

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session - Twelfth Legislature
13th Day

Monday, March 1, 1954

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

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Friday, February 26, 1954, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Wooff for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Louis W. Larsen (Shellbrook): — Mr. Speaker, I will follow the example of other hon. members in congratulating the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Throne Speech. In the years I have been sitting in the House I don't think I ever listened to a better speech than that of the hon. member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff). I can certainly fullheartedly agree with it and want to congratulate him on his wonderful speech, as well as the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs) who always has something the rest of the members in this House have not got, and I always enjoy listening to him. I hope both these members keep on with their good work.

I would like to make a few observations about what has gone on in the House up to the present time, and congratulate one and all on the speeches they have made. I would like to mention something in the House, today, in the few minutes I have, that perhaps has not been mentioned before, at least not at this Session.

It is indeed an honour for me to represent the wonderful constituency of Shellbrook with its parks and streams and lakes making it a real sportsman's paradise. They have some wonderful farmers up there. They are not large farms that most of them operate; but they milk their cows three times a day if necessary, and other times it is just once a day if they are getting a little short of grass perhaps. Anyway, they have been doing nicely, like most farmers of Saskatchewan under certain conditions; but I am sorry to say that in the 45 years I have been in this country (and I think a lot of you people have noticed the same thing), out of these 45 years you can count all the good years in which there was neither a hot or cold war on, on one hand. I would say, roughly speaking, from 1924 to 1929 we managed to run pretty nicely on our own steam. The rest of the time I am quite willing to give the credit (or whatever you want to call it) that our prosperity was more or less caused by either a severe, hard-fought war, or a cold war; and I say in this House that that is not good enough for a province like Saskatchewan. There should be some policy whereby at least we could have good times when there is no war on and maybe a little tougher when there is a war on; but apparently it is the other way.

I have come to the conclusion, Mr. Speaker, on looking the situation over, that the remedy is not a 30- or 40-hour week, nor through higher wages; the solution is not \$5 wheat or \$500 wheat – if we go along with that policy we will just price ourselves out of the market. I almost disagree with our good friend, the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet), whose answer is to increase our farm production get more land under cultivation – when we cannot sell what we have now. Everything is piled up and storage

facilities are full, whether it might be meat or grain or whatever you have, and there are no markets for it. So I am awfully sorry, but I cannot altogether support the Minister of Agriculture and the Cabinet because apparently those who are responsible cannot sell what we are raising now.

I could refer to a little more recent data. Here, the other night, we had a wonderful representation of our organized farmers and perhaps some unorganized farmers, in this House, who suggested the so-called 'Rand formula'. Personally, I am not against it, but I do not think it will solve our problems in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. A province-wide organization like that, I think, would have very little effect. Then, too, there is a certain amount of compulsion in it, and perhaps the directors of such an organization would get a little slack. I think it would be much better if they worked a little harder, got everybody interested and got it on a voluntary basis. I came to that conclusion when I went down, the next night, and listened to the livestock marketing meeting that they had in the City Hall. They have run up against the same problems. There is no market for our livestock; but there is nobody going to talk me into taking that responsibility away from the Federal Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Larsen: — With the tariff situation we have in this country, whenever you raise the tariff a knot or two, you take our markets away a knot or two as well. So again, Mr. Speaker, I am a little worried that somebody will be talked into promising to handle something that is absolutely impossible. I do not think there is anyone in this House who thinks it would be a good suggestion to disband the Wheat Board and allow the Grain Exchange or the Pool to handle our surplus of wheat today. I do not think they are capable of doing it, because they probably could not get past the barriers the government at Ottawa has made, and unless they could trade with the people they wanted to trade with, the deal would be off. Something like when I went to school I could always trade jack-knives with a little fellow sitting along side of me if he had a jack-knife and I had one; but if there was any money involved the deal was off. I think it would work the same way with this situation we are running up against today. I have not anything against our old friend, the Pool Elevators. I worked for them for 20 years. As a matter of fact, when I look back far enough we went through the same period in 1923-24 even after that — the same as this present Government went through when we got started in 1944. There was much of a similarity there. I think it was the Hon. Mr. Dunning who said, "For God's sake, have you read the contract?"

In looking back on those years and my experience in those dry years, the heartbreak and stories I heard from farmers in the lean 'thirties were enough to drive anybody into trying to remedy some of these conditions that were prevalent here. Whether I went in on the wrong side or not I will leave to the members of this House; but I truly remember, as late as 1942, I collected 10 cents, 25 cents or whatever I could get to send 400 farmers down to Ottawa. The war had gone on three or four years and the price of grain was still 70 cents, f.o.b. Ft. William, which gave the average farmer around this province 40 or 50 cents. No. 1 would average 50 cents but it is not all No., 1 wheat in Saskatchewan. Oh yes, we did get a certificate, but I know I still have some 1939 certificates kicking around the house, and they are worth only five or six cents. So, coming through that, if my education is wrong, well, of course, I will have to blame the lean 'thirties for it.

I said here a moment ago, I did not think provincial marketing boards, or disbanding the Wheat Board, was a solution. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I don't think even 1,000 more oil wells in Saskatchewan would solve our problems in Saskatchewan. It might give us a little bit more money to pay some relief that I see coming almost around the corner — as a matter of fact it is almost at the corner now; and when I see that we piped oil down 35,000 miles from Alberta to the States and sold it 10 cents cheaper, I don't know; maybe it dilutes going through that long pipe, but I know they do charge Alberta farmers 10 cents more than they sell it to Minnesota farmers for. Neither do I think the industrial plants that pollute our rivers and our drinking water and so on are going to solve our problems.

Our hon. lady in the House here was quite worried about the consumption of liquor. Well, what are the poor people going to do when the rivers are polluted? However, I don't think the situation is quite as serious after meeting a couple of old ducks down the street, the other night, taking the odd little nip once in a while; but it is not that bad because, regardless of paying there is 100 per cent increase in consumption, if it is based on dollars and cents we know the price is double what it used to be, so we are still down to the same level of 50 per cent. Or if they took the gallons — well these old fellows say, "if you keep one, ten years from now it should be pure water." So I don't think we need to worry about that either.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, do the people of this province realize there are hard times coming? I will say here, in this House (and I am afraid it is going to come true) that these hard times are not around the corner; they are past the corner already, but we refuse to see it. I have noticed, in the 45 years I have been in this country, that if agriculture is doing well practically all our problems are solved in Saskatchewan, whether they are problems of labour or businessmen; but with our produce from the farms piling up and no markets, I am worried. I hope I will never live long enough to see more lean 'thirties, but I think we are a long way towards that. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I hope we don't have to go to war to remedy the conditions, as we had to do in 1939.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Larsen: — I wonder how many members in this House realize the vulnerable position the farmers are in. When I go back, not so very many years, it is remarkable in how short a period of time we have transferred from the old horse-and-buggy days and from the old horse plow and machinery to the position where everything is run by oil and gas. Take a little 300-acre farm, and put 100 acres in summerfallow this year, with 100 acres of summerfallow ready to put in, 100 acres of stubble, and with six horses he could pretty well put that 200 acres in crop and do his summerfallow as well; and if he sharpened a set of plow shares and used an old gang plow and had \$10 in his pocket, he could put that 200 acres in.

But what is the story today, Mr. Speaker? I know my constituency isn't any harder up than any of the others in the province of Saskatchewan, but I know that with a lot of our farmers up there, due to labour shortage and one thing and another over-buying machinery, etc., in a lot of cases their bank loans are not paid, their oil dealer is not paid, their garage repair bills are not paid, stores bills not paid and so on down the line. And he cannot turn a wheel this spring, Mr. Speaker, unless he has at least \$500 in his pocket or he can get somebody to give him some credit. He has

to get a tank of oil out to this farm, a licence for his car, a licence for his truck, get gas on credit; whereas in the early days when he had his horses he had his haystack on one side of the barn and his little granary on the other side, he would milk a few cows and kill an odd pig and so on; but I wonder if the people realize, though, that in those days he got along with very few dollars in his pocket. What is the picture today? If he hasn't got \$500 of \$1,000 in either cash or credit this spring, that farm will never be put into crop and do you know why? Because there are no markets for his produce, and everything he buys is not two prices but three prices. That is one reason I am a little bit worried – that everything is running on rubber and gas, but as always, if the farmer is doing well so is everybody else in this province. But it seems that the farmers are asked to take so much punishment that there is no end to it. There is no question in my mind that, since 1948, everybody else has been raising their prices. It is not a question of what a thing is worth; it has been a question of what the market would stand.

