1952,

at Yorkton:

“A vote for a Liberals, next Wednesday, the Premier contended, is an endorsement of Mr. Gardiner’s agricultural policy that you like the price of \$1.40 initial payment for wheat.”

He brings this right back in again – that you liked that price, and then, “12 cents for pork, 14 cents for eggs and 17 cents for beef.” That is thrown in along with the idea that this other thing had lost \$100 million:

“A vote for the C.C.F. – Premier Douglas’ Party – will show that you are sick and tired of being betrayed and pushed around, and are not going to stand for it any longer.”

“Pushed around” – by being paid \$1.40 initial payment by the Wheat Board. This is the sort of thing that was thrown out, and then after the election was all over, the speech made to the Wheat Pool delegates: “Oh, the Wheat Board system is established; it is a good thing”, and all that sort of thing.

Then attacks were made upon the handling of the foot-and-mouth disease problem; and the Premier is reported to have said that they only used Mr. Gardiner in this campaign so he could go back to Ottawa and stand in the House and tell them ‘the farmers of Saskatchewan like the way I am treating them’.

Apparently the C.C.F. thought that was the only way to escape from answering for their own failures in the last eight years. In that regard I would like, just while I am at it, to read to the House something that the ‘Western Producer’ had to say about the question of foot-and-mouth disease. It is an editorial of January 1, 1953, just about six weeks ago, and I am quoting:

“The year 1952 will always be remembered, though this time not with any feeling of satisfaction, because in the early months, Canada experienced the first outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in her history. This was a very severe blow indeed and cost the farmers dearly. Looking back, however, it can be seen how much worse this might have been. We believe the most grudging critic will admit that, caught unexpectedly as they were and considering the location of the outbreak, the authorities handled the situation very well.

“We do not think Mr. Gardiner was exaggerating when he claimed that his Department had established a record for speed and efficiency in limiting and eradicating this dread disease.

February 17, 1953

“Not every one was satisfied with the price control measures established by the government to cope with the situation after the U.S. markets for livestock and livestock products were closed. Nevertheless, they were sufficiently effective to avert a calamitous drop in prices that might otherwise have occurred.”

Now of course, quite clearly, here is the attitude of an unbiased observer; the editor of the ‘Western Producer’ passing unbiased judgment upon what was done in this matter of handling prices when foot-and-mouth disease broke out in Canada. Of course, the election was over then; the resentment had been capitalized on, and I think it is quite clear to everybody now that it had been made good use of; that the dire results of foot-and-mouth disease were turned into votes as effectively as if the Federal Government or the Liberal Party had been responsible for the outbreak of the disease. Well I suppose, Mr. Speaker, if you can get away with that sort of thing, a certain kind of politician will think that it is an indication of very great cleverness.

So far as we are concerned, I do not think any one can say, at any time, that we did not advocate our policy, which we thought in the best interests of the people of this province, and that we did not stick to it and put it to the people, day in and day out.

So far as the C.C.F. Party was concerned, on the question of a basic policy of socialism, in which they were going to be different from all other parties, because after all they were the Party that upheld the “Regina Manifesto”, they were going to finance all these things for the people out of profits or socialized industries and that sort of thing, it was a very striking thing that there was nothing said about that during the campaign.

We had the {“Program for Progress” indicating what the Government intended to do – the ten points – if they were re-elected to office, and even in that they based their ability to do anything in that regard upon the expansion of private enterprise. The advertisement read as follows: and the C.C.F. Party were going to carry these things out, and the heading was this:

“An expanding economy, guaranteed by the continuing development of gas, oil and mineral resources, and by steadily improving agricultural production, will enable the “C.C.F. Government, during its next term of office, to provide the following:”

Then it set out the ten items that they intended to do. You will note, Mr. Speaker, that there is not a word there of basing what they were going to do upon Socialism, upon anything in their own programme. It was going to be based entirely upon the development of gas, oil and mineral resources which now the Government is begging and pleading private interests to come in and develop. The only place where Government enters the picture at all is in the development of uranium by the Federal Government and by improving agricultural production.

That was regarded by many people as a definite repudiation of Socialism. In the 1951 convention of the C.C.F. Party, a programme was laid before the convention by the 'brain trust' of the C.C.F., and one of their prominent members got up and said, "There is nothing in that programme that a good Liberal could not support. I want something in it about the Regina Manifesto." Then he made his motion that this programme be carried out in accordance with the high principles and objectives as set forth in the Regina manifesto. Well, of course, the 'brain trust' of the C.C.F. did not dare repudiate that, and it went through and was adopted by the convention; but, as soon as the convention was over, it was quietly forgotten. Nothing was said about it during the campaign and the "Winnipeg Free Press" observing what was going on in this province, had this to say:

"Yet in a rather curious fashion, and regardless of the distribution of votes on June 11, a verdict has already been returned. Socialism, in effect, has been repudiated by the very Government which once espoused it as the basis of a new society.

