

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Twelfth Legislature**  
**11th Day**

**Thursday, February 25, 1954**

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

**DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY**

The House resumed, from Wednesday, February 24, 1954, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Wooff for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

**Mr. F. R. MacNutt (Nipawin):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising at this time to take few words of welcome to the two new members who are sitting on this side of the House, the member for Rosthern (Mr. Carr) and the member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly). I feel quite confident that these two new members are going to give us quite a lot during their stay here, and I certainly wish them well. I think everyone else in the House will go along with me on that, and I do want to congratulate them on their 'maiden' efforts. I know, a year ago, when I got up to make my maiden effort in this House, I didn't feel too good about it, and I feel quite certain that when they got up they didn't feel too good about it either, but they did a good job. I feel that what they had to say to us will be of some assistance in bringing down legislation for the good of this province.

I would like to congratulate, at this time, the junior member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper) on her very excellent address which we received, the other day. She patted the Government on the back of course, which is her right; but she had a few ideas of her own — which is noticeable by its absence amongst many other members on your right, Mr. Speaker,

**Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek):** — You can say that again!

**Mr. MacNutt:** — She did throw a few digs across at us on this side of the House, but she did it so pleasantly, Mr. Speaker, that, you know, we didn't mind. I feel quite confident that any time a few digs are thrown across from either side of the House, if they are done as pleasantly as that, nobody will take any great exception to them.

I cannot say quite as much about many of the other speakers from the Government benches, Sir, and it would appear to me that the slogan, this year, seems to be the 'mud-slinging' of the Liberals. I rather resent that. As far as I am concerned I do not sling mud at anybody and, up to the present time, I have not heard any mud-slinging from this side of the House. However the hon. members on your right, Mr. Speaker, should know something about mudslinging because I am sure they all subscribe to this paper that is the mouthpiece of the C.C.F. called the 'Commonwealth', and that is just about one of the finest little mud-slingers I have ever seen. I pay \$2.50 a year to take that paper . . .

**Hon. J. T. Douglas (Minister of Highways):** — Money well spent.

**Mr. MacNutt:** — . . . not for what I get out of it so much, as to see just how far these people will go in calling the Liberals about everything

they can think of. It would appear to me that every time we take exception to anything the Government does, every time we criticize the Government, it is construed as mud-slinging. Well I can assure you, Sir, that this is our job – to criticize the Government, to find fault with the Government on Bills where we think they should be found fault with, and we are going to continue to do that whether we are branded as mud-slingers or not.

Mr. Speaker, there is one subject that I think possibly has been overlooked by a great many of the members of this House and a great many people throughout the province of Saskatchewan, and that is the Civil Defence that we have in this province and throughout the Dominion. A couple of years ago, I had the privilege of attending a course in civil defence at Ft. Qu'Appelle. That course, as you know, is put there to give us something on what to do in case we are attacked from the outside, or in case this country gets into trouble within itself. I got a lot out of that course. It was for members of the Legislature, and I am sorry to say that not very many members attended it because I got a lot out of that course at that time. I think I benefited greatly.

Last winter it was decided that possibly the ladies should take some part in civil defence of this country, and a course was set up for them. That job was taken on by the Ladies' Auxiliary of the Canadian Legion and the course there was for the zone representatives of those Auxiliaries to the Legion throughout the province. At the present time those ladies are going throughout the province and they are endeavouring to get the ladies of the province interested in civil defence in case we are attacked or in case of disaster within the province. I think they are to be congratulated on that stand, and I think they have the well-wishes of everybody in this House, Mr. Speaker.

We hear an awful lot about Saskatchewan not starting until 1944 when the C.C.F. came into power. With the 50th Anniversary coming up in 1955 for this province, I wonder why our friends on your right, Sir, are not postponing that until 1994 – 50 years from 1944. I just want to take a few moments of your time, Sir, and point out a few of the things that did happen for the benefit of this province prior to the time the C.C.F. came into power.

In 1905, when the province was formed, we had a population of something over 250,000 people. We had a Legislature at the time of 25 members. We had no roads. We practically had no hospital service; we had no social services. And we had very little money. At that time I was only a boy, and many of the hon. members of this House were not born at that time. Now let us see what was done under Liberal administration because, as you know, we had a Liberal administration from 1905 until 1944 with the exception of from 1929 to 1934 when the Anderson Government was in power in this province. This country at that time was a wilderness and there were quite a few people in it, as I have stated, with nothing to go on. The government of the day took things in hand and they had a tremendous job ahead of them. Rural municipalities were formed and given jurisdiction over their own immediate needs. With the assistance of the government main market, roads were built, adequate at that time though not as good as we want today, but they did for that time, and thousands of bridges were built throughout this province. Some of those bridges are still standing. A network of highways was built throughout the province and that was a terrific job. Starting from nothing, with very little money, the government of that day started out on a highway proposition which was almost insurmountable, but they did the job. True, the highways at that time were not what we require today, but they were adequate at that time and from time to time since that they rebuilt roads, up until 1944, to meet the needs of the day.

As far as health is concerned, the rural municipalities were given the opportunity to vote on and carry out prepaid hospitalization. That worked very well, Mr. Speaker, and that prepaid hospitalization plan that was put in by a Liberal administration is the foundation for the very excellent hospitalization plan that we have today.

Sanatoria were built at three different points in the province to look after patients suffering from that dread disease, tuberculosis. At first these patients had to pay their own way, but it was later paid for by municipalities that went into a co-operative scheme; and later again there was treatment for any T.B. patient in this province.

Before the Liberals went out of power in this province money was voted for a free cancer clinic and free treatment of that disease; and that is still in force, carried on by the C.C.F. The only difference is, as I understand it, that at that time you went to the clinic and had your examination and it did not cost anything. Today, if you haven't got cancer you pay \$10, well, most people are very pleased to pay \$10 to find out that they haven't got cancer, but at the same time I do believe that this is an unnecessary charge.

The educational part of our province was looked after. Schools were built throughout the province by the people, normal schools were erected and government assistance given to the school districts to help with the education of our young people - \$1.50 per room as paid at that time by the Liberal administration and, I believe, that is the rate today.

These few items, Mr. Speaker, and many others were brought into existence under Liberal administration in spite of a small but growing population and in spite of frozen crops, two world wars, drought and the worst depression that this world has ever known. Even with the effects of those things the province developed by leaps and bounds from 1905 until 1944 so, when the C.C.F. came into power in 1944, they had a well-developed province handed to them on a silver platter. With the buoyant currencies we have had since then any government would have made great strides and developed the province to a great extent, and it is my honest belief, Sir, that this province has developed in the last ten years, not because of the C.C.F., but in spite of them.

I want to dwell just for a few moments on this wonderful document – the Speech from the Throne – which many Government speakers have said is so good, which the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet), yesterday, really 'went to town' on. It has always been my understanding that the Speech from the Throne was a forecast of legislation to be brought down during the Session. Now if the Speech from the Throne is a rehash of what has been done in the past, I would say this is a very good speech; but I still think that the Speech from the Throne should forecast legislation that is to be brought down during the Session.

On looking for that, I see very few items which forecast any legislation. I see one or two: a few amendments to The Lands Act and so on. Some of these amendments have been brought down at the present time and some, no doubt, will be brought down at an early date. But on looking over this I find one suggestion, and that is the amendment to The Teachers' Superannuation Act. At the last Session of the Legislature we had an Act brought down regarding the teachers' superannuation and at that time I, with a lot of others, thought that that Act had been gone into very thoroughly and had met with the approval of the Teachers' Federation. For that reason I did not go into it very

thoroughly. Since that time I find that The Teachers' Superannuation Act does not meet with the approval of quite a number of teachers. I have had representations from the teachers of the Nipawin larger school unit, and they are anything but satisfied with it. I sincerely hope, Sir, that when this amendment is brought down, provision will be made for the superannuation of those people who are giving so much to this country, and that they will be given a superannuation that will be in accord with the work which they are doing. I will, at that time, scrutinize that Act very carefully and if I find that it does not meet with the approval of the teachers in my constituency then I will have something further to say about it.

I am very pleased indeed to see that legislation will be brought down to look after the totally disabled persons of this province. That is good legislation. As far as the rest of it is concerned, some of the legislation forecast has already been brought down, but there is very little in it as far as I can see.

Mr. Speaker, last year I tried to tell this House something about that great north country in which I have the privilege and honour to live. It would appear that what I had to say did not sink in very far, because we are still struggling up in the north, looking for the things that we think should be ours.

We have a very excellent association called No. 35 Highway Association, and we are very determined to do everything in our power to get that highway built from White Fox to Flin Flon. We in that north country feel that that is a 'must'. We feel that we must have access to the great mining areas in the north country and Highway No. 35 is the answer to it. At the present time that highway goes north of White Fox and just goes off 'into the blue'. Thousands and thousands of our dollars are in there not doing very much good for anybody and I would like to impress on this Government the necessity of doing something on that highway. We don't mind if you build ten or fifteen or twenty miles a year as long as something is done, and within a reasonable time we will get that highway through so that we will have access to that great northern country up around Flin Flon where all the minerals and so on are. I would like to impress on the Government, Sir, the necessity for that highway and something being done about it.

On February 2 of this year, I had the privilege of going on that cavalcade from Carrot River to The Pas. As you all know we put on those cavalcades from year to year to try and impress the powers-that-be that it is advisable to get that beautiful north country opened up for settlement and to get a road through there connecting us with The Pas. When I first heard about this cavalcade going up I was very very pleased indeed to hear that the Minister of Agriculture was going to be one of the party. I did feel that he could benefit a lot from taking a trip through that north country. Later on, just prior to moving off (a day or two before), I found that, due to work in Regina, he was unable to come along with us. I feel that the Minister of Agriculture missed something when he did not take time out to come along with us on that motorcade; I am sure he would have enjoyed it. As far as I am concerned, I know the Session was coming on; I know that he had a lot of work to do, but, Mr. Speaker, I do feel that with 14 Cabinet Ministers here, when I don't think we need all that number, either he or some other Cabinet Minister could have come along on that motorcade. It was worthwhile, and it would show that the Government of this province is interested in the opening up of that north country.