Now I come to one of these questions – I seem to be rather pessimistic and perhaps I am – but what is the solution to these things? Well, I can only see it this way, Mr. Speaker, that whenever the Federal Government grants the interests down East an extra percentage in the tariffs a certain amount of our market is gone. I cannot see it any other way. We had a little experience with that just shortly before Christmas when the House prorogued in Ottawa – the tariffs have been climbing for a long time and instead of being able to buy shirts and clothes a little bit cheaper, they will go up again; and if what I hear is right, that Dow Chemicals are down there lobbying trying to get another dollar or two on our anti-freeze, well, if I have to go and fill my tractor, my combine, my truck and my car and if they get another dollar or two on it, that will run into hundreds of millions of dollars for Dow Chemicals. As far as I am concerned, American-made stuff will run just as well in my tractor, if I can get it for just half the price. You don't have to take my word. I don't go to the States very often, but I talk to people who have been down visiting the United States; and it must gall this country an awful lot when you can bring a mix-master home for half the price you could buy it for up here, when it is made by the same company. The other night I was down and had a little supper with a friend who had brought up a nice coffee percolator – one of these electrical appliances, instead of having to build a fire in the stove. I think it cost him \$26, and I believe they are \$48 here – the same outfit, made by the same manufacturer. The same thing applies to fridges, washing machines and deep freezers.

As I said before, if we raise our prices we will price ourselves right out of the market, and that is not the solution. We must get our prices down so that we can live and produce in this Saskatchewan of ours, and there is only one way I can see it and that is to get some more competition into Saskatchewan instead of protecting the monopolies we have down there. For instance, I might even mention our good friend, the Leader of the Opposition, the other day, when he quoted that the Liberals had brought down the tariff on motor cars to 17 per cent. Well, I don't think I want to get into an argument at all but I have a newspaper clipping here from the 'Free Press' to show that there is a 52 per cent protection on a car in Canada, today. If my hon. friend wishes I will send this over to him; he can look at these figures. There is no doubt he knows more about it than I do, but I am willing to lend this to my hon. friend from Saltcoats, and that is quite a different picture from 17 per cent.

And so it is on down the line. I could just mention, Mr. Speaker, if the banks did not have a toehold on the indemnity, store bills, etc., that if there was no tariff down there in the States I would buy a \$20 bus ticket, go down and see my uncle across the border down there, and I would buy just the same car that I have to pay \$2,800 for here on Albert Street for \$1,000, and I would have \$1,000 profit to come home with. I would have enough to keep me going nicely for a whole summer.

These are the things that are pricing us out of the market. Our stuff is too high and the solution is not raising the farmers' prices on his goods because then we will price ourselves out.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that our Liberal friends across the floor here do not have any influence in Ottawa at all. For the love of God, the love of friends and for love of our forefathers from the old country who came over here because they were a little short of soil there – they didn't have enough soil to produce enough goods or enough farm produce that they could live, so there had to be imports from these other areas such as Canada which has not had the population to consume what they can grow. I cannot imagine anybody, whether they are Liberals or Tories or C.C.F., seeing this wonderful country that we came from, or that our forefathers came from, almost starve to death because of lack of food when we are almost starving over here because we have too much. Surely there should be some way whereby we could get a two-way trade with these old friends, or we could bring them out here and feed them over here. I cannot see why we both should starve. We starve because we have too much and they starve because they haven't got enough and they haven't got the soil. And I think the main thing in all these things – protected markets and protected privileges at the expense of this country and monopolies down East – is forcing the trade to other people.

I was just wondering, Mr. Speaker, if our good old friend had been living today, or if he knew what was going on today – and I refer particularly to our old friend, the Hon. R. B. Bennett, who had a tariff policy of brick-for-brick; if he knew the condition today would not come to the conclusion that he was a 'piker' in collecting revenue in former days; because I took from the statistics of the 'Canada Year Book' in the library here the other day – anybody can go in and look at it – Trade of Canada, Volume No. 1, 1952. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if people realize the amount of duty R. H. Bennett collected the last year he was in power, in 1934. He collected the huge sum in tariffs of \$109,135,207.25, in 1934! You know I am sure he would turn in his grave, today, because the Liberals – that low-tariff, free-trade outfit we have in Ottawa – what do you think they collected in 1952? Instead of \$109 million, they collected \$588 million and that is the low-tariff outfit that has been fooling the country for so many years! They still think that that old gentleman, Sir Wilfred Laurier, was down there, who went down to defeat on that very question, and I am sorry to say they are winning lots of votes on it. No doubt the Liberals will say "we can do better than the Tories; we can fool the people out west for another 20 or 30 years." And that is just about the situation.

I do not think there is much else we can do but demand that the tariffs be brought down so that we can trade with our customers. We must not price ourselves out of the market. And I cannot understand why our Liberal friends over there do not endeavour to talk to these boys down in Ottawa – I don't see why they do not disown them. Oh yes, I voted Liberal a good many times myself, don't worry about that! I even voted Conservative once. But this idea of us being with such high tariffs and the Liberals in power, who

profess to be free traders – I think these figures prove it – it is something I cannot understand. The book with the figures is in the library. You don't have to believe me. Go in there and read and study it, and I would suggest to my Liberal friends that if they cannot make them see sense down there in Ottawa, they should quit the outfit and join or start something else that works for Saskatchewan for a change.

Mr. McCarthy: — It wouldn't be the C.C.F.

Mr. Larsen: — Mr. Speaker, there is no hesitation on this side, and I will support the motion gladly.

Hon. T. J. Bentley (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Minister, it has been with a great deal of interest and pleasure that I have listed to the right down-to-earth words of wisdom of the hon. member (Mr. Larsen) who just took his seat. He always gives this House information, and gives it in such a way that I am amazed that some of our friends opposite do not eventually adopt some of his wisdom, having a lack of that on their own behalf.

The debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, is the discussion of the merits, or otherwise of the government programme, and I am going to propose this afternoon that, when I am finished, all those who believe the work of the Department of Health in its humanitarian work is worthwhile will realize that the programme of this Government has been un-excelled so far.

Before going into that subject I want to join with the other hon. members who have spoken on both sides in welcoming our two new members to the House. To be strictly honest of course, I should say that I would have preferred to have welcomed their opponents rather than them, but not being able to do that, I welcome them sincerely in our midst. They have had quite a number of bouquets handed to them, and I would like to remind them of something that will happen to them in the future. Twice you get bouquets, being members of this House – that is the ones you have had so far since you have come in, and then, later on in the years, when you are gathered unto your Father, the Premier of that day, supported by the Leader of the Opposition of that day, will read your obituary and say how sorry everybody is at that time that you have departed. Between this time and then you will get bouquets and brick-bats alternatively; probably more brick-bats than bouquets.

I would also like to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Loptson) on his elevation to that very important office in this House and this country, and I trust that he will discharge his responsibilities as he should. To the other speakers who have spoken I also join with those who have preceded me, in congratulating them on the excellence of their speeches. I won't try to enumerate them all. I will simply mention the mover of the resolution, the member for Turtleford (Mr. Woof), and I must mention my wise old friend and seat-mate from Kindersley (Mr. Wellbelove) from whom all of us, I think, have gained some wisdom in the course of our association with him. I am sorry that I missed the Premier, but I understand he did a very excellent job, as he always does.

I was fortunate enough to be here and listen to some of the members who spoke, among whom was my old friend whom I used to know at Saltcoats, and the hon. member from Nipawin (Mr. MacNutt) for whom I have a great personal regard. I say that sincerely. I listened to him congratulating the Liberal side of the House for what they had done in the past.

He said, among other things, that they had instituted free cancer care. I never allow that statement to go unchallenged and I will not, for I know the history of it too well. It is true that the Liberals did, in the dying hours of an overspent term of office, set up legislation which made free cancer services available in this province by legislation; but, Mr. Speaker, you do not provide those things of services by writing something in the books of the legislature. You do it by making the necessary provisions that are allowed by that legislation, which this Liberal party had completely failed to do; and it was required of this Government when it came into office to make these arrangements with the professional groups which provide the services. I want my hon. friend from Nipawin to remember that.