"Far from seeking re-election for the purpose of implementing a Socialist programme, Mr. Douglas has appealed for new mandates on the strength of expansion schemes which rely frankly upon private enterprise."

Well, that idea that the C.C.F. had abandoned Socialism was fomented very strongly throughout the province. Many workers for the C.C.F. said, "Well, the C.C.F. have abandoned Socialism. You do not need to worry any more about them carrying out their programme; we are just a progressive Party" and that idea was put across very assiduously.

It did not please some of the people who like to adhere to principle. It was very interesting to notice the reaction of the President of the C.C.F. Party, Dr. Carlyle King. He used some very strong language, writing in the 'Canadian Forum' – the April issue. He said this:

"There is no left any more, or left of the centre where a group of Socialist parties huddle to keep their metaphysics warm, and beyond that an abandoned territory where no socialist bird sings..."

This is the President of the C.C.F. Party:

"It is the historic business of the left to startle, shock and arouse. Who, nowadays, is either much disturbed or much aroused by the Socialist programme, and where can you find a Socialist Party that has had a fresh idea in the last ten years?"

That is the head of the C.C.F. Party speaking! And he goes on to say:

"The trouble is that Socialist parties have wanted success, victory, power, forgetting that the main business of socialist parties is not to

February 17, 1953

form governments but to change minds. When people begin to concentrate on success at the polls, they become careful and cautious, and when they become careful and cautious, the virtue goes out of them.”

So, when that is the verdict upon this Government by the head of the C.C.F. Party, Dr. Carlyle King, as to the way they have compromised with their principles in order to cling to office, I do not think there is anything to be very proud of in the results of the campaign that is just over.

But once the election is over, and after this had been put out, then these serious minded souls had to be quietened down and reassured, and so, at the next C.C.F. convention after the election was safely over, we have the Premier now taking that role, and I have here the report of what he did at the July convention the C.C.F. held, in 1952. Again I point out, the election was safely over:

“Premier T.C. Douglas said, Wednesday, the Saskatchewan C.C.F. Government had not departed from its original principles since 1944 and he promised that, as our programme succeeds, the principles underlying a Co-operative Commonwealth will be applied with increasing effectiveness.”

He (the Premier) says “hear, hear” to that.

Well now, there is the picture. There is a very definite move made to hide and cover up the only thing that makes them different from the older parties in this country in regard to claiming that they are going to carry out Socialism when they can. Nothing was said about it during the campaign, in their advertisements or anything else; but once the campaign is over then there is the reaffirmation of their basic ideas in Socialism. Well, the effect of that is, as I see it, Mr. Speaker, it has worked all right for the Party opposite in getting members elected to this House and in them hanging onto office, as Dr. Carlyle King said. They have successfully done that, but what about the effect upon our development? I will deal with that more fully later. We are getting development in this province, but not the share that we should get, and if the Premier of this province continually repeats that they are going to ultimately carry out their programme, it means that people with money to invest – if they can have a choice between investing it where there is not that threat being held over their heads and investing it where it is, they are going to go where the threat is not held over their heads.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, when Canada is going ahead faster than in all the history of our country, Saskatchewan is comparatively hosing ground in spite of the fact that we have 80,000 or 90,000 square miles of pre-Cambrian Shield, the greatest mineral-bearing formation in the whole of Canada, perhaps as good as any in the world. Also we are supposed to have greater actual oil resources than Alberta. That is why, for example, when we come to a Redistribution, Saskatchewan which had 20 members, found that if they applied the population yardstick rigidly, we were going to lose five of our members. Mr. Speaker, that is under the C.C.F. Government, and

instead of letting the "Regina manifesto" and all the silly ideas of Socialism be decently interred, as the Provincial Treasurer tried to inter it several times, the Premier keeps resurrecting it and holding it over the heads of potential investors.

We will express our opinion on that in a motion which I will move before I am through and which will perhaps clear the matter up as to just where the C.C.F. does stand on this important matter.

In regard to the effect of this manoeuvring, I have said that it worked out well in getting members elected to this House. It certainly did that. I would like, of course, to point out, so far as the people in the country are concerned, we received the support of 30,000 more voters than we got in 1948 while the C.C.F. received the support of some 24,000 more voters, so that actually we increased the number of people who voted for us by 6,000 more and they increased theirs by some 6,000 less than we did.

Our share of the popular vote, in 1952, was, roughly, 41 per cent. In the Federal elections of 1949, the Liberals received 43½ per cent, 2½ per cent more than we received in 1952. I suggest that the reason for that is to be found in what happened in regard to Social Credit and Conservative Parties. In the Federal elections of 1949, they received 15½ per cent of the total vote. This dropped to 6 per cent in the 1952 elections. In other words, the combined total vote for the Social Credit and Progressive Conservatives went down by 9½ per cent in 1952 as compared to 1949, and the C.C.F. vote went up something over 10 per cent.