We have land up there, as some of you know, second to none in the Dominion of Canada. It is beautiful stuff. That land, when opened up, will grow 30, 40, 50 and 60 bushels of wheat to the acre; but there has to be a lot of work done on it first. That country all has to be drained, proofed against flooding, surveyed and all the rest of it, and it is going to take a lot of time and an awful lot of money; but when it is done it is going to be worthwhile. It is the last frontier of Saskatchewan as far as agriculture is concerned, and I do feel that this Government should be taking a little more interest in it. I know they are doing some work up there; I know they are doing a little surveying and so on.

Manitoba has made an agreement with the Federal Government to open up their portion. That agreement appears to be satisfactory to both the Federal and the Manitoba governments, and I do know that if Saskatchewan wants the same agreement, all they have to do is ask for it and it is theirs, and we could get that country opened up to take care of people who are at the present time looking for land.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I know the hon. member would not want to misinform the House. I wish to advise him that we have asked the Federal Government for an agreement on the development of that project.

**Mr. MacNutt:** — That I am very pleased to hear, Mr. Speaker, and I sincerely hope that the agreement will be satisfactory to the Federal Government and to this Provincial Government and the people of this province. I am very pleased indeed that something is being done to get that great country open and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that anything I can do to help in opening that country up (I don't care whether it is the C.C.F. Government that opens it up or not) I will be only too pleased to add what little weight I may have to see that it is done and that country made ready for settlement of the people of this province and other places.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not too much more to say at this time. I sincerely hope that I have a chance to speak again on the budget when I have other matters that are very near to my heart to place before this House. I am glad that there is some little work being done round the Connell Creek area and the co-op farms; but again, there is not enough being done in those areas, and I would like to impress upon the Minister of Agriculture the necessity of getting out there and doing a lot of work in those areas because that is just about the finest country that we have in the province of Saskatchewan. People are sitting out there and are having trouble. They are flooded out every year. They haven't roads; some of them have to walk in a couple of miles to their farms. I sincerely hope that something is going to be done before too long to see that those people are given a better chance to make a decent living than they have been given up to the present time.

That is about all I have to say at the present time. I hope that this work carries on. I am very much intrigued with the wealth of that country in which I have the privilege to live, and I can assure you that I will do everything in my power to see that we get what I think is coming to us. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the motion.

**Mr. G. H. Danielson (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I wish first of all to congratulate the two new members who have come into the House this Session. I am sure that they will make some contribution — they already have made a contribution; and if the indications I have are correct, they are going to make a good contribution. They are men of ability, they are men of brains also, and that combination calls for some results. I surely wish them well.

I was very much interested in the remarks by two or three of the members, particularly the member from Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Wellbelove) in regard to the new member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly). He handed him a warning in respect to certain things that would happen to him if he associated with us Liberals on this side of the House.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — That's up to you.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Now, if the member from Hanley wants to speak he will have all the time after I am through, and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that when he gets on his feet I shall not interrupt him. He also told him that he should not become too familiar or too closely allied with the Liberal Party. I do not think that advice is necessary by any means, for the simple reason that the new member from Estevan, I am sure, is a man who can do the thing that he wants and make his own decisions without any advice from either the C.C.F. or the Liberal Party in this province. He gives me the impression that no person is going to tell him what to do or where he is going to sit and what attitude he is going to take on questions before this House. He just does as he pleases and I admire that ability in any man.

During this Session, Mr. Speaker, there is a new type of tactics from the C.C.F. They have learned over the years the strategy and the police tactics of the Communists, and they have learned them well, too. You know, when the Communists get into trouble about anything and they are in difficulty they scream accusations against their opponents. They throw all the mud they possibly can throw in order to divert attention from themselves. That has been done in this House, I would say by the member for Kerrobert-Kindersley, even by the Premier when he made his speech, and it has been faithfully followed by all except two members who have spoken so far in this House. They have said that there is something rotten in this Party, that there is something wrong with the Liberal Party. Well, I would tell these members now to come out and tell the public if they have anything against any member on this side of the House and not be so cowardly as to sit back there and hint about it. Let them speak their minds. Let them throw their cards on the table, or else cease these accusations and keep their peace forever after. But why is it done? To distract attention from their own — should I say back? No, I am not going to say back-benches, I am going to say front-benches. I will have something to say about that in a few moments.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) thought he was putting over something really smart. He thought he was doing government something that would go far and wide over the radio and into the minds of the people of the province of Saskatchewan. He said “This is the same Liberal stew and the same stain on the tablecloth,” and gee! What a gem that is . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — What a stain!

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . coming from a gentleman like him. Let me tell him that the C.C.F. ‘mulligan stew’ or Rawluk, Shumiatcher, Bodnoff,

Fines, Allore and Jacqueline Gates is not only on the C.C.F. tablecloth but it is right up on their shirt fronts. The people can see it, and in spite of the theatrical performance of the Premier and his stalwart followers, last year, with 35 members back of him, to try to whitewash and get the stain off the C.C.F. tablecloth and their shirts, it is still there, Mr. Speaker, and it is going to stay there until they take action to remove it by legal means, by means in which the people of this province have a faith.

**Mr. McDonald:** — They need a dry-cleaning job.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Why don't they submit the charges that have been made, and partly proven without any doubt, to a judicial inquiry that can weigh the evidence that is submitted and render justice in respect to the people of the province of Saskatchewan?

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — Why don't you demand . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — We did . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — Where is Allore today?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Now just a minute. I am not through with you fellows yet. It is a long time between now and 6 o'clock, and you are jumping up like jackrabbits. Mr. Speaker, you have the graciousness to permit every member of this House to stand up here and read newspapers. Some of them have been reading "Pravda" as I call it — the 'C.C.F. Commonwealth' — two or three times in this House. The Premier did considerable reading, and now I am going to read part of two editorials and I am going to ask the members opposite, in spite of the fact that they come from the 'Leader-Post', to sit down and wait till I am through reading and then think over seriously the implications these editorials contain. One is dated February 19, 1954, and it refers to the Leader of the Opposition when he spoke in this debate and mentioned that there was some "unfinished business." The 'Leader-Post' says this:

"If the Opposition still believes there should have been a more impartial weighing of the evidence than a Committee composed of a majority of Government members is capable of, it was its duty on the first opportunity offered at the new Session to make this known. This has been done. Mr. Loftson obviously had no intention that the present Session should thresh over the old straw of the prolonged hearings. He simply asked that the evidence now on the record be subjected to a judicial review.

"Premier Douglas, in his reply, implied that the responsibility for further action lay with the Opposition, although the Committee in its report referred the matter to the Attorney General for consideration and any action that might appear to be appropriate. The Premier took the position that the Opposition, at the last Session, should have proceeded differently than it did, that instead of initiating a consideration of the Rawluk charges by the Crown Corporations Committee steps should have been taken by the Opposition for a judicial inquiry.

“Since these charges involved a Crown Corporation – The Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office – the appropriate place to bring this matter before the Legislature was at the first meeting of this Committee which is charged with the duty of examining the conduct of Crown Corporations. Accusations have been made that the Rawluk charges were concocted for political purposes. Had the Opposition used them as the basis of an attack on the floor of the Legislature coupled with a demand for a judicial inquiry, this simply would have lent credence to these accusations.

“Mr. Douglas in his reply implied that he believes a government and its servants who are accused of malpractice are in a position analogous to that of accused persons under British law: they are presumed to be innocent until proved guilty. He inferred that the onus of proof in the Rawluk affair lay entirely with the Opposition. He stated that if the Opposition had not been satisfied with the Committee’s report it should have launched action in the courts.

“A government cannot expect to be able to hide behind a presumption of innocence until charges against it are proven. It should keep itself clear of even a suspicion of wrongdoing. The Opposition’s role is not that of policeman and prosecutor to gather all the evidence and then conduct the prosecution in the courts. It is the critic of the Government, and once allegation of malpractice against the Government or its servants are brought forward, supported as in the Rawluk case by a sworn affidavit, it becomes the responsibility and duty of the Government to clear itself. The procedure adopted also becomes the Government’s responsibility.

“The Government has another obligation, that of safeguarding public men and government servants from false accusations. If the Rawluk charges were completely false as the Committee contended, then it follows that Rawluk committed a serious offence. The appropriate action for the Attorney General to have taken would have been to launch a prosecution against him. Yet nothing has been done.”

That, Mr. Speaker, is a cold, reasonable and logical survey of the situation as facts are today. But I have another one. The Premier told us here in this House, at the conclusion of the last Session, that this was the highest court in the land – a political committee, weighted in favour of the accused by 3 to 1. We have experience of what other political leaders, including Mr. Woodsworth, think about this performance, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to read you what he says. This is from another editorial, and this quotation of Mr. Woodsworth’s is absolutely correct as it appeared in Hansard.

**Premier Douglas:** — What paper is that?

**Mr. Danielson:** — ‘Regina Leader-Post’, April 16, 1953, just at the conclusion of the hearing, last year:

“Premier Douglas on occasion referred to the inquiry as the most exalted court in the land. It never was any exaltation at all. It was the high elevation of its political, and not judicial, leanings. The Committee was a packed jury for the defence, with 25 out of the 35 on the Government side and 10 from the Opposition. It included the most active and ardent advocate for the defence during the inquiry – Premier Douglas himself.”