I also listened with interest and a bit of a sick feeling in the pit of my stomach to the member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) for whom I also have a high personal regard. I never heard such a spate of hatred and venom from anybody as came from him the afternoon he spoke. I want to assure him beyond all shadow of a doubt that no one on this side of the House or on that side nor outside this House, has ever muzzled me and furthermore, I want to assure him that, after years of association with the hon. Provincial Treasurer of this province, it will take more than speeches full of venom or the evidence of a man like Rawluk to destroy my confidence in him.

I want to again refer to the Leader of the Opposition and some of his remarks during the course of his address. I supposed he had to have something to fill his speech with after he was through with the attack on the Government over what happened last Spring, but he took unto himself and his party the credit for the abolition of the public revenue tax, the credit for the grants to municipalities in lieu of taxes, and the provision for homes for the aged. Mr. Speaker, does he think we are all newcomers here to this province? I have been in this province most of the time since 1907 with a few excursions out.

Mr. Loptson: — You didn't think about it till we told you about it.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Oh, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear that remark, because the hon. member accused the C.C.F. of being false in their statements that many of the social services of this country can be attributed to the work of Mr. Woodsworth, simply because Mr. Woodsworth had been dead two years when family allowances were introduced. Mr. Woodsworth had spent a lifetime in promoting all these things, many of which became effective in this country during his lifetime. Family allowances, it is true, did not take place until two years after his death. And then, the Leader of the Opposition, leading a party which if not dead is certainly in a state of decrepit desuetude, Mr. Speaker, rises up and says that the Liberal party was instrumental in bringing about the abolition of the public revenue tax and for the provision of the other two things that I have mentioned. The abolition of the public revenue tax was a recommendation of a Commission set up by this Government to study municipal-provincial relations, and it was after their recommendation was brought in that the public revenue tax was abolished. And the Liberals never in their term of office, when they sat on the right of Mr. Speaker instead of on your left, Sir, ever brought in a measure for or mentioned the abolition of the public revenue tax. But they picked it up as something to work on when it was recommended by the Commission on municipal-provincial relations.

The grants to municipalities are in exactly the same position. They could have made these grants in lieu of taxes. The government of this

country, on behalf of the people of this province, has owned property in this province for quite a long while before the C.C.F. came into office. I never heard a Liberal government even suggest that sometime they would make grants in lieu of taxes, and now he says they are entitled to some credit because that has taken place under a government that recognizes a square deal and tries to provide it.

And the homes for the aged. I will not encroach on the territory which properly belongs to the hon. Minister of Social Welfare; but for anyone to suggest that our friends opposite there had even a small part in producing what are now the homes for the aged, and the other expanded plans for their care, and housing; that they had any part in providing housing for the elderly people, is something beyond the realm of imagination. I cannot think why he would make such remarks.

I want to also mention another one or two things that the Leader of the Opposition dealt with. One is that he tried to make this House, and I suppose any who listened to him on the radio, believe that the Federal Government had something to do in a large way with the provision of hospital services and health services. I have said before, we are grateful for their small contribution; but their contribution came very late and it is too little compared to their promises of 1945 and 1946. I will mention more about those later as we go along, Mr. Speaker.

He also mentioned something about the treatment of student nurses. I want to explain here and now that student nurses are students in my opinion. We do not pay wages to student electricians, or student lawyers, or student doctors. Those are people who are going to an institution of learning to become proficient in a profession or a trade in which they propose to become earning members. We take the same position with regard to nurses who are going to enter an ancient and an honourable profession and, therefore, must spend their students years without particular emolument. They do get a small allowance as well as laundry, living quarters and food, which is paid for by the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan. The fact that there are no wages paid to them needs to be no deterrent on any young lady who wishes to enter that profession, because all she has to do, if she finds herself requiring some money to assist her through that course, is to apply to my hon. friend, the Minister of Education, who administers the million dollar Education Loan Fund and she will be able to assist herself, through the use of that fund, through her training period if she requires it. There are no economic barriers to any young lady entering the field of training for a graduate nurse.

A good deal has been said in the House by members of all sides about the glories of northern Saskatchewan; about the talents and skill of its people. I agree with them all. I am just as proud as they are of the people of the north, and so are all people in Saskatchewan. But, while we recognize their value, sympathize with their problems and their needs, the fact remains that this Government is making provision for supplying those needs. I want to point out that there are areas of this province that are not in the north that are equally important to the people of this province and this country. I represent such an area in the south-west corner of Saskatchewan, and that is an area of the province which also has demonstrated that it has talents, that it has productive ability, that it has all the things necessary to make up the great citizenship of our province and our nation, and it is peopled by citizens who not only had to have the courage to go in there in the early days when it was wild country – that takes courage anywhere for pioneers – but it is peopled by folks who had the enduring

courage that can meet the terrible conditions, some of the worst visitations of nature, and to remain there and continue their faith in the country *** their whole capacities to the general welfare of Saskatchewan and of Canada. I would like to give a few examples.

For instance, I suppose, per capita, the production of livestock, of field crops and even of dairy and poultry would not be excelled in any other area of Saskatchewan. They have excelled in the field of sports as witness the ball teams and the curling rinks that have come from the town of Shaunavon; consider the contribution to our provincial culture in drama from Val Marie, from Eastend and from the town of Shaunavon. Regard the work that has been done in the field of natural history by the folks around Eastend, and the voluntary work of the man who runs the museum there and the assistance that has been given to the archeologists or those interested in museum work in this country. I would like to say that they have made a great contribution and, if they were not there, would be sorely missed by the people of this province. So, while I say we recognize the value of the north we should remember that natural resources abound in the south-west as well, resources such as petroleum, natural gas and clay deposits, in addition to all the agricultural production. So our corner of Saskatchewan is making its contribution through its natural, its agricultural and its human resources.

I hope I am right in thinking and believing that health is regarded as the most important thing in our lives today. Certainly it is so regarded on this side of the House, and I have no reason to suppose that it isn't on the other side of the House because, without good health, we have not very much left. I am going to deal mostly with the health services this afternoon. The reason I am going to do so, Mr. Speaker, is because this coming summer will be the tenth anniversary of the advent of the C.C.F. Government in the province of Saskatchewan and the summer of 1944 – in spite of what might be said by our friends across the way to the contrary – marks the advent of a new approach to the health services of this province. This can be demonstrated, and I will demonstrate it this afternoon by statements of fact and by making comparisons.

I want first to deal with the need, and how these needs were first prepared for. In recognizing that this is an agricultural province primarily, I want also to mention that there is sort of a popular opinion – and I guess it has grown up; we have all held it at one time or another, and maybe it is naturally so – that, because agriculture is the oldest occupation of the civilized world and because it is the kind of an occupation that it is, it is also the healthiest occupation. Well, that is not so, Mr. Speaker. It has been discovered by research and experience over the world that that is not necessarily so. The idea that it should be so probably arisen from the fact that the agricultural population enjoys pure air, sunshine, and healthful exercise, which my friend from Shellbrook (Mr. Larsen) mentioned. Add to those the abundant and nutritious food available to farmers, and the popular opinion (whether it is correct or not) that their habits are more temperate than their city brothers', that they have a healthier life and they should live longer; they should be free from disease and injury and premature death. The same conditions would not apparently apply to his city brother. Mr. Speaker, that is only a notion. It is not borne out by the facts, because there are many hazards that agricultural people face. There are, for instance, the hazards of contaminated water, raw milk and the outdoor privy, which are all hazards against health; traditional lack of hospital and medical services; the gross inadequacy of any preventive service; the long years they have spent in this province and in

most other countries on a very low income, making it difficult for them to acquire even those medical services which do exist.

It is proper, of course, that I should give some evidence to support the statements that I am making. As one piece of evidence, let me point out that in 1942, just 12 years ago, the infant death rate in Canada was twice as high as the infant mortality rate in Sweden and New Zealand, primarily because of the higher infant mortality rate among Canada's rural areas. On top of that, of course, is the less measurable but equally important fact that, because of the lack of the necessary preventive measures taken in the past, a good many people today are suffering with illnesses in their latter years, or even in their late middle years, that they might have been prevented from suffering had the necessary services been available.