Now I can say that the Premier, as a political operator, showed great dexterity because when the fight became clearly on a Federal basis, and the fact that all these Parties are in opposition to the Liberals in Ottawa, there was a tendency for them to transfer that opposition to us here in Saskatchewan, and although we got the Liberal vote, there was a tendency for people who were not Liberals to support this protest movement against Ottawa which they had been invited to do. In this regard it is very interesting to see what has happened in the rest of the country. This tactic may operate successfully in regard to one province, but it is very interesting to see the effect upon the C.C.F. movement in the rest of Canada, because, after all, they look on in a more detached way as to whether a Party is living up to its principles and whether it is really showing that the C.C.F. can do better than other Parties.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, it was put out when the C.C.F. were elected that they had won a 'beachhead' in Saskatchewan; they would set up a government here that would show the rest of the country what the C.C.F. could do and what Socialism could do, and that that would be so good that the C.C.F. would proceed to take over other provinces very rapidly. It is very interesting to see what has happened. Here we have the C.C.F. coming in and they are going to take the civil service out of politics, and one of the first things they do is to drag it into politics more than has ever been done before.

They were going to operate natural resources in a way much better than it had been done before, because it was going to be done under the auspices of the Government for the benefit of the people, and private

February 17, 1953

individuals were not going to be permitted to make vast fortunes out of it. Well, I leave it to anybody here whether they lived up to that programme or not.

Then they were going to use public money that they were going to make out of these Crown Corporations to help the sick and the needy and the old. Well, with regard to the alleged profit out of this corporations, if you allow for the amount made by the Power corporation and the Telephone Corporation, and allow for interest and taxes that they should pay, there are literally no profits available to help those in need, or the old, or anything of that sort. And people outside have seen the failure of the tannery; they have seen the failure of the sodium plant; they have seen the failure of the shoe factory; they have seen the failure of all of these things except such things as Telephone and Power corporations which were set up long before the C.C.F. came into office, and which should actually be operated, Mr. Speaker, on a basis of service at cost, providing enough for rebuilding, something for extension, but not on any basis of trying to wring money, by hidden taxation, out of the people. And that is the only way the C.C.F. have tried to make out that they have made profits out of Crown Corporations. But that has not fooled people in the rest of Canada. Just let me, hurriedly, indicate to what extent that it has not fooled the people in the rest of Canada.

In 1945, the year after the C.C.F. was elected here in Saskatchewan, they had 28 members in the House of Commons. Instead of the example being one which enabled them to elect more members, they now have 13. Take Ontario for example: this is an industrial province where this was really going to work wonders. Well we had, in 1948, 21 C.C.F.'ers elected, 53 Conservatives, 13 Liberals. We heard a great deal there indicating that the Liberals had been put out of the picture as the official opposition, and that the C.C.F. were the potential government of the province of Ontario. And what happened? Well, today, they are down to 2 members in the province of Ontario, and the Liberals have, I think, 7 or 8. In other words, they have been practically wiped out of the province of Ontario.

I cannot help but have some sympathy for Harold Winch, in British Columbia. He has worked hard; he has preached Socialism quite sincerely and honestly to the people of British Columbia, and he though he was on the verge of office, last summer. Well, the Premier went out there and told him all about what had been done by the C.C.F. in Saskatchewan – at least he did not tell them all, because there were certain things he showed an admirable reticence about; but he told them some things...

Premier Douglas: — I did not go to British Columbia. I am sorry to disappoint you.

Mr. Tucker: —You were out there in the elections of 1949, and they remember the things that you said then, I expect.

The result of it all was, Mr. Speaker, that they were beaten badly, in 1949, and the observation of what had happened in Saskatchewan compared to what the Premier had told them in 1949 – these things had such a profound effect on their minds that the C.C.F., who thought they were going to be elected in the last election, were not elected. I am told that they are well on the verge of extinction now, in British Columbia. However, that

remains to be seen; but here is the effect of clinging onto office, as Dr. Carlyle King says, regardless of principle. Here is the effect upon the movement in the rest of Canada.

Now then, I should like to deal with the 10-point programme on which the C.C.F. saw fit to appeal to the people, in 1952.

First of all, there was the \$75-million highway and market road programme. All I will say about that is that in regard to the building of highways, I hope they will be built without so much consideration for political pressure and so on. I hope, in regard to the market road programme, that something really worthwhile will be done in the way of building market roads and gravelling them, because, certainly, that is one of the improvements which would help the people in the province, giving them access to their market town and ending, as much as possible, rural isolation, particularly in the winter. It is one of the things we have advocated steadily ever since I have been in the Legislature here, and it is one of the things that I hope the Government will get busy and really do something about without further delay.