Now, then listen to this – you C.C.F.ers listen to this! You worship Mr. Woodsworth, and I don’t blame you; I think Mr. Woodsworth was an honest man because he never compromised his principles, and if you follow him you are not going to go very far astray. Take that home, all of you:

“No less an authority than the late Mr. G. S. Woodsworth, founder of the C.C.F., need be quoted as establishing the improbability of an unbiased report emerging from such a jury. During the Customs inquiry in parliament in 1926 Mr. Woodsworth requested a judicial inquiry ‘because’, he said, ‘justice could not be expected from a parliamentary committee’. It should be noted that the committee here referred to contained not a preponderance of government members, but a minority of government members – 4 Liberals, 4 Conservatives and 1 progressive – (it was a minority of government members on that committee).”

Surely to goodness, in this day and age, after all your professions, after all your protestations of innocence and all this, the facts are spread on the records of this House, the sworn affidavit in a large measure corroborated and substantiated by reliable evidence before this Committee. Think it over.

But, Mr. Speaker, during the inquiry, last year, there was not a solitary day that we did not have certain threatening statements from the Premier on what was going to happen to Mr. Rawluk, what was going to happen to all these fellows who dared to bring any accusations against the members of the Government and the civil servants of this Government. He went down to Weyburn, and it is reported in the press of April 8, 1953, that he said this:

“I am not going to discuss the charges made before that Committee for the obvious reason that the inquiry is still before the Committee. Until the Committee has completed its investigation I am not at liberty to discuss the matter in public. As soon as it goes before the House I will have plenty to say about it, both in the House and to you people; plenty to say about the people cloaked up behind this affidavit.

“Premier Douglas said there were just two things he wanted to say at the moment. First, he said, it was a good thing to look at the reliability and dependability of those making the charges. And second, in the C.C.F., we do not believe any man is infallible, but we do believe in our leaders’ integrity.”

Well, that is good sensible thought; that part of it is. No doubt about that. The Premier told his audience he would have plenty to say to the people. But, Mr. Minister, what has the Premier said to the people of this province about this thing since the inquiry closed a year ago? What has he said? Not a solitary thing! He is not on record as ever making one statement about this. He wants to squash this thing. He wants the people to forget about anything like the Rawluk inquiry. Let me point out this, Mr. Speaker, when this thing was before the House, before they moved to make a decision, sitting 42 members on that side of the House (I think it was) and 10 over here, there was not a solitary person or a member on that side of the House who opened his mouth to speak in favour of it or against it except the Premier. There was no other allowed to speak. Has there been anybody, this year? No, sir. He has muzzled the whole crowd, and he tries to keep this from public discussion. Now, just an illustration . . .

**Mr. Gibson (Morse):** — On a point of privilege, I don’t think I can let that pass. I don’t think that any member on this side of the House can let that pass. I must correct the hon. member and state that, as far as I am concerned (and I hope every other member will make the same statement), I have never been muzzled in this House.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Then they consented unanimously.

**Mr. Gibson:** — I think it is only fair that the hon. member be asked to withdraw that statement.

**Mr. Danielson:** — All right, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw that statement, but happenings speak for themselves. The actions before the House, today, speak for themselves. It has been a remarkable thing that of that whole group of men sitting over there, members of this House, not one has the courage to get up and put his foot in this thing and try to explain his position.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. A charge has been laid against members of this side which we claim was untrue, and I think it is only fair that he withdraw . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — That’s not a point or privilege, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the hon. member for Arm River said that not a member of this House had the courage to get up and talk about the Rawluk case, and that imputation against the courage and the character of the members of this side of the House ought to be withdrawn.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I did withdraw it. It is not a point of privilege any more.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member repeated himself after he had withdrawn the first time.

**Mr. Danielson:** — No, I didn't. I said the facts speak for themselves.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — What facts?

**Mr. Danielson:** — The fact that not one of you ever declared yourself when you stood up.

**Premier Douglas:** — Could I ask my friend how many Liberals spoke after I spoke on the Rawluk charges? Not one! They were too ashamed.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I'll challenge the Premier, Mr. Speaker. There were six members sitting on this side of the House who spoke on that motion and the amendment, and one on that side of the House.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Right – six to one.

**Mr. Danielson:** — And that is my answer to you, now. You won't catch me napping. Mr. Speaker, there was one member of this House, however, who asked for an expression of public opinion on this and that is the illustration.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas (Rosetown):** — He got it.

**Mr. Danielson:** — He went down to Estevan and spoke in that election campaign. As reported in the Press on June 12, 1953, he said something to this effect:

“There are three main things we must decide before we go to the polls, said Mr. Fines, the first, which candidate can get the most done for the people, the Government supporter or the member of the other side of the House . . . (and he got his answer there) . . . You have an opportunity now to tell this Government what you think of the programme instituted last year.” (And he's got his answer there too).

But here is the crux of the whole thing and he shouldn't ask for any expressions of opinion any more, because he got it, stronger than it has ever been expressed in this province before. He said this:

“You will have an opportunity to tell the Liberals what you think of their tactics in the last Session of the Legislature.”

Well, he got that answer, 1200 strong and another 1200 C.C.F. didn't even bother to go out and vote. They were so disgusted that they stayed home.

**Premier Douglas:** — How many votes did the Liberal candidate get?

**Mr. Danielson:** — There wasn't any.

**Premier Douglas:** — That's right!

**Mr. Danielson:** — It is just the same as he peddled around the country about what happened at Ottawa a few years ago, involving Mr. Tucker. He

said, "Why didn't Mr. Tucker vote for that motion?" He didn't say he voted against it you know, but he said, "Why didn't he vote for it?" Well, I took the Hansard and checked it up, and nobody voted for the motion. It was ruled out of order by the Speaker. But he continues to run all over the province and leave the impression with the people that Tucker voted against the motion that nobody voted for – he didn't say he voted against it, but he said, "Why didn't he vote for it?" That is one of the tricks he plays. You know, so long as a juggler hasn't got a new trick, he'll have to think up new tricks, you see. A vaudeville performance soon dies if he doesn't have a new supply of tricks to hold the crowd, and I think it is clearly demonstrated here that this juggler is dying off. But, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Fines is Provincial Treasurer. He got his answer, and the people told him just what they thought about this Rawluk inquiry and there is nothing to flatter him.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Better talk that over with Dr. McCusker.

**Mr. Danielson:** — McCusker has nothing to do with this.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — He got his answer, too.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Say, that's too silly for anything.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The whole speech is.

**Mr. Danielson:** — If that is the best defence you can offer I wouldn't say anything if I were you. But the people of Estevan when the inquiry was going on, read the papers, heard it on the radio, and they come out even months after and they said, "This thing has not been settled to our satisfaction, and nobody has told us the truth so that it has been cleared up today." That was their answer. And that is the situation today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, who was this Rawluk? Who was this man?

**Hon. Mr. Douglas (Rosetown):** — You fellows ought to know.

**Mr. Danielson:** — There were attempts made by the C.C.F. election machine and their propaganda (and they spend about \$300,000 a year on propaganda at the taxpayers' expense) to leave the impression that this Mr. Rawluk was a Liberal, that he was with us. There has never been a greater falsehood uttered any place, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Rawluk was picked out by Shumiatcher, by Bodnoff and those others associated with him as a man suitable for what they wanted to use him for. And another thing, they say this was brought about for political purposes in the election of 1952. Well, there is no one can tell the truth and say that. There was evidence produced before this inquiry that Rawluk was handing 'kick-backs' and engaged in conspiracies to bribe Government officials as early as the first part of 1951 and it was corroborated by evidence before that Committee. Now then, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, this whole thing was the falling out among a bunch of – well, you know what Mrs. Cates said: "We were all friends together." It was a falling out among this group who were all friends together, because they were stepping too hard on Rawluk and he found that his allowance of funds did not go far enough. So he commenced to 'rat' and to squeal and that was not anything done by Liberals. I never heard of him before the afternoon when it was brought out in the Crown Corporations Committee.

**Premier Douglas:** — He was a Liberal scrutineer.

**Mr. Danielson:** — It was out duty, Mr. Speaker, with an affidavit like that to bring it before that Committee, and we would be forever remiss in our duty if we had not done just what we did.

Then the Premier says you got the inquiry that you wanted. Yes, that is partly true, but, Mr. Speaker, we did not expect that the Premier was going to come into that inquiry determined that there was going to be no proper investigation of the charges. He came in there determined to discredit Mr. Rawluk. There was no need of that, Mr. Speaker; there was no need of anybody discrediting Mr. Rawluk. Mr. Rawluk had taken an affidavit that he had been engaged in conspiracy and bribery. Wasn't that enough? It is right in the affidavit.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — He was a self-confessed liar.

**Mr. Danielson:** — What was the object of spending weeks and months trying to twist and distort and stop information and evidence being produced before that Committee? That was done.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Stop slinging mud.

**Mr. Danielson:** — There was a lawyer engaged, Mr. Leslie, and I think Mr. Leslie did a fairly good job. I am not going to criticize Mr. Leslie only in this respect — and I am going to be fair about it. He spent hours and hours, day after day, repeating and repeating the same questions and getting the same answers out of Rawluk which he had got in the first place. That is what he did.

Another thing that took place in that inquiry, Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Rawluk was on the stand — I think he was on the stand about 33 hours — he had to answer questions by saying 'no' or 'yes' and give a definite answer; but when the others came on the stand — when Dr. Shumiatcher came on the stand, did you ever hear him answer a straightforward 'no' or 'yes' to a question? I didn't. He said this: "Well, it appears . . ." or "Likely that would be it," or "Well, that may be." These were the answers he gave, and I got up on my feet and I called it to the attention of Mr. Leslie, but he still let him get by with that kind of answers.