So when this Government came to power ten years ago, these inadequacies in our health services were recognized, and it was recognized also that by the slogan of this party "humanity first", recognition was not enough. Something had to be done about it. The something was done, but not thoughtlessly. Thought and study were given to it, and it was deemed by the Minister of Health at that time, the Premier, that we should have somebody come here to review our needs and make recommendations. He looked around for a proper person who would be competent to do this job and decided to ask Dr. Henry Sigerist, who was then at John Hopkins University in Baltimore, to come. There were good reasons for inviting Dr. Sigerist. He was a noted man in the field of medical history and an outstanding scholar. He had a keen sense of the social problems connected with health. He was a humanist and a health authority. He was sought after by a great many other governments for the advice that he could give. I think we can pay personal tribute. I do – and I know I would be heartily supported by the Premier in paying personal tribute to the work that he did and to the man himself as a great scholar, historian, physician, social scientist and a man befriended by the great of many nations. He was 15 years in the United States away from his native country. He came to Saskatchewan and completed his work. He then went to India and spent time there to give them the benefit of his abilities. He returned to Switzerland about four years ago and is now writing a history of the experiences he has had and his knowledge of the various health services in the world and what is required to improve and co-ordinate them.

He gave very special attention to the work he was asked to do here, and I have a copy of his report which I have read several times. I am not going to go through his whole report, but I am going to deal with the ten main recommendations that he made to this Government after his examination of what we had and what he thought we should have.

First, he called for the establishment of health regions (I am going to deal with each one of these specifically, but I will enumerate them first). Then, he urged a medical care programme for the aged and the needy and the widow and the blind pensioners. He suggested a hospital insurance plan. He recommended that it be started as a maternity hospital insurance plan and then worked into a general hospital insurance plan. He suggested more hospitals were needed in the country. He called for the building of a medical school; a place where we could teach our own young people the arts of healing in our own institution. He urged the housing of the mentally retarded separately from the psychotic and the other mentally ill people. The mentally retarded will respond to training and to the amenities of civilization to a certain extent and will learn certain skills; but they can not

be cured of their defective mental condition. However, mentally ill people can, in many cases, be treated and cured, and he called for the segregation of mental defectives from them.

He recommended, also, an improvement (and it was certainly sadly needed) in the treatment and custodial care of the mentally ill people, and anyone who knows anything of the mental institutions of that day (10 years ago and before that) knows that there was not nearly the attention, or the thought or the desire to give the attention and the thought to the care of these unfortunate people in an attempt to treat them. He recommended rehabilitation services for the disabled. He saw the need for improved preventative services, including health education, venereal disease control, sanitation and nutrition, and he urged the additional training of nurses, laboratory technicians and physical therapists. He regarded these as a minimum requirement for a health programme in this province. He saw that there was an inadequate number of doctors here; there were not nearly enough hospital beds, as I mentioned, and so he made his recommendations based on his observations.

Lots of governments at lots of times have invited people in to examine some particular phase of their economy. Liberal governments have had commissions and enquiries and then have put their recommendations in a pigeon hole and left them there. But Dr. Sigerist's were not pigeon-holed. They were acted upon, and I propose now to deal with each one of those things as they were acted upon in the years after he made his recommendations.

His recommendation regarding health regions was acted on with vigor and there are now eight fully functioning health regions in this province where there were none before, except the two major cities which had set up their own. None had been established under provincial authority prior to the C.C.F. So we only had public health service in the two major cities and a small staff of public health workers at the provincial headquarters. I want to point out here, Mr. Speaker, that the reason regions are desirable is to do the very thing that we on this side of the House are accused of not wanting to do. We are frequently accused of wanting to centralize everything and control everything with a 'big stick' from the centre and from there say to the people 'this is what you must do'. Just exactly the opposite is the philosophy of this side of the House, Sir. We try to diffuse the responsibility and to give everybody in the province the opportunity to handle their own affairs in their own areas, and to encourage them to take it. That is the reason health regions are regarded as important, because they are operated and administered by a board of directors chosen by the people of the Region.

I must emphasize that health regions are primarily formed for the provision of preventive or public health services, and those are the most important health services that can be instituted anywhere. I agree it is a grand thing to mend a broken leg when the leg becomes broken; it is a splendid thing to take out tonsils when the tonsils are diseased; it is a fine thing when a person's life can be saved because the chest can be opened, the heart massaged and started to beat again and bring the person back to life. That is spectacular; but the more you can prevent broken legs and diseased tonsils and bad hearts, the less you have to wait for the spectacular events that may (or may not) completely restore the afflicted person. So health services in the preventive field are the most important thing that a health department and any government can institute, and the health department's duty is to promote them as much as possible.

His No. 2 recommendation was that there should be medical and hospital services available for the most helpless members of our society: that is, the older people, and the mothers who have been deprived of the bread-winner, blind people and those who are less fortunate in the economic field and require some measure of social assistance. That recommendation was not put in the pocket of the Minister of that day, Mr. Speaker. It was worked on immediately, and I think we can say that it is one of the best things that has ever been done for the elderly and unfortunate people of this province. Along with many other things this has been the best, because it has provided them with an assurance that they are able to get these services when they require them and without having to worry about what the cost is going to be. While it is true that many of the illnesses that affect these people today for which they need medical and hospital attention need not have happened had history provided us and those people with the necessary preventive services, the fact remains history did not provide them. These people are here; they do suffer, and at least they have access to the services that will alleviate and, in many cases, cure that suffering. And so virtually the whole field of medical services is covered in providing for these elderly people. That was done by this Government – the first provincial government, or the first government of any kind in Canada, provincial or federal, to bring about such a programme. Others have followed in the wake of what this Government did, but this was the first province to introduce such a provision, and that was done – why? Because we believe absolutely in the slogan and the motto of the party ‘humanity first’.

Dr. Sigerist also recommended hospital insurance. As I mentioned, he did it in two parts. He was not sure how much energy this Government was prepared to exert. The Minister of that day said, “If we need hospitalization for everybody, let’s not delay it and do it in bits and pieces; let’s do it right away.” Provision was made to do that. It was done by careful and thoughtful planning, by finding the kind of people on this continent who are in that field and have knowledge of it, who are interested in the provision of this kind as a public service; by bringing them in here and working assiduously morning, noon and night: countless conferences among themselves; countless conferences with the Minister of that time; conference of the government itself and with the members of this side of the House and those interested; and conferences above all (which was not done in the case of cancer by our friends opposite) with the Hospital Association, the Catholic Hospital Conference, the medical men and others who were going to be involved in this. All those people were taken into consideration. The result is that today we are entering the eighth year of not the first proposal of Dr. Sigerist, but the complete proposals that he recommended as something for the future. We have a complete hospital insurance plan which has operated for seven years and is now in its eighth year.

What has that done for us? It has brought to all our people essential health care; an essential hospital care free from what hospital used to entail – the financial worry and threat that goes with it, when one has to pay the bill oneself at a time when the bill might be difficult to pay. Another extremely important factor enters into the picture here. It has provided stability in the financial position of our provincial hospitals. Now, this is in sharp contrast, Mr. Speaker, with the deficits which are continually rising with many of the hospitals beyond our borders, west and east and south of our province, also showing the people in those areas that it can be done.

I do not think our plan is causing dissatisfaction with the voluntary plans, but I do know there is a great deal of dissatisfaction arising from the operation of the Blue Cross Plan because their premiums are rising sharply. Working on an actuarial basis, without any public support of the government behind them, they are unable to provide the services without constantly increasing the premiums and restricting the benefits. That, of course, is the kind of a programme the 'Winnipeg Free Press' so ardently admire and for which they express so much admiration in a variety of articles by a gentleman whose initials are 'M.B.' in a series of articles which the Free Press was quite willing to print for him but which refused us the space to even answer in one-half the words that he was allowed to use in promoting his. The Free Press has a great loyalty to private free enterprise. Their loyalty to private free enterprise is only exceeded by one thing and that is their groveling subservience to the Winnipeg Grain Exchange in the speculative markets.

Dr. Sigerist also recommended the construction of more hospitals. I am going to deal with the hospital situation before I am through, this afternoon. Suffice it to say at this point that, on his recommendation, a vigorous programme of hospital construction was undertaken with improvements in hospital design necessary, but short equally of facilities to make hospital beds effective. A hospital bed is only effective if it has the equipment and the people to service that hospital bed or the patient in it. You do not plough land with a horse without any harness or a plough or a driver; you do not take care of a patient just because you have got a bed. You have to have the ancillary and the complementary services along with it. So the Government gave a great deal of financial assistance to the people of this province in building hospitals. And I want to remind our friends opposite that as far back as 1918 the Liberals knew the need. They passed an Act in 1917 which became effective in 1918 setting up the Union Hospital legislation, and it took 26 years (from 1918 to 1944) to get 26 Union Hospital districts established. Since that time, that is in less than 10 years, there are now well over 100; this is well over 80 new ones have been established. It could have been done by the Liberals when they were on this side of the House had they wanted to do it, had their interest in humanity been as great as the gentlemen now over there would wish that it had been, so they would have something to brag about.