Second – power to 40,000 (I am quoting from the “Program for Progress”) farms and all towns and villages. This is at an average rate of 8,000 to 10,000 a year. Now that has not been nearly attained yet and, as a matter of fact, last summer we had the situation that Saskatchewan had about 6 per cent of its farmers with electricity and Manitoba had over 50 per cent. Manitoba expects to have over 80 per cent connected inside the next three years; when we get the 40,000 connected we will have far less than 50 per cent of our farmers connected. I think that one of the ways (and this is most important, it is being brought out before the Royal Commission) to end the movement away from the rural centres into urban centres is to provide electricity.

Mr. Speaker, you will remember that session after session I have pleaded with this Government to get busy on the farm electrification programme, something along the lines Manitoba was following. Well, they did not take it seriously until they were almost beaten in the 1948 election. Then they began to get busy on a farm electrification programme. The figures show that, and the provision which worked so well in Manitoba with the province as a whole carrying half the capital cost of connecting the farmers with electricity, has not been adopted in this province. The idea here is that there will be no subsidization whatever.

Yesterday, the hon. member seconding the motion, spoke about the cost of connection of the farm as subsidization, because the Commission paid, roughly, two-thirds of the cost of connecting the individual farm. That is not subsidization! It is intended, in the rates charged, to get back every cent of that! But, in Manitoba, there is no attempt made to get back half the capital cost of connecting the farmers with electricity. It is assumed, right away, by the province itself, and I think that there was more need for the province as a whole to pay part of the cost of farm electrification here, as our farms are more scattered, and I believe there was far more need for some such scheme as that in the province of Saskatchewan than there was in Manitoba. But here is this Government throwing millions of dollars away on useless Crown Corporations and so on, some of which have now been wound up and others will be, instead of doing something really worthwhile for the farmers.

I hope they will go ahead with this farm electrification scheme. I hope they will do something worthwhile in regard to having the province as a whole pay part of the cost, because surely, if we want to halt the trend away from the farms into the urban centres, we have to bring electricity to our farmers as quickly as possible where it is reasonably feasible to do so.

The next thing in the 'Program for Progress' is "Continued Development of Saskatchewan's oil and mineral resources." Well, the only thing suggested that is going to be done by this Government to promote that idea is to set up another Department. They are going to set up a Department of Mineral Resources. I suppose there has been so much heart-burning amongst some of the members of the C.C.F. Party in this House over the two members who were put in the Cabinet, that perhaps the idea is that they will get another seat and that will help quieten things down a bit. I can well understand that, because, while the members appointed to the Cabinet are most admirable men – and I congratulate them very much; they have reason to be congratulated, when it meant increasing the Cabinet of this province to 14 members — but I am sure that, perhaps, this province could have struggled along, as other provinces in the west do, with far fewer members of the Cabinet. Of course I can realize again, Mr. Speaker, that when it comes to a Federal election these Cabinet Ministers, with their well-know ability to get around and influence votes and so on, will be a great help to the C.C.F. people – paid for by the people of Saskatchewan. It will be a great help to the C.C.F. Party, with all their secretaries, assistants and so on; but so far as being needed for the public service of this province I do not think anyone honestly believes that.

However, we have the suggestion made that there is going to be another Department – the Mineral Resources – set up, and that is the way in which we are going to develop the oil and mineral resources. Other than that, I suppose, there will be trips to Europe and trips to London and trips all over the place, and no doubt that will make a tremendous contribution too. In any event, that was the promise there. So far as I can see they rely on private enterprise to do it, supplemented, as I have said, by these excursions made here and there; and we hear all about them on their return, that there are going to be large investments of money and so on, while, as a matter of fact, we are not getting the development that they are getting with similar resources in other parts of the country.

Mr. McCormack: — Like a lot of other things – on the verge!

Mr. Tucker: — Yes, as my friend says, we have been 'on the verge' of getting many things. I think of the pulp mill as an example of that. After trips, we have heard that we are going to get a pulp mill, but we still haven't got one. With all the pulp resources we have, surely we should have had one long before this.

Then the next item: "Natural gas in larger cities and intermediate points." That, of course, will again depend upon private enterprise for finding the natural gas, and then, having found it, there is apparently to be no definite programme of fetching this gas to the people at cost the way it should be done, the way the power should be brought and the way telephone service should be supplied; but the idea seems to be to go to a city like Saskatoon and by threat that, if they do not agree to the Government's proposition, gas may go to Regina or some other place, forcing them to line

up and agree to the Government's proposition. This was coupled with a little bit of abuse of the mayor because he dared to stand up for the city of Saskatoon. Is that the way we are going to administer the natural resources of this province in regard to gas? No definite policy, no provision where some independent Board will fix the rates to be charged on some fair basis – the rate is going to be fixed by some Government employees. Well, I do not think that is the proper way to handle it, and I certainly thought there would be something in the Speech from the Throne providing for an independent Board that would regulate the rates to be charged in regard to natural gas.