Rawluk's private papers were brought into this House and left in the custody of paid officials of this Government, and what happened? They were turned over to Dr. Shumiatcher, Leslie et al, the whole group of them. And the private papers of Mr. Rawluk were dragged out and used on the floor of the House.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, that is reflection on the Clerk of this House. All documents were turned over to the custody of the Clerk of this Legislative Assembly and were not allowed out of his custody, and they were there available to the counsel for the Committee and any other counsel. That statement is completely untrue and is a reflection on the Clerk and ought to be withdrawn.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Mr. Speaker, there was no reflection on the House.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, that was brought up in the Committee.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member should withdraw that statement.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That was brought up right in the Committee.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Make him withdraw.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The hon. member should withdraw that statement because not only is it a reflection on the Clerk of the House but on all the members of this Government.

**Mr. Danielson:** — As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it was brought up before the Committee.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The papers were left in the custody of the Clerk of this Legislature and were taken to the Legislative office and were never removed from that office.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, it was brought up before the Committee and it was admitted that Rawluk's private papers were brought out; all the private papers of Mr. Rawluk, a whole packingcase full of them and they . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Withdraw, withdraw!

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member must withdraw that statement because it is a direct reflection on the honour and integrity of a servant of this House.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, I don't know who it is a reflection on, but it was done.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, it was not done . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — It was done.

**Premier Douglas:** — The member, by saying it was or wasn't, isn't answering the point. Not a single document that was received as evidence ever went out of the custody of the Clerk of the House. Those documents were kept in his custody, were available to the counsel either for Mr. Rawluk, for the committee, or any other counsel. For the hon. member to say that those documents were turned over to other people is completely incorrect. No such evidence was ever submitted at any time, and he owes it to this House and to the Clerk of the House to withdraw that statement.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Mr. Speaker, I think there is a misunderstanding . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Loptson:** — I have a right . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I must insist that the hon. member withdraw because you have made a direct accusation against an individual who is not in a position to refute it himself, but is a respected employee of this Legislature.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, I made no accusation against any person.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I must ask the hon. member to withdraw the statement. I heard what you said and I am asking you to withdraw the statement that

the papers that were given to the custody of the Clerk of the House were made available and were removed by any other person.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Were made available and scrutinized by the opposition counsel, McLeod and Shumiatcher, and it was admitted before the Committee.

**Mr. Cameron:** — They were all available to everyone.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes, they were available to anyone., I haven't mentioned any names either. I say this without contradiction . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member knows that it is not necessary to make a direct accusation by names. You made the accusation against the conduct of the custodian of those legal documents, the Clerk of the Legislature, and I know personally that that trust was honoured, and I am asking the member to withdraw that allegation.

**Mr. Lopton:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, he never said that the documents were removed. He merely indicated that they were perused.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! He implied that they were, and he implied that they were made available to anyone and to others outside the representatives . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Oh no, no, I didn't!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Yes, the implication was there.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Never, never, Mr. Speaker!

**Mr. Speaker:** — I ask you to withdraw that implication.

**Mr. Danielson:** — There were documents placed on the table in this House that came from that box and they were private papers of Mr. Rawluk. It was the result of that . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, we can probably settle it – most of us heard that statement when the hon. member said that they were removed and turned over to other people.,

**Mr. Danielson:** — Oh, no! Oh, no!

**Premier Douglas:** — If my hon. friend says he didn't say that or that he didn't mean to say that, that will settle the whole thing. The fact is that the papers were there to be scrutinized and were scrutinized, but they were never out of the custody of the Clerk and also Shumiatcher's papers were also in custody and were also scrutinized. But my friend did not say 'scrutinized'; he said they were 'removed', and that was the point I took exception to. You said you didn't mean that, so let's go on with the debate.

**Some Hon. Members:** — He did say it!

**Mr. Danielson:** — No, I didn't. I said they were allowed to be examined by the opposition – and they had to take them out of the box to look at them, didn't they?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Now, I want to take up the statement the Premier made. Do you mean to say, Mr. Premier, that the private papers of Dr. Shumiatcher were also placed here? His private files?

**Premier Douglas:** — I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that his account files were called for by the Committee — books out of his accounting files, from his ledger book, were brought before this Committee and examined by all the counsel, and he was questioned on them. My hon. friend will remember that distinctly.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, I can imagine, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I must ask the hon. member if he didn't say that, say it is a misconception, but I took it that there was a direct implication against the Clerk of the Legislature.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I am not making any implications against anybody, but I can look at the facts as they are. The papers from that box were placed on the table of this House, and questions were asked relating to Mr. Rawluk's private affairs.

**Mr. Speaker:** — But that is not what you said.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I certainly did, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — What I am taking exception to and asking you to withdraw is the implied statement that the papers were not properly kept when they were given to the custody of the Clerk. That is the statement that I am asking you to withdraw.

**Mr. Danielson:** — But that is not the statement I made.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The implication was there and I am asking you to withdraw.

**Mr. Danielson:** — If anyone in this House, when I made that statement, thinks that I had any particular individual in mind, well then I will withdraw; but I am not withdrawing the statement, Mr. Speaker, that Rawluk's private papers were available to Dr. Shumiatcher, Mr. Leslie, Mr. McLeod and Mrs. Cates, and they were brought right in here. That fact was brought to the attention of the Committee.

**Some Hon. Member:** — We have wasted enough time . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — I just wonder, Mr. Speaker, what revelation, what we would have found if we had had Dr. Shumiatcher's private packingcase and correspondence here, if we had had access to the Provincial Treasurer's. My, my, what a field-day the reporters would have had if they had reported what they found in those! But that was the treatment that Mr. Rawluk got, in his private affairs.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I would raise just one point, and it is that all of the documents of Mr. Rawluk were brought here by Mr. Embury, the counsel for Mr. Rawluk, and were submitted by him.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes, that is true; sure they were. He brought them down here because . . .

**Mr. Erb:** — A big nuisance, too!

**Mr. Danielson:** — He brought them down here because Mr. Embury was Rawluk's counsel. Why didn't you tell him that?

**Premier Douglas:** — I said that. I said he was Rawluk's counsel.

**Mr. Danielson:** — No, you didn't say he was Rawluk's counsel.

**Premier Douglas:** — Well, everyone else heard it and understood it. I am not responsible for my friend's congenital deficiencies.

**Mr. Erb:** — You're really making chaff out of straw!

**Mr. Danielson:** — You'd better go back to Russia.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, and today, in spite of all their seats, this Government has the nerve and the audacity, like the Attorney General did a few days ago, to tell the Leader of the Opposition, "Why don't you start action?" Well, Mr. Speaker, that was one of the most peculiar statements — I should apply something more strong to that statement,

**Hon. J. W. Corman (Attorney General):** — You are scared to.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. McDonald:** — It doesn't look like it, this afternoon.

**Mr. Danielson:** — There has never been any C.C.F. that could ever scare me, and there never will be, even if they had another 42 over there.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General — of course I am not blaming him, I think he is pretty well told what he has to do . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — By whom?

**Mr. McCarthy:** — You can say that again.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, I think you have 14 Cabinet Ministers, and I suppose you have to have unanimity before there is any drastic action taken in anything. That is the responsibility of government, isn't it, Mr. Speaker? That is the way I understand it. But the Attorney General took an oath, when he became Attorney General, to enforce the law of the province of Saskatchewan, and the criminal laws of the Dominion of Canada. There is no question about that. Well now, here we have Mr. Rawluk who has taken an affidavit and confessed day after day that he entered into a conspiracy of bribery: in the name of common sense, when he knows there has been a crime committed, why doesn't he prosecute Mr. Rawluk? He is not doing his duty. That is how I feel. We had another gentleman who offered to bribe, or did bribe presumably (I don't know); but he took action against a man named Wilkes, who tried to bribe some officials or some employer of the salt plant down there. Surely to goodness, Mr. Speaker, that isn't anything compared to the crime that Rawluk

was supposed to have committed! Why doesn't he take action? Why doesn't he do his duty? No, Mr. Speaker, they don't dare to do their duty.

**Hon. Mr. Corman:** — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member has asked a question I would like to answer it.

**Mr. Danielson:** — All right, go ahead.

**Hon. Mr. Corman:** — He has asked why an action, a criminal action for perjury is not brought against Rawluk. The Opposition asked the same question of Mr. Leslie, counsel for the Committee, when the report was prepared, and Mr. Leslie explained to the Opposition why it was almost impossible. Everyone with a memory will remember why it was almost impossible to get Rawluk's evidence properly before the court on a perjury trial. Rawluk's evidence before the Commission was taken down by a recording machine — Mr. Leslie a sworn stenographer, and very probably, extremely probably, would not be admissible in an action for perjury against Rawluk in a criminal court. Secondly, and more import, Mr. Leslie pointed out, under questioning from the Opposition, why Rawluk could not be charged with perjury on the so-called affidavit that his lawyers were smart enough to get from him instead of a statutory declaration.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Who is making a speech?

**Hon. Mr. Corman:** — You asked the question; you started this.

**Premier Douglas:** — You take it now.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The hon. member asked a question, and you gave him the privilege to answer.

**Hon. Mr. Corman:** — Mr. Leslie pointed out that a statutory declaration should have been taken, and that on that so-called affidavit no charge for perjury would be allowed. That is the reason this man has not been charged with perjury. And Mr. Leslie told them that, not the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Danielson:** — A most remarkable answer, Mr. Speaker! He is a lawyer, of course, and he is just as slippery as his desk-mate over there. He talks about . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — That is a compliment, coming from you.