Another thing that Dr. Sigerist recommended was a complete medical school. This should have been done years ago. It was not because we did not have men walking around who were skilled, when governments of a Liberal stripe or any other stripe were on this side of the House, particularly Liberal, and when they had their counterparts in Ottawa where the whole control of finance and credit and trade and commerce rests. When they were over here running this side of the House, had they had any courage, brains and vision and had desired to do something, they could have got the idle men together and the food and the clothing that were in the warehouses, and they could have built a medical school and staffed it for less than one-half of what it is going to cost to do it now. But it is going to be done because this Government recognized the need for it. I think we are going to have a medical school that will be equal to any in Canada. Not as big perhaps. We do not need as big a one as McGill or some of the others, but we are going to have a good one. We have chosen very carefully the new Dean, a medical man well recognized by the various Foundations on this continent, as well as the medical profession, for his ability in his field, his academic knowledge, for his demonstrated desire to make his profession useful to humanity, and

his willingness to teach all the things he knows, and he himself is attracting some very able and excellent professors to the faculty of that school. That University hospital which completes the school and makes it possible for us to train our own students in the medical arts in this province, will be open for operation approximately a year from now, and the students presently in that school, who entered last year, will go right through and complete their course in Saskatchewan.

I mentioned a while ago that the mentally ill or retarded people were not considered too seriously by our predecessors in office, and when it was recommended by a competent man that the defectives should be separated from the actively ill people, that was acted on immediately and they were separated. They now occupy the place out at the airport at Weyburn and will soon be moving to Moose Jaw where a most up-to-date institution is being built, where the kind of care and treatment that defective and retarded people have a right to expect from a society that calls itself civilized, humanized and christianized will be available.

He also recommended an improvement in mental health services and treatment. I do not think I need to tell anybody in this House the amount of improvement that has taken place in our mental health services. I do not want anyone to think that I do not recognize that there is more to do. What I am pointing out is that, in less than a 10-year period, measures have been taken, professional staff have been recruited and other staff trained which have resulted in a vastly improved programme for the care and treatment of the mentally ill. This programme will continue to be improved as rapidly as financial resources and the acquisition of personnel will permit.

Dr. Sigerist recommended the free treatment and diagnosis of cancer and if he had thought it really existed at that time (as our Liberal friends pretend) he would not have thought it necessary to recommend it, and I won't mention any more about that at the present time.

He also recommended the rehabilitation of the disabled. This is a tremendous field. As I mentioned a while ago, if history had provided the kind of preventive service that many people knew years ago should have been provided but which governments of that day did not have what it took to start to provide; but if they had been provided we would not have had the residue of disabilities that we have at the present time. This is a tremendous field – a backlog of illness and disability, crippling diseases still to be caught up with, requiring tremendous expansion in personnel and facilities. That is being undertaken at the present time by this Government, and I expect my friend, the Minister of Social Welfare, will deal with that more extensively when he is speaking on the matter. If he does not, I will take occasion to do so myself at a later date; but I am sure he will.

He recommended improvement in health education, venereal disease control, sanitation and nutrition. Mr. Speaker, these improvements have all been established. There is a very definite improvement in the field of health education. Our Health Education Division is second to none in Canada, not even barring the Federal Government's. Our Health Education Division does a tremendous amount of work in disseminating knowledge that is essential for people to have, if they are going to co-operate as they must if we are to have effective preventive action in the various services that are being provided, particularly through health regions. I want to say that many people

now who are not in health regions are anxious to be in. They see the value of this type of organization; and just as soon as we get the personnel (which we are *** at the present time) to staff another region, another region will be started in the area most prepared to undertake it, and that means about three of them. How we will pick them out I do not know, unless we can do them all at once. The important point is people are asking for it.

I want to mention also the field of venereal disease control. In Public Accounts Committee, the other day, the question was asked whether there is not a greater incidence than there used to be. I think it would be wrong for anyone to look at the figures and see something around 1,200 – nearly 1,300 a year or so ago, and now something over 1,300, and assume that is because of a greater incidence. The reason for that is because we are improving our case-finding all the time, and we are discovering where it is and getting more and more people who are afflicted to come in and take the treatment that will cure the disease. And so I think the reason why the figures may look slightly increased is because we are finding them.

In the field of sanitation there is a lot to do. However, a lot is being done, and certainly the sanitary standards of the communities, particularly the villages and towns and cities, are improving all the time, and I believe in the rural areas also. I would like to mention here in connection with sanitation that there is a field of sanitation which the Provincial Government is going to have a difficult time dealing with as we have discovered in the recent case of the pollution of the North Saskatchewan River. I am not going to blame anybody in this respect. I do not think anyone did it deliberately or with malice aforethought. I think they honestly thought that it was not going to happen when they dumped their effluent into the North Saskatchewan River just this side of Edmonton, Alberta. But we find that the Saskatchewan Hospital, North Battleford, the town of old Battleford, the village of Maymont, the city of Prince Albert and further down into Manitoba, have been affected, and I think in this field this Government will be careful to see that any new industries which may enter this province that are going to discharge their waste products into any stream whether it runs across our borders or not, will be governed by stringent regulations. But, in the main, I think it is proper to assume that the Federal Government should take unto itself the necessary legislative authority to see that streams running across inter-provincial borders are not polluted. It is more important than at any other time in our history – and I am not blaming them for not having done it heretofore; but I hope they will do it now. Because of the industrialization of Canada, there are going to be more and more plants that are going to use vast amounts of new and sometimes unknown chemicals in the production of their particular products.

Well, finally, Dr. Sigerist's tenth recommendation was what? The training of additional nurses, laboratory technicians and physiotherapists, and that has been undertaken.

While it is not contained in Dr. Sigerist's report, I could not let this opportunity pass without saying a word about another very important branch of the Department and that is our Vital Statistics Branch. In that branch are recorded all the births and the marriages and the deaths and their causes, and The Marriage Act is administered. There are now many superannuation and annuity schemes coming into being, as well as public pension plans, in connection with the establishment of age is necessary. Our Vital Statistics Division becomes more and more important in the provision

of proofs of birth for those people I have mentioned, and also it is very important for people when they wish to go abroad, or in the settling of an estate or things of that nature and it is essential that Vital Statistics is correct in the information it gives out. There has been a terrific *** for that division's services, and I think it has, under great difficulties, provided a most exemplary service for the people of this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have said the things that were done. Some of you quite honestly and properly might say to me, "Well, what about it? What is the difference? You say you have done so many things; what has happened? Is it any lighter than it used to be, or is it just as dark as ever?" Well, in spite of the fact that someone says comparisons are a big odious, I am going to make comparisons, because the only way you can see whether you are making progress is to look at then and now. I am going to have a look at a few things then and now. To me it will not be odious except insofar as they should not have had to be made; they should have taken place years ago.

I am going to deal with hospitals particularly right now for a moment. In 1943, we had a total bed capacity of 3,209 beds; that was less than four beds per thousand of population. By the end of 1953, we had 5,596 rated beds – and I want you to get the distinction between that and my next remark. That meant we had 6.5 rated beds per thousand people, and in the same year we had 6,220 beds set up or a complement of beds, meaning that we had actually available to the public of this province 7.2 beds per thousand. By rated beds I mean those beds that are in a fireproof structure which has been constructed by a plan for a hospital – not converted from something else to a hospital, but properly constructed. Those are rated beds, and those are able to give up-to-date and the very best of nursing service. By the bed complement, or bed setup, we mean those beds which are not so acceptable but which we think are suitable at the present time for use until more up-to-date hospitals are built in their stead.

Besides this, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention that in increasing the beds, it was done largely, mind you, by money provided from the treasury of this Provincial Government. It was not until 1948, in a shame-faced, and inadequate way that the Federal Government finally decided that it would make some little show towards implementing its promises to provide a national health insurance scheme, and so it came into the hospital construction grant picture. And I am glad of it. We will make use of every dollar that they will allow us to have in that field before our construction programme is finally completed. But the original impetus was from this Government and the contribution of funds from this Government; and we have improved the hospital facilities greatly.