Then we come to the next item: "Construction of the South Saskatchewan Dam in co-operation with the Federal Government." In this advertisement put out by the C.C.F. it pre-supposed the co-operation of the Federal Government, and I think the C.C.F. Party and the Liberal Party are both in agreement that the resources of the province are not adequate to do this project on their own. My attitude towards the dam, Mr. Speaker, is this: I am a very firm supporter of it and have advocated it for a long time, and I still believe in it. I think I am more convinced of it now, after reading the report of the Royal Commission, that I was before I read it, for many reasons which I haven't time to go into now. I hope that it will be possible to convince the rest of the country that this is good for western Canada and good for Canada, but it will be necessary to convince the rest of the country of this.

I remember when I first brought up the suggestion of asking the country as a whole to pay the cost of bridging the unproductive gap on the railroad across northern Ontario. At first, there was very little support that that view, because it was realized that that was putting some of the burden of transportation upon all of Canada, including the central provinces; but, when it was finally brought home to our fellow-Canadians that that would be a measure of fairness to us here on the prairies, they agreed to it, and it is now part of the law of the country. And I am just as sure as I am standing here that it will not be long until the Saskatchewan Dam proposition will be established, but it will be established not by threats or accusations against our fellow-citizens in other parts of Canada. It will be done by good-natured persuasion, and perhaps, sometimes, by a little bit more than good-natured persuasion; but I say 'persuasion' anyway, and I regret if it is going to be, again, the tactics of the C.C.F. Party not to try to do everything possible to persuade the rest of the country that this should be built, but to try to make political capital out of this thing by accusing the Government of this country of not keeping its promise.

Perhaps it will pay off in votes, Mr. Speaker, but I think a time should come when all political parties, in something as important as this, should put the question of winning votes secondary to getting things done for the benefit of our country, and our attitude will be that we support this South Saskatchewan Dam and we suggest to all the members of this House that they realize, as they should realize, that the way to get other people to co-operate with you is not by accusing them of bad faith, not by accusing them of breaking their word, but by going to them and saying, "it is right that this should be done", and that it should be agreed to by fellow Canadians interested in the development of the prairies just as much as they are interested in the development of any other part of Canada. That is the way in which, I think, Mr. Speaker, we should approach this proposition.

The next item in this 'Program for Progress' is the "Reclamation and settlement of new northern areas." The Government in office had been in office eight years when it laid this down as a programme. Again it is a matter that Liberal members from northern Saskatchewan and we, in this House, were continually advocating and pleading for, that this Government should spend some of its increased revenues on opening up the rich northern part of this province by building roads, establishing drainage ditches, going after this thing in a big way, because that is where the great development in Saskatchewan is going to take place. And here we have this Party, after eight years in office, asking for an endorsement of going ahead with some such programme as that. Well, I say they have not done much in the eight years. I hope now that with some people in their own Party from the north, somehow or another they may listen to them where they did not listen to us in the last four years.

The next item in 'Program for Progress' that was advertised all over this province was to abolish the Public Revenue Tax on December 31, 1952. We passed a law abolishing it as of that date at the last Session of the Legislature. By the law of this Province it was already abolished; and yet this Party sought to create the impression that the people should vote in order to get that tax abolished. Where they trying to mislead the people? Or pretending that it would not be abolished unless they were elected? It was already abolished! I do not understand, or profess to understand, the workings of the minds of the people who tried to put this across to the people of this province; but in any event, there it is – a definite attempt to mislead the people of this province.

The next item: "Assist municipalities on basis of need." Well, certainly we are favourable to that. We realize the tax burden upon our municipalities is beyond their bearing. We think that the vastly increased grant to this Government under the financial agreement whereby this Government will get from the Federal Government over \$25 million this year, and probably \$25 million next year, as compared with something over \$8 million that we received before this Government came into office; with this increase in payment of approximately \$16 million, we think it should have been reflected in some real substantial grants to the municipalities to help them carry their burdens. If something is going to be done now, surely it is overdue, and long overdue.

"Increased grants for Education." This was in the 'Program for Progress' of the C.C.F. Well, we look forward with great interest to see to what extent increased grants are made for education. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, they are justified and needed. Taxes on real property on homes and farms are, today, so high that it is very difficult to consider raising them any higher. As I say, this Government is now in receipt of about \$16 million more than the previous Government from the Dominion Government – money that it does not have to raise in taxation at all. The receipts from the Education Tax are up \$3 million. Total increase in revenue from those two items alone is \$19 million. Something was said, yesterday, about the increase in the school grants. They have been increased \$5¼ million – out of this increase in revenue of \$19 million. Now surely this increase in revenue was given, mainly, to enable Provinces to discharge the things which are peculiarly within their constitutional responsibility; and one of those things definitely, the outstanding thing, is education. And what do we find in this province? Young people are refusing to go in to be trained as teachers.

Financially, teachers today, in this province are being treated – I do not know what word adequately represents it. The result is that, all over the place, people are saying, “I am not going to go in for teaching”, and yet teaching is probably the most important profession, from the standpoint of the future of our country, of all professions, because they have to do with the teaching and moulding of the future citizens of our country.