**Mr. Danielson:** — He talks about perjury! I never said anything about perjury. I said Rawluk had confessed to entering a conspiracy for bribery. That is a criminal case in any province in the Dominion of Canada, and it rests with the Attorney General to take the necessary action and forget about the perjury; that grows up in your imagination, that is a 'smoke-screen'. I never said a word about perjury. You go ahead and do your duty on the bribery charge. You can't answer that — scratch your head. You can't answer that because you can't do it. Mr. Speaker, if that were done, they would not talk about the evidence before the Committee. That is a criminal case against Rawluk. You have taken criminal action against the employee of the salt plant down there, this Wilkes. You have already taken action . . .

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — What's the evidence?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Never mind, you're not a lawyer. I am talking to a lawyer and Mr. Speaker, you and I have lived long enough and have had enough business associations in the many years we have lived, to find out the fundamental principles of the law. I am not a lawyer, but I have a little bit of common sense and, if the day ever comes when the Attorney General is ready to do his duty and prosecute Rawluk for bribery, and you go to the court, and Dr. Shumiatcher, Mrs. Cates, Bodnoff and the man who went to Vancouver, and the Provincial Treasurer would be called as witnesses; and there won't be any Mrs. Cates sitting there taking shorthand notes of the evidence, there won't be any Provincial Treasurer sitting in his glory, like he did in this Committee, writing notes and sending them up to the counsel for the Committee and the witness, telling him what to say. That would be a court of law with the correct procedure of taking evidence and the whole thing would be on the table, and justice and honesty would prevail in Saskatchewan. Now, can you answer that? Go ahead and do your best now. You have done your worst so far; now go ahead and do your best, do your duty. That is my answer to you and all your friends over there.

**Hon. Mr. Corman:** — Mr. Leslie told you all.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Leslie never talked about bribery at all; he talked about perjury. That is not the question here at all.

**Mr. Cameron:** — That is the job of the Attorney General.

**Mr. Danielson:** — And there was that other case, not half as bad, and yet there is a criminal case before you. Go ahead. Let us get them all in — Shumiatcher and Mrs. Cates and the whole group of them, Bodnoff and all of them, and let them give their evidence before a court of law and you'll see where you wind up. There you are. That is all I have to say about this, Mr. Speaker.

**Premier Douglas:** — More than enough!

**Mr. Danielson:** — That is lot more than you like to hear.

**Premier Douglas:** — I just love listening to you.

**Mr. Danielson:** — And when you get your henchmen over there saying there is mud in the Liberal backyard . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Hear! Hear! It's coming out today.

**Mr. Danielson:** — And if the member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Wellbelove) were in here I would say to him that mud doesn't stink, but the stuff that you have in the C.C.F. frontyard stinks, and he being a farmer will know what I mean.

**Premier Douglas:** — We're getting an awful load of it today.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — These C.C.F.ers, Mr. Speaker, they are great for sitting there throwing a little bit of . . . around, thinking it is going to stick; you see they don't like to take it, but they will get it . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Oh, terrific!

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . we're not over with this thing yet. No, Sir. And I want to tell the Attorney General, before he goes to sleep tonight – do your duty as Attorney General of this province and we'll have something to remember you by, anyhow, when you pass away.

**Hon. Mr. Corman:** — Thanks for the free advice.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, you are badly in need of it.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — It is likely worth all it cost!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, I am getting away behind here . . .

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — The audience is gone anyway.

**Mr. Danielson:** — The member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff), when he moved the motion, Mr. Speaker, made a very sanctimonious and rather a moving speech, but he could not get away from that particular topic which has always entered into the finishing touches of this Government's back-benchers for years. And that was to take a dig at the United States, criticizing the United States for what they have done. He said they had bases at so and so, all over the world. Well, Mr. Speaker, why are these bases spread all over the world? They have bases in Great Britain, and, by the way, most of those bases were put in while you had a Labour government in Great Britain, too, and personally, I am glad they have them. I think the government of Great Britain knows what they are doing whether they are Liberal or Tories or whatever they are. But they are there. Do you suppose that the government of Great Britain would allow the United States to put these bases in that country unless they wanted them? Oh, no. You have them in Denmark; you have them in Germany; you have them in Italy; you have them all over, and they are going to have one in Spain, at least that is the proposition. Well, Mr. Speaker, is there . . .

**Mr. Wooff:** — On a point of order . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . in the United States . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! The hon. member is up on a point of order.

**Mr. Wooff:** Mr. Speaker, I am not going to allow any member in this House to put words in my mouth. I never mentioned the United States, and if he wants my address I will give it to him.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, I would like to say . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — You are still having pipedreams 'Danny'.

**Mr. Danielson:** — No, I'm not having pipedreams.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I think the hon. member's recollection is not very good. I think you are mistaken.

**Mr. Danielson:** — But those bases are placed by whose consent? By the consent of the United Nations. They are part of the defence . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — That is nonsense!

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . to keep it a free world and to keep it from being overrun by the Communists on the other side.

**Premier Douglas:** — That is complete nonsense.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — If you say that is nonsense, then you get up and tell us why it is nonsense . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — I will.

**Mr. Danielson:** — All right, and in the meantime you might look after your own . . .

**Mr. Wooff:** — I insist that I didn't mention the United States.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I think the hon. member will agree that he was mistaken.

**Premier Douglas:** — The heroic chorus!

**Mr. Danielson:** — If he says he didn't say anything I will agree with him on that too, because he didn't say anything.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! You will agree —

**Mr. Danielson:** — I'll agree that he didn't say anything; not a thing.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! Let's get the record straight. The hon. member for Turtleford said that he did not make that statement, and I think you are gentleman enough to say that you were mistaken.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I have. I said that he didn't say anything.,

**Mr. Speaker:** — You didn't say anything? You agree that you were mistaken in quoting the hon. member's speech.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Of course, I'll have to accept his word; that is a rule of the House. That is correct, isn't it? When a man gets up and denies that he said something, whether he did say it or not, the speaker has to accept it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, you agree that he did not.

**Mr. Danielson:** — We're all in agreement now. But this attitude, Mr. Speaker, by the members opposite, to take a dig at the United States, talking McCarthyism and all that sort of thing, as in the Premier's tirade at the end of his speech, what is it for? Haven't we heard it year after year? And the Communist movement in this province small as it is, but its influence is far bigger, is solidly behind the C.C.F. That is what it is for. And there haven't been any remarks made by the members opposite in this House that could be made and have been made by Tim Buck and Mr. Clarke in regard to United States activities, McCarthyism and anything else. The member for Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs) . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Some good Liberals said the same thing.

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . I kind of enjoyed his speech; he said a few things that intrigued me very much. First of all he said the daily press is keeping the people of this country ignorant, it prevents them from knowing anything, and that in order to gain knowledge and information he urged them to read the 'Commonwealth'. Well, in his view, perhaps that is correct; I am not going to dispute his ideas or his thinking along that line. I happen to know, from a clipping I have here of November 17, 1953, that his colleagues over in Great Britain think just the same as he does. I quote: "Mr. Bevan, Labour Party leader, last week, told the people at a political rally that the British people are living in a sort of intellectual twilight. One of the causes is to be found in the British newspapers." He named no other cause. "They are no longer newspapers; they are a paid power paper used not for the purpose of communicating news to the people, but for indoctrinating ideas and concealing from the people what they ought to know." And he said they were among the most ignorant people in the world. That is what he said about the British people. Well, I do not agree; I think the people over on the other side of the ocean are just as well informed, or better informed, than the people on this side. But if he thinks so, it is all right with me; but I do not agree with it.

He (Mr. Gibbs) spoke of some of the things the C.C.F. has done. One of them was that they had increased the Workmen's Compensation from I think he said 65 per cent (or  $66 \frac{2}{3}$  per cent) to 75 per cent. Well that is true, but when he said that the Liberal government reduced it after the Conservative government had increased it to 75 per cent before 1934, I searched the statutes all the way and I cannot find any place where it was done. It was  $66 \frac{2}{3}$  per cent, and this Government, after being in power about two years, increased it to 75 per cent. That is an increase of  $10.32 \frac{1}{2}$  per cent. Now then, can you think, Mr. Speaker, of anything else in the whole of our economy that has gone up less than that? Can anyone think of anything that has gone up less than the increase in the workmen's compensation? I can think of one thing; but it doesn't matter, I am not going to tell it.

In his speech the Premier quoted certain figures, and he is an artist at quoting figures, of course. I have some of the documents here from which I think he extracted some of those figures. There is the "Private and Public Investment of Canada, 1953," and, as a matter of fact, the statement is complete here for 1953. I have another one showing the mineral production of 1952; and when we look at the investment in Canada we find that things are not exactly the way the Premier represented them to be. You can take his figures and find where, by using certain figures, you might get a favourable conclusion or a favourable showing so far as the province of Saskatchewan is concerned. From this publication, according to the Premier's report, he quoted Professor Britnell of the University of Saskatchewan in the November issue of the 'Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science', and it says: "Over a five-year period, annual capital expenditure actually doubled in Alberta, increased by 71 per cent in Saskatchewan, by only 21 per cent in Manitoba as compared with 61 per cent for the whole country." It looks to me, Mr. Speaker, that Professor Britnell – I wouldn't accuse him, of course, because I have a great deal of respect for him; but really some of these statements – he might have been having, or I should say he hasn't had the training of the informational writers that my friend from Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield) spoke of the other day.

**Premier Douglas:** — He is one of the best economists in Canada.

**Mr. Danielson:** — The Professor made comparisons with the neighbouring provinces of Manitoba and Alberta. He might have used figures on a per capita basis because, in another part, the Premier said, using the five-year period 1948-53 they could have a showing of investment over five years per capita in Alberta of \$3,760; it was \$2,560 for Manitoba and \$2,480 for Saskatchewan.