I was going at this point to deal with the situation at Luseland for the benefit of the very hon. member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) but he is not here; so I will take it up at some other time if he wishes me to. I have not a great deal of time left.

I want to make another comparison, because we have heard so much that industry was going to be driven out of Saskatchewan by the Socialist Government, everybody was going to run away. The former Leader, backed by all his cohorts of the Liberal party, used to tell us that we were losing population. Of course, the Premier exploded that time and again. We were told people would not come here. The same thing was said of professional people. In 1943, there were 408 active doctors in this province – one for

every 2,064 people. In 1953 – and you can get this out of the ‘Medical Quarterly’; they are their figures, not mine, although we have them, too; but in 1953, 722 active physicians are now operating. That means one for every 1,192 people; nearly down to the federal average and they have great concentration of doctors in the big industrial areas of Canada. With the present complement of doctors and with our medical school in operation, I look forward to the time when we will have enough for all the people that are required. So that explodes the idea that these people will not come and serve here. They do come and they are staying.

And nurses. Everybody knows there is a shortage of nurses. If we only had the number of nurses now in hospitals that we had in 1943, we would not be able to run our hospitals. In 1943 we had 565 graduate nurses; today we have more than double that number, 1,274. Someone says we will never get nurses if we don’t pay a salary while they are in training. Of course we will get them. We are getting them all the time. The number was doubled. The hospital beds have nearly doubled. The nurses have more than doubled, and besides that we are giving a far better type of training to these nurses than they used to get, partly because of the impetus of the Department and partly because we have more experience to work on.

Now, someone would say to me, “All right, what has it done for everybody? You say you have done all these things. You say you have improved the numbers of people in the services. What is the difference in the health of the people?” Well, let us take a few comparisons. We might just have a look at the progress that has been made. The first and one of the important things is that people have been provided with essential services in hospital and medicine, in the medical practices and surgery, optometry, etc., and a great deal of the financial burden has been removed from the family.

We get into the humanitarian aspects, for people are going to be born. If anybody in this Assembly, Sir, is a parent he will obviously say that when his babies are born he wants them to live, to grow up to be children, men and women and into old age and to live a full life. You cannot do that when a lot of babies die before they become one year old.

In 1943 our infant mortality rate – and infant mortality means the death of babies before they are a year old; of every thousand babies born in 1943, 47 of them died before they were a year old; in 1953 it was less than 31, a drop of 35 per cent. It is not good enough yet, Mr. Speaker. Until we can see that every child born has a chance to live, we have not completed the job set out for humanity to do. But we are making progress, and that is the important thing when anyone asks the question, “What have you done?” Those are two great accomplishments – taking a great deal of financial load off the families, and reducing the infant mortality rate.

Not only is it important to keep the children alive when they are born however, it is also important that the child has a mother alive when it is born and comes home from the hospital, or wherever the birth takes place. In 1943, the maternal death rate: for every thousand mothers who had babies 2.6 of them died during childbirth; last year it was .5, or one-half of one per cent, or one-half death for every 1,000 that went through childbirth. That is a drop of 80 per cent. Surely, Mr. Speaker, that is progress worth while having on the records of this Assembly and on the records of the province of Saskatchewan!

Our T.B. death rate, I believe, has been dealt with in the House before, consequently I will not dwell on it. I want to deal with just one item here that I think is important for us all to give attention to. It is something that has come on us without expectation. I refer to the increase in the incidence of polio. We in this province recognize that it is quite possible that it will be some time before this disease is controlled. We have great hopes for the new vaccine that is being tried in the United States. We had great hopes for gamma globulin which has not been proven to be as effective an agent for immunizing as we had hoped, but which has some value; and we hope the work that Connaught Laboratories are doing in Toronto will produce an effective vaccine against this disease. In the meantime we are doing our utmost to meet the increasing load. An authority has been given by the Government to the Department of Health to expand its facilities and personnel, and we are doing it just as rapidly as we can train people for that purpose. So I think it is safe to say that we have done a great many things; that we recognize the challenges in this field that are going to face us in the future, and that this Government will, in the exercise of its slogan 'humanity first', do all it possibly can to assist in preventing the incidence of accident, illness and disease, and do all it can to provide the services for those who do not escape these things and require the act of treatment.

I want to say in closing that this cannot be done as effectively within one small political area in this country of Canada as it could be if it was nation-wide, because the skills across Canada are in some cases concentrated in certain areas. The facilities necessary, or the places where facilities can be provided necessary for many of the treatments that are required by ill people, may be outside of this province; but we on this side of the House do say that whether a person lives anywhere from St. Johns, Newfoundland, to Victoria on Vancouver Island, that person is a Canadian citizen and that the Canadian Government, the Canadian people, have a responsibility which they cannot escape, and eventually will not be allowed to escape, for the provision of all the facilities available in this Canada to everybody in Canada, looking forward to the time when we will have completely healthy people.

Mr. Speaker, I assume by now you know I am going to support the motion.

Hon. J. H. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural and Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take the time of the House repeating the congratulations to the various individuals who have been congratulated, but just to ask you to take my congratulations as read. They will be just as sincere and I am sure they will do everybody just as much good as if I took 15 minutes to go over the various individuals who do have personal congratulations coming to them.

I would like, first of all, to deal with a few of the remarks made by some of the hon. members sitting on the opposite side of the House. I was particularly interested in the remarks made by the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Ripley); so interested that I clipped from the 'Leader-Post' the news report where he said that our efforts in the fish and fur business were absolutely of no value. He is quoted this way: he said he would strongly urge the Government to abandon these businesses, such as fish and fur, which were not worthwhile.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Is that when he spoke to the women?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — No, this was when he was speaking in the House. I did not check up on what he said to the ladies when he was speaking to them. Now I have no quarrel with my hon. friend for holding that opinion, but he does represent a constituency in this province, and I think it would be most interesting if he took the trouble to inform his constituents that he wants us to get out of the fish and fur business. I am sure that his constituents at Wollaston Lake and at Reindeer Lake would be very happy to know what his stand on this question is.

Mr. Ripley: — How do you know they don't?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I would suggest to him that he might reconsider his stand before he goes back to report to his constituents. Although these two industries, fishing and trapping, are comparatively small industries in the province of Saskatchewan, nevertheless they are very important to a number of people, and for anybody to say that the Fur Marketing Service has not brought very much increased prices to the trappers in Saskatchewan is ridiculous. It has not only brought increased prices to those who have shipped their furs through the service, but it has brought increased prices to those who have sold to the dealers. Perhaps the hon. member would like to get into the fish and fur business.

Mr. Ripley: — I have been in it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — There is one peculiar thing: most of the complaints about the Fur Marketing Service come from dealers or are engendered by the fur dealers. I don't blame them for doing it; but the funny part of it is that quite a few of the dealers send their furs to the Fur Marketing Service for sale. We send out reports on prices after the sales. We establish a December sale and get out prices to the field in order to prevent the fur dealer from taking advantage of the trapper who is ignorant of the market. We give him that information.

The fisherman, in almost all cases, voted overwhelmingly for a continuation of the operations of the Fish Marketing Service. The Fish Marketing Service has been responsible for the construction and operation of processing plants without which it would be impossible to carry on the fishing business.

Now the hon. member says we should get out of these things. He says the Government should get on with enterprises of value, such as the promotion of railways, telephones and radio systems and airways. Where has the hon. member been?

Hon. J. T. Douglas: — Asleep.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — He certainly does not know what has been going on. I want to tell the House now that years ago I made personal representation to the authorities in regard to the extension of railways into northern Saskatchewan and if the hon. member would go to the proper place and use his influence there (if any) it would be appreciated. I asked them to consider construction of a railway from St. Walburg to Bonnyville to finish the line up in the northwest of the province. I asked them to consider construction of a railway from Big River to Buffalo Narrows; from Prince Albert to Lac la Ronge, and from Arborfield to The Pas before most of the members sitting opposite were in this Legislature, and any time they would like to lend their influence and voice to a request like that, I will be very happy indeed.

He (Mr. Ripley) said 'telephones' and 'radio systems'. We have the best radio service in our north of any province in the Dominion of Canada. There is no argument about it. There are 351 two-way radio sets and 64 more under construction which will be ready presently — a total of 415 sets. In 1946, there were only 72 sets. Of these sets 123 are used by business and industry in northern Saskatchewan — mining companies, fish camps and all of the

business that goes on. And then private industry in the north uses our system to get out messages, and the volume of messages is very large. We have seven key stations – Uranium City, Stony Rapids, Foster Lake, Lac la Ronge, Meadow Lake, Prince Albert and Hudson Bay, and the expansion is continuing in this work.