And yet here is the record: taxes as high as they can go on real property and homes, and this Government so niggardly in regard to grants that the result has reflected itself in the payment to teachers. I have here the May, 1952, report of a speech made by Mr. Eamer, and the situation, I am satisfied has not improved since then. He gives here the average weekly wages paid in Canada to industrial workers; in Saskatchewan, to industrial workers, and to Saskatchewan teachers. I would just like to lay this before the Assembly to make everybody realize just why it is that we have a shortage of teachers. If you underpay people in one profession as compared to others, you can depend upon it that young people who hope to get along in life are, unless they are attracted by a tremendous desire towards public service, going to avoid that profession which seems to be one that is not appreciated in regard to its remuneration. And here is the table:

	Canada Ind. Worker	Sask. Ind. worker	Sask. Teacher
August 1, 1949	\$41.44 wk.	\$42.13 wk.	\$35.12 wk.
March 1951	53.03	51.87	38.99

By March, 1951, Saskatchewan industrial workers were getting less than the average in Canada, although they were getting more in 1949; but even while the industrial worker was getting \$51.87 per week in Saskatchewan, the average teacher was getting \$38.99 – nearly \$12.00 less per week than the average industrial worker.

If this Government and the C.C.F. think that is in accordance with their programme of ‘Humanity First’, I certainly do not; and I certainly hope that they meant what they said when they put it in their programme that they are going to increase school grants.

Then we come to the “Extension of Medical Care.” In that regard there is the Old-Age Security Act. I submit – and I do not want to take too much time at it – that the actual saving by the Dominion Government entering further into the picture in regard to old age, taking over the responsibility of paying \$40 a month to old-age pensioners, meant a saving to this province of \$1,130,000 – over a million dollars; that is by the Dominion taking over the entire responsibility of paying \$40 a month to those over 70. There is the saving there. The number of old-age assistance recipients – those in the age group 65 to 69 – according to the last figures that I have, is 4,152. The cost of giving them hospitalization, the cost of giving every one of them medical care and the supplementary allowance could not amount to much more than \$290,000.

Now then, that means that this Government, by only giving them hospitalization, is saving in the neighbourhood of \$800,000. The Dominion Government is increasing its contribution to the old people of this province

February 17, 1953

by \$13 million under its present programme. This province is paying less, since the Dominion increased its payment, towards the assistance to the aged, than they were doing before. If that is 'Humanity First', Mr. Speaker, I am surprised. The Premier held out the hope, in December of 1951, that when it was found out approximately how many people were going to apply and what the dimensions of this problem were, something worthwhile would be done in the matter; and I certainly hoped and thought there would be something in the Speech from the Throne about it.

And then, there is the question of the totally incapacitated. I find here in the 'Commonwealth' of May 31, 1944, regarding social services:

“A C.C.F. Government will re-organize the social services of the province on the basis of accepting responsibility for widows, orphans and all those who are physically incapacitated.”

The province was going to accept responsibility, and that was nine years ago! And we have asked and asked that something be done to give a pension to physically incapacitated people, that something be done to provide for them other than having to get social aid from municipalities and all the difficulties that are entailed by that. And while this Government put it right in its programme, in 1944, it has done practically nothing about it. Well, I hope that they meant to do something when they put it in their 'Program for Progress'. The Premier stated, when they put that programme out, that it was only done after careful study, and after satisfying himself that this could be carried out.

Now I come to the actual programme that was in the speech. It certainly contained a great deal of propaganda. I marvel that so much public money is being used to put out C.C.F. propaganda, at public expense, through the 'Saskatchewan News', the Bureau of Publications, and over the radio; and they even make use of His Honour to put out their propaganda. At least three pages of the Speech from the Throne was unadulterated C.C.F. propaganda. The actual programme could have been put into about half a page. It is hard to pick it out of the propaganda. Here it is: We are going to have an implement engineering committee appointed; we are going to have a new Department for Mineral Resources; we are going to have further provision made for farm electrification; amendments are to be made to The Health Services Act, The School Act, The Library Act, The Vehicles Act, The Automobile Accident and insurance Act – and that is, of course, going to be very difficult for the Provincial Treasurer to introduce. He told us, not so very long ago, “Oh, a couple of dollars on a licence would take care of the amount we were going behind on the Automobile Accident Insurance.” He passed it off like that; but that was before the election. Now it is a different story. The Workmen's Compensation Act, The Co-operative Act, and a Rehabilitation Act is to be brought in, and estimates are going to be laid before us – this is the programme in the light of the “Program for Progress' which I have been laying before you, Mr. Speaker, for the last three-quarters of an hour. This is the result.