In this figure on new investment is included — the Premier never told us what is included when we talk about investment in Saskatchewan during the past year or any year, or any period of years. What is involved in that? Well, I have checked on this and find that the figures include not only investment in industry, but investment in church buildings, schools, hospitals, housing, and it includes investment by farmers in machinery which we know is a tremendous figure in this prosperous agricultural province of Saskatchewan. It includes the granaries built, last fall, to store the heavy crop. The only reason why Saskatchewan comes near the provinces of Alberta and Manitoba is because of the very large farm income to which the Premier referred, which was invested in heavy sums in farm machinery. The figures of investment in manufacturing are a very good indication of what has happened in industrial development apart from agriculture. In the same period of years, 1948-53 (and I want the Premier to listen to this), the per capita investment in manufacturing for the last five years in Alberta was \$303; in Manitoba, \$177; in Saskatchewan, \$103. Those are the correct figures. The Premier did not use those and I am giving them to you; if anybody wants to see them, they can.

**Premier Douglas:** — What is my friend quoting from? Send them over, will you?

**Mr. Danielson:** — No, I'm not going to send them over to you because I am going to use them.

**Premier Douglas:** — You said anybody could see them so bring them over, will you? What is my friend quoting from?

**Mr. Danielson:** — You can have them. But why should I supply you with figures? No, I'm not going to . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — I just want to . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . when you have a big office you can sit in as long as you want, why don't you get your own figures? Tell us where you got your own figures?

**Premier Douglas:** — Oh, I'll be glad to. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has asked me the question where I got my figures. My figures are taken right out of a booklet, a copy of which he has in his hand, called "Public and Private Investment in Canada" issued by the Department of Trade and Commerce at Ottawa. Now, all I asked my friend was what he was quoting from when he quoted his figures.

**Mr. Lopton:** — This a breakdown on them.

**Premier Douglas:** — Well, he wasn't quoting from that; he was quoting from a sheet of paper. I wondered where he got it.

**Mr. Danielson:** — What I pointed out to the Premier was this . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! The rule is that if you are quoting, you are

supposed to give the authority you are quoting from, unless you claim it is a privileged document.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, I held this up and showed it to him.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — You are not reading from that. You quoted from a paper in your hand.

**Mr. Cameron:** — He is quoting from his notes.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes, and if my friend, the Minister of Public Health, will look on page 2, he will get all the figures.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Well, why didn't you say so.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I said so, and if he didn't hear I can't help it. I held up both of these. I said here are the minerals and here are the investments. That's what I did.

Mr. Speaker, the figures I have quoted have been broken down. He takes the gross figures. His figures included investment in churches, schools, hospitals, housing, investment in farm machinery and buildings, including granaries to store the crop last fall, and all these things. They even included, if I understand this thing correctly, the money that the Provincial Treasurer sunk in his Crown Corporation — some of those self-liquidating debts that he talks about. They include everything; but when the Premier quoted the figures, he did not use them that way. He should have told what was invested in manufacturing and industrial enterprise in this province during the past few years, and he would have found that the capital investment in the province of Alberta was \$303 per capita, \$177, and Saskatchewan, \$103.

**Premier Douglas:** — What page of that booklet is that on?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, why should I stop and tell you that when you have it in your own book? I got behind when I was on the radio. Surely if you don't know, call in your staff and some of these informational writers will write it up for you.

**Premier Douglas:** — They would probably know better than Mr. Staines where to find it.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes, he knows quite a little about this thing; but it does not take any university graduate to read this. I have all this at home and lots more too, and I have a habit, Mr. Speaker, of sitting down in the evening and looking at these figures because they're interesting. I think that, if these men across the way would occupy some of their time, when they have nothing else to do, studying these things, they might be a little better informed when they come to the House and make certain statements, because there is such a wide margin that it is practically a joke.

Then they go on about metal production. Well, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that metal production in the province of Saskatchewan, during the last five years, has declined in volume in considerable quantities. As a matter of fact, gold is down 30 per cent; silver is down 50 per cent; copper, over 20 per cent; zinc, about 12 per cent, and then there is cadmium,

50 per cent. That is a reduction in minerals taken out of the ground; but the price, the amount of money, has increased because these are, of course, higher in price. There are some minerals here that were not known of until the last year or two, and they are selenium and tellurium of which a very small amount has been taken out – only 45,000 lbs in 1944, and last year there was 101,000 lbs mined in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall conclude my remarks. It has been a rather stormy afternoon, but I enjoyed it to the full. I am sure that I enjoyed it more than my friends over there.

**Some Hon. Member:** — We got a great kick out of it.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I am sure I did. Some of the things I said, this afternoon, could be very well taken to heart by the members opposite. They try to make fun of this thing; but the people of Saskatchewan are interested. There have been two by-elections, and I think that the best indication of what the people think, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, as I have said this afternoon, you don't need to think the people have forgotten. They haven't forgotten. They will remember these things that have been padded over and white-washed by the government majority and are not settled. Their verdict is not accepted by the people of the province. I thank you, and I shall not support the motion.

**Mr. Arnold Feusi (Pelly):** — I would like to point out that there is only one pitchfork over here and we had to let the Premier use it, but probably it might be wise if we order more pitchforks or else some minds across the way should be taken to the cleaners. I would like to bring to the attention of this House the challenge that the Premier made to the people across the way, last year, to stand up if they believed the trash or forever hold their peace, and none of them had the gumption to stand up. I think we have had enough of it, Mr. Minister, and I shall not dwell any more upon this matter.

Seeing that my friends across the way quote from papers from hither and yon, I would like to quote from a little paper and change the tone of the debate here. This little paper gives out that the C.C.F.ers are "tops" according to the Ottawa correspondents, and they deal with the little group of federal members that were sent down East from the electorate of Canada. And here it states:

"Toronto, C.P.A. – The men of the press gallery at Ottawa represent publications of differing political views, but they themselves have just one opinion of the current crop of C.C.F. M.P.'s – they are tops! On C.B.C. 'Capital Report' Peter McLintock, who writes for the 'Regina Leader-Post' said that some members of parliament are worth \$10,000 a year. (Mr. Speaker, every C.C.F. M.P. is worth it). John Stevenson . . ."

**Mr. Lopton:** — He's a good C.C.F.er himself.

**Mr. Feusi:** — John Stevenson, writing in 'Saturday Night' had this to say about C.C.F. leader, M. J. Coldwell, 'He is still the most finished parliamentarian in the House of Commons'."

Mr. Speaker, the most glowing compliment comes from the 'Wall Street Journal' of the Montreal financial world, the 'Financial Times', and that certainly is not a C.C.F. newspaper. Writing in the issue of January 19th, the front page commentator, Tempus, has this to say:

"I must say that the 1954 edition of Coldwell is pretty good. Truth to tell (and here I must apologize to my editor), I am rather enthusiastic about the C.C.F. right now. The Socialists are a strong and firm team. They have more talent per square inch than any of the other political parties. They stay on the job and they do their homework. Every one of the boys is not a genius, but like the fellow who had his talents and used them, every C.C.F. member is making the most of what he has got."

**Mr. Loptson:** — And that's not much.

**Mr. Feusi:** — "This then is a warm salute to the C.C.F. leader and his group of 22 plus. Here is a top of the hat to their ability. Long may they endure."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to another paper, a prairie paper, and one that is quite well read:

"In the view of Patrick Nicholson, who writes the Ottawa report of the 'Moose Jaw Times Herald' and the 'Prince Albert Herald', Saskatchewan Liberal M.P.'s at Ottawa are not bringing much credit either to their province or their party."

And we can probably say the same thing about the provincial Liberal members, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Cameron:** — From what is the hon. member quoting?

**Mr. Feusi:** — I am quoting from a very well read little paper, the 'Commonwealth'.

**Mr. Cameron:** — It sounded like it.

**Mr. Feusi:** — Mr. Speaker, with this, I would like to adjourn the debate until tomorrow.

(Debate adjourned)

## LABOUR AND CRIMINAL CODE

Moved by Mr. Heming, seconded by Mr. Stone:

"That this Assembly regrets that certain sections, including Section 365 and 372, of Bill No. 7 — An Act respecting the Criminal Law, which is presently being considered by the House of Commons, fails to give adequate

recognition to labour's hard-won rights to strike and picket."

**Hon. D. H. R. Heming (Moose Jaw City):** — Mr. Speaker, it is generally known that all governments in the world make laws, rules or regulations to govern their people, and making laws, they have the power within them to amend or rescind these laws. Similarly, with the proposed amendment to our Criminal Code in Canada. Canada has the right to amend, indeed there is need. The last amendment to the Criminal Code was in 1892, so there are bound to be words, phrases, paragraphs, sentences, which need to be adjusted to the times.

In amending this Code, which is a very important one, governing the felons, criminals, dope fiends and similar characters subject to criminal offences, it is necessary that the Government of Canada give consideration to the obligations which have been made in the past. For instance, during the war, we were all told it would be the aim of Canada and all the free nations, that there should be an absence of fear and freedom from want. Since that time there has been other obligations assumed by Canada, as a member of the United Nations Organization and the International Labour Office. At the United Nations Organization, Canada expressly agreed what it was specifically in favour of, and I will quote, Mr. Speaker:

“Recognition of the inherent dignity and of the inalienable and equal rights of all members of the human family is a foundation of freedom, of justice and peace in the world. Disregard and contempt for human rights has resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind. It is essential, if man is not compelled to have recourse, as a last resort to rebellion against tyranny and oppression that human rights should be protected by the rule of law.”