I believe he also mentioned (though it was not quoted in that paragraph in the paper) mining roads and road construction in the north, and I would like to give him just a little bit of information with regard to what has been done in one year in roads and fire-guards by the Construction Branch of the Department of Natural Resources. There are 352 miles of fire-guard maintained, 583 miles of northern roads maintained, 61 miles of new construction, 126 miles of rebuilding, 35 miles of graveling and custom work done for other people, 187 miles of maintenance and 80 miles of road locating work, and even in streets it adds up to 23 miles – a total of almost 1,450 miles of roads and fire-guards that have been maintained.

May I say just a word or two on the question of mining roads. The Federal Government has a programme of assisting the provinces in the construction of mining roads. We got assistance from the Federal Government for the construction of the Stony Rapids-Black Lake road. That was a three-way proposition between the Nisto Mines, the Federal Government and the Provincial Government. That was a few years ago. Then a couple of years later, we got assistance on the Beaver Lodge road from Black Bay through Uranium City to El Dorado mine at Beaver Lodge. Since that time we have made application for assistance on two or three other roads, and they have all been turned down. I wish my hon. friends opposite, again if they have any influence, would ask the Federal Government to get a policy that would be practical in helping to develop the mineral resources in the north I am not asking . . .

Mr. Ripley: — Would you mind telling me what those other roads were that you mentioned?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I will tell the hon. member what roads they were. They were two short roads in the Beaver Lodge area. They weren't to accommodate El Dorado Mining & Refining Company, but two private companies, and they were turned down; the applications were turned down on both of them.

Premier Douglas: — And the road to Flin Flon.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — And the road to Flin Flon, which the Minister of Highways has been handling as well.

Now I do not believe, and I do not think the hon. members over there believe, that we can construct roads in the north country just for the purpose of prospecting and exploring. It is too expensive; you can't do it. Roads can only be constructed when you have located and proven resources that are worthwhile, and I am quite in favour of the test that the mining companies who want the roads should be willing to put up some money. That is the proof that they believe they have something. But I am just a little suspicious that we have been had! El Dorado Mining & Refining Company had to have a road to Black Bay. There is no question about it; they had to have it, and so it might be more true to say that we went in to assist the Federal Government to build that road than to say that they came in with us. Now that is finished, I am just a little suspicious that their programme is not showing so much interest.

We should operate airways, extend airways. My hon. friend had a ride in some of our planes during the election campaign; they carried him safely home to the Legislature. We now have a fleet of 24 planes and one of the big problems in operating a fleet of planes is the question of airfields. It is rather a common thought that the Federal Government is responsible for

airfields. Let us look at what has happened in Saskatchewan, in the northland: The Department of Natural Resources constructed the field at Lac la Ronge, at Isle a la Crosse, at Buffalo Narrows, at Laloche, at Snake Lake, at Stony Rapids, at Cumberland House, at Big River, and assisted in the field at Meadow Lake. The Federal Government has constructed one field in northern Saskatchewan – at Beaver Lodge: one field only, which the El Dorado Mining & Refining Company simply had to have, and so they constructed that one. We are presently requesting (and I may say that we have in the past requested the Federal Government to give some assistance in this regard) assistance from the Federal Government on some of our airfields, and I hope that my hon. friend can back up our requests. One place in which we are particularly interested at the present time is Lac la Ronge, to get an extension and improvement on that field, with more and larger planes using the route.

It is not to a member of the Legislature that I am going to refer next, but it is on a related subject. In the 'Leader-Post' on February 13 last, there is an article headed "Saskatchewan slow to develop riches of northland." Mr. Speaker, if Saskatchewan is slow now, it was surely going backwards when the Liberals sat on this side of the House. This, of course, is the story about the new president of the Liberal Association, Dr. Russell E. Partridge, of Prince Albert. It is a very interesting story; there is one particularly interesting paragraph here:

"In 1947 his brother Eric, an experienced and expert prospector, was prevailed upon to come to north Saskatchewan and the two brothers allied themselves with initial attempts to evaluate the richness of mineral outcrop."

That is quite commonplace. I have often spoken of the Prospectors' Assistance Plan. Eric Partridge – I have no criticism of him at all; we were very happy to have him; he is one of the prospectors who was helped under our prospectors' assistance plan in northern Saskatchewan, and I hope the president of the Liberal Association appreciates it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend the member for Nipawin (Mr. MacNutt) who isn't in his seat at the moment, is a constituent of mine. I do not know if I have ever got him to vote for me, but he lives in my constituency, and he talked here about the Flin Flon highway. We want a Flin Flon highway, he said. I agree that it would be fine to have a Flin Flon highway and we should have had it. We had it started first, and had it not been for the prejudice of the Federal Government, they would have given us the assistance instead of in Manitoba, and we would have had the road going to Flin Flon – and a better road than the present road in Manitoba. However much we regret that the Federal Government did not come thorough and do that, and we didn't get the road, I think we have to recognize now that Flin Flon has one road and there are areas in our north that have not a road at all where roads are needed. So far as I am concerned, I would prefer (and I know I may be unpopular with some gentlemen on my own side of the House) to see roads built to develop the resources of a community where they haven't got a road at all, before duplicating a road service to a centre. I have nothing against Flin Flon and I have nothing against Nipawin, but I do think we have to put first things first.

I was interested in the headlines in the 'Leader-Post' when the report of the Royal Commission on Rural life in Saskatchewan was

tabled in the House. The heading was "Land Settlement Probe is Asked." You would really think there was some trouble. You know, I am not going to read from that news item, but I am rather proud of the work that the Minister of Agriculture has done in land settlement in Saskatchewan; and just as he would be the first, I would be the second to admit that not all the things have been done that should be done; but when I remember the kind of inefficient and haphazard settlement that took place previously, this is really a great improvement. As my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Health (Hon. Mr. Bentley) said, "some people say comparisons are odious". Maybe they are. But when I remember the settlement that took place right up in the constituency the hon. member from Meadow Lake talked about, where people had no hope in the world of ever making a success of it – it was just a question of putting them into the bush to forget them and that is all – this, I repeat, is a great improvement.

They had the same kind of settlements in my constituency. One would think this Carrot River triangle just suddenly turned up in Saskatchewan in the last few years. It was there in the 1930's; as a matter of fact, the timber was burned off it in the 1930's. Now we hear a lot of talk about it; but if everyone reads this report and takes the report in a reasonable way, as the Minister of Agriculture says, there are a lot of things there that we know about that need to be done and are going to be done.

I was interested when the member for Redberry (Mr. Zipchen) speaking, the other day, said that during the depression years nobody went back to oxen. That is not correct. I am sorry to have to say it, but that is not correct. The Liberals put them back to oxen. In their re-establishment plans did they buy tractors in the 'thirties? Or give them any help in that direction? They sent them into the bush with oxen. The Liberal party, of course, is still in the ox-cart age; they haven't yet got out of it.

I was interested, too, in the remarks of the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield) about the Green Lake settlement. He got himself worked up into quite a heat about that situation. I happen to know something about it too, and I know that the residents there know that they have had far more opportunity to make a living since this Government has been in office than they ever had before. They know that. And again, when the Liberal government was carrying on that re-habilitation programme there, one of the things they sent in there was a little flour mill – one of these little things that does a few bushels an hour. They never got it set up to the time they were defeated in 1944, and we never did set it up. That was the kind of programme that they had in mind. When I heard him talking about the man eating fish, I thought, yes, the Liberal party would carry on a programme of re-habilitation to the extent that they could eat fish, they could grow some wheat, they could grind it in their own mill and eat that, and that would be it. They do not seem to realize that people are not contented with that kind of living any more, and should not be expected to be contented with it.

The hon. member mentioned the schools at Green Lake. Certainly I believe that it was an Order of Sisters that started the schools at Green Lake. It was not the Liberal government. Now, since there has been a C.C.F. government, the Sisters get salaries. No political party,

no government ever exploited the Orders of Sisters like the Liberal government did. In the name of charity, they had them doing things which they should have been paying for.