Now I come to the matters that should have been in the Speech from the Throne. There should have been provision for payment of taxes in regard to commercial Crown Corporations.

cancelling the Education and Hospitalization Tax on farm fuels and greases. Surely that is a most unfair tax; it is a tax upon production. Surely the time has come when the mineral tax should be taken off the farmers of this province. If you are not going to give them some share if oil is found under their land, certainly they should not be taxed if they happen to hold the mineral resources already.

And then we have the question of payment to farmers when oil is discovered. It was in the Speech from the Throne, last year, that the matter was being studied. The Premier, just before the elections, put it out – and his actual words, in a radio speech, were:

“...that immediate steps would be taken to provide benefits to farmers on whose land oil was discovered but who do not own their mineral rights.”

Immediate steps were going to be taken! Of course, that was before the election! What has been done since to carry out that promise to take immediate steps? Well, we would be glad to hear about it.

Then there is the question of assistance to churches, to charitable and benevolent institutions, in maintaining homes for the aged and crippled who are unable to take care of themselves. Now, surely, Mr. Speaker, while the state institutions have a place in regard to looking after people in that category, surely, also, the church and benevolent institutions have a big part to play. They can do a great work in that field, do better for the people they are going to serve, and incidentally at far less cost to the state. The Minister of social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Sturdy) over a year ago said that some programme was going to be worked out. So, just before the election some small grant was made to a couple of these institutions in our province – just before the election, Mr. Speaker; not on any definite basis that they could rely upon from month to month, or from year to year. I was glad they got it, but surely by this time it should not be a matter of handing out grants at the whim of the Minister. There should be some definite provision for payments on a daily or on a monthly basis per patient. Nothing along that line yet from this self-styled ‘humanitarian’ Government.

The Health Survey Report pointed out that changes were needed in regard to the health programme. The Minister suggested, when it was brought out, that he was in agreement; but there has been a great silence since then. I was very interested to read in the paper that, in Manitoba, the cost per family to provide hospitalization on a voluntary basis has been raised now to \$31.60 per family. But that pays everything! And what I mean by paying everything – and the Minister shakes his head – they do not have, in addition to that, a deficit paid out of the public purse approaching \$9 million. I do not know how the Blue Cross can draw upon the Government. They have either got to make it pay on that basis or go broke. And they are doing well. They have got 42 per cent of Manitoba signed up. It is quite true that the net stay in hospital does not go beyond 90 days – there are some differences in that regard; but I would be very interested if the Minister would get up and say that the differences in regard to the length of stay in the hospital, and the small difference in that regard, accounts for all the difference between that \$30 in Saskatchewan, only paying about 40 per cent of the cost of hospitalization, and \$31.60 in Manitoba, paying all

the cost. These are figures that I think the Minister should enlighten the province on and enlighten the House as to just why it is possible to have that sort of thing in Manitoba, and why we are going behind here \$9 million. He nods his head; I hope that he will tell us.

Let it not be said that we are against the hospitalization scheme. This idea was held out. One of our colleagues, in the last Session, said that he was favourable to some sort of deterrent charge being made. C.C.F. speakers went up and down the country saying, "Oh, that member let the cat out of the bag. The Liberals are really against it", although, at that time, I got up on the floor of this House and said: "The member is speaking for himself; he is not speaking for the Liberal Party." And yet the C.C.F. were so frightened as to what was going to happen to them, and what should have happened to them, that they found it necessary to misrepresent our position in regard to hospitalization.

They not only did it in regard to hospitalization, they did it in regard to Crown Corporations. The Premier engaged in that. He said that the cat had been let out of the bag by the member for The Battlefords because he very carefully said that the corporations that were not giving any public service and were losing money, as far as he personally was concerned, he would "thrown them out the window." Again it was stated that he was speaking for himself and not for the Party, but there was a suggestion made by the Premier that that was the policy of our Party.

The junior member for Regina, in her speech yesterday, made a very effective and moving statement in regard to housing. I wondered just how uneasy those occupying the Government benches were as they heard that story in regard to housing in the capital city of the province of Saskatchewan, where the so-called 'Humanity First' Government has been in office for over eight years, especially in view of the fact that in 1944, this was one of the things that they emphasized needed attention. In speeches just like the hon. member made, they aroused sympathy all over the province and asked for the election of the C.C.F. in order to end this disgraceful state of affairs. The people elected a C.C.F. Government, and then we have the spectacle, yesterday, of this terrible picture being painted, after eight years in office, of a Government which has been in receipt of revenues far beyond anything ever thought of by the governments who were in office before 1944. And here is their programme; this is outlined in the 'Saskatchewan Commonwealth' of May 24, 1944. Those were the days when they were going to be a real 'Humanity First' Government; they were going to do things. Here it is, and I quote:

"Adequate housing for the thousands of families that are now living in slum areas and in crowded tenements in our cities, and that this programme will also include the re-housing of our citizens in the rural areas and that our natural resources will developed to the fullest extent to bring this about."