Canada, at the same time, and through the same agency, agreed under the economic and social department of the United Nations Organization, that everyone as a member of society has the right to social security and is entitled to realization through national and international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State for his dignity and free development of his personality. Everyone has the right to work, at free choice of employment, in favourable conditions of work; everyone has the right to form and join trade unions for the protection of his interests.

It is regrettable that action has not already been taken in a larger way and in a different manner to give organized labour the status which is warranted, and has been asked for, for some decades in the past. It is true that, since the Confederation, when originally Canada had far greater powers than she has now, apparently, to govern our nation; but since that time there has been a gradual slipping away of federation powers, and there has been a congregation of segregation of powers. The provinces have, through various appeals to the Privy Council, gradually taken away many of the rights that the original Confederation fathers thought they put into the British North America Act.

However, they still have in Ottawa, under the British North America Act, the right of:

“Bringing any work under the exclusive Dominion jurisdiction by declaring it to be work for the general advantage of Canada and of two or more provinces.”

To illustrate that I would like to state what happened during this last war in this regard. We were engaged in war here, and all our facilities were being fully occupied. Our production had to be speeded up, and we had to get every effort behind the war effort. The Federal Government at that time, by an order-in-council PC1003, issued orders under this Order whereby organized labour had the right to organize, the right to declare an unfair employer, the right to bargain, the right to strike and the right to picket.

It is somewhat strange that, during that time when we were at war, the Government of Canada did not then seek to put organized labour within the bounds of the Criminal Code. Of course, when the war was over that regulation, that order-in-council, was rescinded. It was only put on the books for the good and welfare of the whole of Canada while we waged war. And then, under sovereign right, has differing labouring conditions, a different Minimum Wage Act here than in other provinces; different compensation acts; different labour regulations act; a different tradesman’s act. We are going towards segregation rather than towards Confederation on account of the inability or disinclination of the Federal Government to utilize that one phase of the British North America Act for the betterment of the whole.

It is regrettable too, Sir, that when the Federal Government gave the opportunity to our provinces to suggest amendments to the British North America Act whereby the Federal Government would be given certain powers and cash of the provinces would be given certain powers so that they would know exactly where they stood in jurisdictional rights, which would tend then to give a lead towards some type of a national Bill of Rights where everyone would know where they stood, politically and physically, within this great Dominion of ours; and, of course, all federal legislation, and this Criminal Code particularly, comes within the administration of the various attorney-generals of the provinces, who, interpreting these laws as they see fit, would make possibly variations in interpretation and a law such as this could be used very harshly if it was applied specifically to organized labour in certain areas.

But it is not only organized labour, Mr. Speaker, that has deemed these potential amendments to the Criminal Code as being dangerous. I would quote here from the ‘Anglican Outlook’, a church publication of Canada, of January, 1953. It says:

“This is not a mere reorganization of the Criminal Code. It contains many important and startling changes in criminal law that threaten freedom and safeguards won by centuries of struggle. It is no exaggeration to say that in its present form Bill No. 7 could be used to curtail severely not only freedom of speech and legitimate criticism, but labour’s hard-won freedom to strike and picket.”

I would quote Senator Roebuck, when the original Bill was before the Senate. Speaking to the proposed amendment in the Senate, he said:

“I want to put myself on record as being opposed to this kind of drastic, reckless, bill of legislation of a prohibitory and dominating character.”

And even, Mr. J. G. Diefenbaker, M.P. from Saskatchewan, speaking in June, 1952, on Section which then was 74 and now is Section 46 – the Section which, Sir, makes a penalty of death for anybody who criticizes the foreign policy of Canada, whether we are at war or not, said:

”I know of no case in 400 or 500 years interpretation of the law that goes as far as this amendment.”

So it is not only organized labour, Mr. Speaker, that is concerned about the progress of this Bill in the House of Commons, but also other people who are interested in the welfare of us Canadians.

The National Executives of our four major unions – union councils of Canada at Ottawa – presented a brief to the Federal Government in regard to the proposed amendments. I would like briefly to quote them in order that you may have some idea of how they view it. The Trades and Labour of Canada are especially concerned with Section 365 and Section 372, the one dealing with a breach of contract and the other with the right to strike and picket. They point out:

“There is provision in the law of Canada for lawful stoppages of work under the Industrial Relations and Disputes Act and the various Labour Relations Acts of the provinces, and assert that there should be some clear definition of the rights of labour, preferably under a national labour code.”

The C.C.L., (C.I.O.) state that proposed Sections 52, 365, 372 would make it a crime to strike or picket; Sections 46 to 48, 51, 60 to 62, 64, 69 and 92 aim at freedom of opinion and expression and could make freedom of speech a crime. Specifically they state that Section 372 would provide employers and hostile public authority with a weapon that could be used against labour with utter injustice and utter ruthlessness. The Canadian Catholic Sections 365, 372 and 366, stating that if left in they could be used to paralyze all union activity. They mentioned that British law, since 1869, has retained the right to strike and picket. Their brief specified that there should be criminal laws strong enough to ensure the proper maintenance of order; but in as much as the Criminal Code comes under the jurisdiction of the province, great care should be used in a too general wording of the proposed amendments.

The Railway Transportation Brotherhoods expressed concern over the sections dealing with sabotage, with the right to strike and picket, asserting that in Quebec under the Civil Code an individual contract is presumed to exist between employer and employee and section 365 would be particularly hard on labour in that province. This committee suggested that bona fide unions be recognized and protected.

It may be coincidental, but it certainly is strange, that while we here are going through a stage of potential discrimination against organized

labour, similar conditions are prevailing in the United States of America. Our brothers to the South with their Taft-Hartley Act, are much concerned with the potential amendments to this Act. Antagonistic politicians are going to endeavour, if they can, to pass amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act, which will mean an equal embarrassment to organized labour there, as it would here, if the amendments to our Criminal Code are enacted. The American Federation of Labour, one of the largest organizations of labour in the world to which many Canadian unions are affiliated, has this to say in regard to the Taft-Hartley Act and they have asked Congress to repeal to this Act. They say that this repeal is necessary because:

“It is a clear necessity not only for the preservation and the right of labour, but also for the maintenance of sound labour management relations and of industrial peace.”

It seems, Mr. Speaker, that there are some big interests probably even beyond the confines of the National Association of Manufacturers, beyond the area of the jurisdiction of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, who are desirous of reducing the stands and the ideals of the common people, down, down, down. It seems unwarranted that we up here, who have really laboured and fought arduously for our rights, should have to conform to the same type of maladministration which is present in the United States of America. This is McCarthyism which has been previously mentioned in this House. McCarthyism is rapidly growing in the United States of America notwithstanding the fact that there are a number of people who are critics. In fact it has been asserted that McCarthyism has labelled all the Democrats of the United States of America as traitors; as he says he makes it his God-given duty to get rid of twenty years of treason, and even the F.B.I. head, this man Hoover, says that all the Communists of America want a repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. Yet, Mr. Speaker, it was organized labour who asked for it, and who are being branded as Communists because they ask repeal of anti-labour legislation. It is somewhat strange when a man such as McCarthy can label, without rebuttal, anyone from the person of Truman down, as being a resurgent, as being a traitor, to the United States of America. This is what Mr. Truman says of that type of presumably political trickster. He says:

“It is the corruption of truth, the abandonment of our historical devotion to fair play. It is the abandonment of due process of the law. It is the use of the big lie and the unfounded accusation against any criticism, in the name of Americanism or security. It is the rise to power of the demagogue who lives on untruths. It is spread of fear and the destruction of faith in every level of our society.”

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that organized labour here is activated only by a general desire to secure its fair share of its produce. There is no labour organization which would try or seek to secure more than was warrantable under our present method of bargaining and our present method of labour relations. But I sometimes think that possibly some persuasive voice from the East may have told our Government at Ottawa that there was some need of drastic trade union relations in connection with the governing of labour in Canada.

And one man, calling himself an experienced observer, in an article published in the 'Financial Post' and republished by the 'Leader-Post', has this to say in connection therewith – in strikes in public utilities and essential industries, and mind, you, most every industry is essential.

First, we would have the dismissal of those refusing to work, or work satisfactorily. Second, effective policing to prevent malcontents from defying the law and interfering with the right of others to work. Third, provision for operation of essential services by substitute help, if necessary by the militia.

In this Dominion of Canada of ours we have about 5.5 of a labour force, and 1.5 within that group who are organized labour, indicating that the trade unionists, by their bargaining, are securing rights for themselves and also for other people. That is, they are the leader for the economic advancement of more than half the population of Canada at the present time. What right would there be to discriminate against one class of people in Canada, and permit others to pursue their ways? The Canadian Manufacturers' Association organized 'big business' together; you have your professional men organized; your school teachers are organized. In fact, there is either organization or association behind practically every effort in Canada, so why should there be any discrimination placed in the way of the basic vast group of workers who produce so many of the commodities for Canada?

Mr. Speaker, I contend that there should be a process in law whereby the workers of Canada are not deprived of the rights of organizing, the rights of bargaining, the rights of striking and the right to picket. Some say, whence comes the lead for these demands of labour for these rights; and some say, well labour should be satisfied with progress without organization. But many many years ago, it was written, "Give a man leisure and he shall learn, some day, how the birds fly and the grass grows and find out why man, the animal, cheats his fellowmen." From that time on down to Abraham Lincoln, the great American patriot and emancipator, who gave leadership to men to organize for their own mutual benefit, when he said: "It so happened that in all ages of the world there have been some who laboured and others, without labour, enjoyed a large proportion of the fruits. This is wrong and should not continue."

And I quote Mr. Lincoln again, when he says: "Labour is superior to capital and deserves much the larger consideration."

Mr. Speaker, when men of high standing give actual evidence of precepts for his fellowmen to follow in order to benefit himself individually, I think that organized labour has every right to continue to press for its rights today. And mind you, Mr. Speaker, organized labour is not selfishly engaged in its own welfare. Organized labour understands the problems of business, understands tariffs, customs, revenues and taxes; they understand the idea of the dumping of goods and the production of commodities for sale here and elsewhere. They understand all these problems. In fact, at the present time, we have close to 500 committees of labour and management, who are seeking and striving to produce more efficiently in order that trade of Canada can be enhanced, so that labour is concerned with the business men insofar as mutual progress can be made. But, of course, if we want to increase our trade in an international way there is not much that organized labour as such can do here. It comes on the level of the United Nations organizations, and committees within that body to decide where trade can be pursued and public markets won.

But, Mr. Speaker, if the Government at Ottawa insists upon some type of compulsory legislation discriminating against organized labour, I can tell you that it won't work. They tried it in Australia 30 years ago and it did not work, and they rescinded the legislation. Free labour, with its right to bargain and its right to strike and picket is what is demanded where we would have to have soldiers and police and spies whereby everyone is made to follow compulsory government orders. Organized labour believes that compulsory legislation is neither warranted or necessary.

There was another directive warning issued a short while back by the International Free Trade Union Federation, which is an international organization representing 50 million organized workers and in effect they said: "Whereas, today, we only have the employer to argue with and to beat to get an increase in wages and satisfactory working conditions, now it appears that other interests are creeping into the picture where totalitarianism is affecting our world trade and we will have to fight not only our employer but also the principles of totalitarianism whereby we can get recognition and maintain it."

Organized labour asked the Government at Ottawa to pursue their own Canadian way; to listen not to much to those below the 49th parallel as to what they should do in regard to the benefit of labour here where, organized labour says, "We can work in harmony with our employers and with government; we can produce goods in this country for world markets and still make a fair share for all the world and provide in return a reasonable share of life, liberty and happiness for our Canadian workers."

The organization specifically asks at this time that the Federal Government give consideration to the creation of a national labour code. They ask that labour be not included in a criminal code. They seem to feel that it is not warranted that a working man, even if he does go on strike, even if he does force hardship, should be put in the same book with a murderer, with an arsonist, an embezzler, a dope fiend and various other types of criminal who come under the Criminal Code. They say, "Give us a national labour code and, if possible, institute for the whole of the Dominion a national Bill of Rights whereby all the people of Canada shall know how to live, where to live and what rights they have everywhere in Canada."

Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in moving this motion, seconded by the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Stone).

**Mr. Arthur T. Stone (Saskatoon City):** — Mr. Speaker, the mover of the motion has covered the subject matter so fully and so ably that he has left little for me to talk about without fear of repetition. He has covered the struggles of the workers and the right of association, the right of collective bargaining and the right to strike; and he has told you of the implications of the sections in the Criminal Code. He has also advised you of those who are protesting against those amendments to the Criminal Code.

The problem before us, today, is by no means a new one. This is as old as the beginning of the Industrial Revolution. It is true that man did solve one problem — he solved the one of production; but he also made many other problems, and this problem has been an aggravating one ever since the

inception of the Industrial Revolution. Many industrial nations have spent hours and hours of discussion and study, many books have been written and many motions have been applied, such as conciliation boards, arbitration boards, compulsory arbitration boards for certain groups of workers, and we have the generalized arbitration board as the mover mentioned, in New Zealand and Australia. But I think that the most success has been in the British Isles, where most of the legal obstacles have been removed so that the workers could have free development, free association, and collective bargaining. It does not need to be said, of course, that they have not had their problems and their strikes and their labour troubles.

I would like to take just a few brief minutes to see what has happened to the south of us, because we in Canada are prone to pattern our customs and our way of life somewhat on the lines of the people to the south and, as the mover has mentioned, these amendments to our Criminal Code smack very much like the provisions that are in the Taft-Hartley Act to the south of us.

The history of the American workers has been a sordid and a sad one all the way through – one of bloodshed, brutality and tyranny; and it is hard to believe that in a country which boasts of the freedom of the individual, such conditions could prevail for such a length of time. However, it was impossible to hide these situations from decent Americans, and we find that some public-spirited men did take up the cudgels on behalf of the American workers. And so, along in 1935, we had a senator from New York; he had a rather difficult time to persuade Congress because the forces of anti-union were strong, and he had to use all his oratory and influence to put over the Wagner Act. The Wagner Act was passed in 1935 and proclaimed by President Roosevelt in July of the same year. I just wanted to say that these are some of the comments that were made when the Wagner Act was passed – here was a law specifically and deliberately framed for the purpose of protecting and encouraging the growth of the union movement. Society had at least declared that collective bargaining was socially desirable, and that the union member is not criminal in the eyes of the law.

Mr. Speaker, if you let men know the dignity of freedom and self-expression in their daily lives they will never bow to tyranny in any quarter of their national life. It at last had become an accepted fact that if sufficient purchasing power was put into the hands of the people it was one road to a healthy economic life. Now the passing of the Wagner Act did not mean that the troubles of the workers in the States had come to an end, because the powers of the anti-union forces were very strong. They were so strong that, out of the 47 million workers there were only approximately three million who were organized at that time. That will give you some idea of the anti-union forces in America. These forces went to work, and the anti-union employers and the anti-union press were successful in getting an injunction placed before the Supreme Court of America curtailing the powers of the national labour regulations board whose responsibility it was to carry out the provisions of the Wagner Act. I would like to pause here to say just how very similarly we have faced this same problem in Saskatchewan ever since the beginning of our Trade Union Act; how very similarly our anti-labour union forces have put a barrage on our Labour Relations Board in this province.

The injunction was placed with the Supreme Court in the United States of America and as usual in those circumstances, the Supreme Court of America dilly-dallied. It was suggested that they were not too favourable to the Wagner Act. The judicial courts all through America had shown their opposition

to the Act. Perhaps it was because President Roosevelt received an overwhelming majority in the election of that year, or it may have been because the same president threatened to change the complexion of the Supreme Court – but finally they did bring down a narrow, favourable report recommending the validity of the Wagner Act. So labour had won a great victory, and from that victory things began to improve. It did not mean, of course, that the anti-labour voices forgot the battle. With their political lobbying they were able to bring in the Taft-Hartley law in 1927. That was a red-letter day in the annals of labour problems in the United States, because this was passed by Congress when it overruled a presidential veto.

Those defending the Taft-Hartley law claim that the law frees workers from the tyrannical hold of union bosses; it reduces the monopolistic position of labour unions; it protects against strikes which cause catastrophe; it protects management from union abuses; it makes unions legally and financially responsible for their actions; it diminishes the power of labour dictators, and it promises a state of labour relations between labour and management.

On the other hand, those opposed to it claim that the law gives aid to the employer who shows little or no inclination to bargain collectively, and it was also charged that the law seriously interfered with the right of labour to strike. It threatened the existence of the American labour unions and they set out facts proving that, since that law was passed, many organizational strikes have occurred; that is, since the passing of the Taft-Hartley Bill.

That is the history, briefly, of the workers in the United States, and it appears that our Government are taking a leaf out of the Taft-Hartley Bill to stifle the free development of association and collective bargaining. I want to appeal to all members in this House to study these amendments and to see the implications in them; and if they can see them, as the mover and myself do, I hope they will join us in support of the motion and appeal to our representatives at Ottawa to do something about it.

What is the position in Canada? Well, the problem is one that if you are on one side you are a fanatic; if you are on the other side you are a fanatic. If you are a labour man you are certainly a fanatic for labour organizations. If you are against it you are a fanatic against them. We hear people say, “Well, I agree with organized labour; I am all for it, but they are getting too strong; they are too powerful; they should have their claws clipped.” Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that every association wants to be strong, and every association must be strong in this society of ours because if you are not strong, the chances are you won't survive.

I want to say that it appears to be the desire of some people to gradually pick away at certain groups of workers until finally there won't be any workers left. We say the police force – it would be a terrible thing if the police who protect our lives and our property should have the right to strike. From there we move on the fire-fighters who also protect life and property in the case of fire; and then we go on to say there are certain groups of civic workers who provide the necessities such as sewer and water, light, and so on; and, of course, we must include hospital workers who protect the lives and safeguard the welfare of those who are sick. And we are getting down now to the railroads, because, Mr. Speaker, we had a 'blackout' on the economy of this country just a year or so ago. I took part in that strike; possibly I could be a criminal. I think anybody who made a study of that

strike, a thorough study, must realize there never was any intention, from the start, of the railroads to seriously bargain collectively with railroad workers at that time. True, they went through the motions, but there was no serious attempt; it was the purpose of the railroads then to lay the problem into the lap of the Federal Government and the Federal Government was just as keen not to have the hot potato. Finally the workers were caught in the jam; we had to call their bluff; a year and a half had progressed and very little was done. Of course a strike came about, and the Government had to do something about it; but there was a complete blackout as far as the economy of the country goes. I do not blame people who feel that something should be done about these strong labour unions, because, as I have already said, this a problem that has been worrisome and that has been given study by all industrial nations in the world, and nobody yet has been able to come up with a proper solution to the question.

But we could go on, Mr. Speaker, and we could say that if the steel-workers, for instance – and our daily lives depend so much on steel – withdrew their services tomorrow across Canada, they too should be excluded from going on strike; we could say our communication lines – telephone and telegraph – and so on we could go. Where are we going to end?

I want to conclude by saying that I and hundreds of thousands of union men and women along with me do not want to appear, or to be criminals in the eyes of the law; but I am suggesting to you that if those amendments as proposed are passed it is quite possible that we could be. And so I gladly second the motion.

**Mr. H. C. Dunfield (Meadow Lake):** — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly then adjourned at 6.00 o'clock p.m.