The Government was going to develop the natural resources. They were not going to hand them out to this choice group. They were going to develop them for the benefit of the people, and they were going to use

that money to build houses. Where has that promise gone, Mr. Speaker? Well, there is the record in that regard. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that I said I was not surprised at all that the Premier wanted to raise all kinds of diversionary considerations to that this record would not be considered by the people?

I have said, Mr. Speaker, that where a government is in office that keeps saying it is about to go ahead with its programme of socialization, that adheres to that as its ultimate objective, people with money to invest do not want to invest their money and have it taken away from them. So, whenever the head of the Government keeps reiterating that idea, then there is a thought in people's minds, "if we can invest our money equally favourably elsewhere, it is better to go there." And that is why, Mr. Speaker, we are not getting the development that we should get. The C.C.F. speakers are trying to avoid this by saying, "Look at the developments. We are getting ahead; we are getting some development." Why, they are getting development in the middle East in spite of the most backward governments on earth because, Mr. Speaker, the resources are there, and if the resources are there, somebody is willing to take a chance. But I ask, do they get the development there they would get if they had stable governments that were not holding the threat of confiscation over the people who invested there? After all, the same considerations apply to our province.

I am not going to go into a great many figures, but I will just point out that Canada as a whole has been going ahead as never before in our history. Our national output is up to \$23 billion; our population will be up to about 15 million at the end of this year. Meanwhile, Saskatchewan barely holds its own. Exports in 1952 will exceed \$4 billion – five times the pre-war volume. Capital development in Canada in the last five years was \$25 billion, and there has been as much capital exported as there has been imported, so that \$25 billion represents the savings of the Canadian people. The investment in Saskatchewan during the same period is something like a billion and a quarter, in tractors and machinery largely and in building and so on – not nearly our share in that development. Saskatchewan has gone forward to the extent she has, not because of this Government, but in spite of it.

For example, in regard to oil, we are supposed to have potential resources equal to Alberta. The expenditure in western Canada, last year, in the development of our oil resources and the search for them, was \$300 million; in Saskatchewan, according to the Government, about \$40 million. Is that our fair share of that after the eight years in office of this Government? If it had not been that they held the threat of confiscation and socialization over the heads of people, I think we would be going ahead, for example, just the same as Alberta. Some 1,175 oil wells were completed in western Canada, last year; 100 in Saskatchewan. Drilling activities: 177 drilling rigs in Alberta; 38 in Saskatchewan. It is easy to go about the country, Mr. Speaker, and point out the development and make fun of people who say that we are not getting the development that we should, because some people do not realize what is going on elsewhere where they have not got any greater resources than we have.

On January 1, 1952, there were 120 parties engaged in geo-physical operations in Alberta; only 25 in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. We are certainly suffering from having a Government in office which has avowed Socialism, when it feels it is safe to do so from an electoral standpoint;

February 17, 1953

as soon as it is safe it avows its devotion to Socialism and the 'Regina Manifesto' and has this blighting effect upon our development. I intend to move, Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my speech, words which we believe are absolutely true. I intend to move, seconded by Mr. Danielson that the following words be added to the address:

“but regrets that Your Honour’s advisers have as their ultimate objective the socialization of our economy as laid down in the Regina Manifesto.”

Before I conclude, Mr. Speaker, and I am near the end of my speech on this motion – it has been said to me by many people that our opposition during the time we were in the Legislature during the last four years was too constructive: that, for example, if we had not hounded the Government, the Public Revenue Tax would not have been taken off; that, if we had not pressed the Government about farm electrification, that programme would not be going forward on anything like the scale it is going forward today. These are only two examples. It has been put to me over and over again that the duty of an Opposition is to oppose. So far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, since I have had the honour to lead the Liberal Party in this province, my attitude was that when I was elected to this Legislature my job was to serve the people of this province to the very best of my ability, great Liberal statesman who is now dead, and who said this:

“Never lose sight of that saving quality which alone makes politics a reputable profession for honourable men, that a party exists not to keep power, not to acquire power, but it exists for the promotion of great and worthy ideals.”

Mr. Speaker, so far as we on this side of the House are concerned we may not have been smart politically, but we did do our best to bring forward what we thought was in the interests of the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Danielson (Arm River):

That the following words be added to the Address:

“but regrets that Your Honour’s present advisers have as their ultimate objective the socialization of our economy as laid down in the Regina Manifesto.”

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order, I presume there will be no objection in carrying on the debate if the amendment and motion are carried along together. I have no desire to speak on both, but I think it is often customary to carry the general debate along. I want to be clear on that point.

Mr. Speaker: — Is that in general agreement?

(Agreed)

February 17, 1953

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am not going to begin the debate now. As members can hear, I have a frog in my throat; I hope to be back tomorrow, and hope I will sound a little less like Donald Duck.

I therefore beg leave to move the adjournment of the debate.

(Agreed)

The Assembly adjourned at 4:45 o'clock p.m.