The Liberals cannot believe what they see in the province of Saskatchewan – the development that is taking place. They remind me of the young lumberjack in the State of Maine who went for a trip across the country. He finally got to California and applied for a job, and he got a job with a lumbering outfit there and they sent him out to the bush. On the road out he happened to meet a big truck with a great big redwood log on it about 15 feet in diameter and he stopped and looked at it and his eyes nearly popped out and he said, “the fellow that cut that tree was an awful liar.” He could not believe what he saw, and our friends in the Liberal party cannot believe what they are seeing in the province of Saskatchewan. They cannot believe it because they do not want to believe it.

Mr. Loptson: — We can hardly see it, it's so small.

Mr. Buchanan: — Not over your glasses!

Mr. McDonald: — We're on the ‘verge’.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Hope of the conversion of my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Loptson) is rather faint.

Mr. Loptson: — It sure is!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I was also interested in some of the things said by the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson). It is always a pleasure for us to listen to the hon. member; he is entertaining.

Mr. Danielson: — You sure enjoy it. You cannot sit still.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . if nothing else. He did quote some percentages in regard to the decrease in production of metal. Now I checked over the records and I found he did not give any base year.

Mr. Danielson: — I took the figures from your own reports.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I don't care where he took it from – he told me a minute ago we couldn't sit still; what's the matter with him? He didn't give any base year. Reduced from what? And so as to prevent any misunderstanding I want to give the House some information. Gold and silver production in Saskatchewan, in the last ten years, is down about 50 per cent. That's terrible, isn't it? Of course gold and silver production in Saskatchewan is purely incidental to the other mining . . .

Mr. Danielson: — That's right – go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — They are not mining for gold and silver, and just because there happens to be some gold and silver in it they have taken it; but they may have run of ore that is less gold and silver. The prime objective is not to get ore rich in gold and silver.

The goldmining industry in Canada gets quite a substantial Federal subsidy; but none of this subsidy is available to Saskatchewan mines. It is not prejudice or discrimination in this case. It is not available because any mine that produces gold incidental to its main programme does not come in for this subsidy. But why I mention it is to show that they are not interested in the gold and silver except as they get it, incidentally, in the process.

Copper, in ten years in Saskatchewan, is down 20 per cent, and I think 20 per cent is the figure the hon. member used; but I didn't know what base year he was using. The explanation of that is, of course, that ten years ago was at the peak of wartime production, when the company was under pressure to produce all the copper they could and where they were overloading their mill and their equipment, where they were actually high-grading in the mine instead of taking the mine-run ore in order to get a greater production. Now they have quit high-grading. They have cut down the overload so that they will get a better yield from the ore, and they are producing about 20 per cent less.

Zinc, in ten years in Saskatchewan, is up 2 per cent; he didn't tell us that. He told us it was down 12 per cent.

Mr. Danielson: — Which?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Zinc is up 2 per cent in the last ten years. The actual story in regard to zinc was that from the peak of wartime production that went down too; but with the establishment of the new plant at Flin Flon to re-work the tailings from the plant and recover zinc, their production of zinc has been going up. The price of zinc went down very seriously.

Then there is selenium and tellurium; in ten years in Saskatchewan the production is up 50 per cent. But these metals are incidental, and the ores are selected for copper and zinc value.

Now I would like to say a word or two on another question which the hon. member raised, and I was rather amazed at him. He was speaking abut the "Rawluk affair" (shall I call it?) and he said that we needed a judicial committee which "can weigh the evidence". Maybe the hon. member can speak for himself as to whether or not he can weigh the evidence. In the most serious cases that are tried, men like us, ordinary common people, form a jury to weigh the evidence and decide whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty. What does he think — that the members of this House are not capable of weighing evidence?

Mr. Danielson: — I certainly do.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The only interpretation that I can put upon it is . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Someone could always challenge the jury.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . that his own political party is so biased that it would be impossible for them to weigh evidence. And then he says "a political committee weighted in favour of the accused." I will deal with that in a minute. I think he said that Mr. Rawluk never

was a Liberal. He was a Liberal scrutineer at the election in 1952 and when he lost his job, through this performance, he was hired by the vice-president of the Liberal Association. Now, maybe he wasn't a Liberal but he looked awfully like it.

Mr. Loptson: — He was a good C.C.F.er before that.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, the 'Leader-Post' had an editorial a little while ago entitled "A reasonable Approach". This was quoted from by the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson).

Mr. Danielson: — Read it all.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I want to read some parts of it, and the funny part of it is that I am going to read just about the same parts that my hon. friend read.

Mr. Danielson: — No, read it all.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Just about the same. Just listen to this.

Mr. McDonald: — Take it as read.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — This is it:

"It will be remembered the curtain fell almost immediately after the Government majority had over-ruled the demand of the Opposition for a judicial inquiry and then had adopted, the Opposition dissenting, the report of the Crown Corporations Committee (on which the Government was in the majority)."

How ignorant can the Leader-Post get? I think everybody else knows that on the Legislative Committees the Government has the majority and when my hon. friends were sitting over on this side of the House (there is only one of them there now that was sitting on this side of the House) they had a majority on the Committees. What the 'Leader-Post' is trying to do is to infer that this was a special cooked-up committee for the job.

Mr. Danielson: — Correct.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The hon. member interjected 'correct'. Well, I agree with him that it is correct that the 'Leader-Post' was trying to make that nasty inference and I am surprised that he agrees with me.

Mr. Danielson: — You should know!

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I have another quotation from this editorial.

Mr. McDonald: — Take it as read too.

Mr. Danielson: — Read it all.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Here it is:

“Mr. Douglas, in his reply, implied that he believed 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.”

And then the ‘Leader-Post’ goes on to say:

“A government cannot expect to be able to hide behind the presumption of innocence until charges against it are proven.”

Premier Douglas: — Even McCarthy could not beat that.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, if the Leader-Post were right (and thank God it isn’t!) every member on both sides of the House, once they are elected to the Legislature are guilty when charged. Every individual who works for the government is also guilty when charged, according to their theory. If there is anything more crazy, more silly, more totalitarian . . .

Mr. Loptson: — The Government is —

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That is the kind of stuff they want to get across — a complete reversal of the principle of British justice. I never heard anybody say before that British justice was for everybody except those people who work for the government, or who are elected public officials. That is a new theory — a new theory to suit the ‘Leader-Post’.

Then they are worrying about the Government clearing itself of suspicion in this respect, but I am not worrying about that at all. We are not worrying on this side. If they want to worry about it they can, and they have a cure for that. But I am disturbed about this. By this editorial, the Editor of the Leader-Post insinuates that the majority of the members of this House are crooks and unfit to sit on a committee and make a judgment and that they are dishonest. You can’t read anything else into that editorial except that meaning. That is coming close enough to the point where it is doubtful if such a newspaper deserves any privileges at all in this House. It ends up:

“The Government has another obligation — that of safeguarding public men and government servants from false accusations.”

Mr. Speaker, as long as the ethics of the Liberal party and the ‘Leader-Post’ remain what they are today, and as long as we have that kind of political ethics, I expect that these kinds of charges will be made. I am sorry, but it is true that people who are public servants are subject to that kind of attack. There is no way we can protect them. My hon.

friends over there have the power to protect them; and they have the power to refrain from making, from cooking up these stories, bringing in-a-Rawluk; they can take the person to a proper court and have a proper trial if they want it, but that is the last thing in the world they want.

Mr. Danielson: — That's your remedy, right now. Go ahead and prosecute and clear yourself. The case rests right on you and nobody else.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, you and I are having quite a hard time keeping order here.

I do not intend, this afternoon, to give anything like a full review of my Departments. I wanted to comment on the remarks made in this debate by the speakers in the Assembly because I could not properly comment on those in a later debate. I promise — and I want you to remember that this isn't a threat, Mr. Speaker — that in the budget debate I will give a report on my Departments.

There is another subject, however, on which I would like to spend a few minutes, a subject which, I think, is of vital importance to all of us. True, it is not a business of this Legislature. It is the question of world security and freedom and peace. When we look at the picture, today, we cannot very well come to any other conclusion but that this world of ours is a vale of tears. The history of prejudice and persecution has been pretty bad. There has been torture, starvation and death, needlessly; there have been wars and rumours of wars. It is not a pretty picture to look at. I was reading an article by Matthew Halton, entitled 'Adventures and Memoirs', in the 'Star Weekly' of February 20; and one of his ten most vivid memories was described thus:

"The opening day of the Nuremberg trials: there in the docks were the Nazi leaders minus Hitler and Goebbels. There were the men who had shut the gates of mercy on mankind. Perhaps this is the beginning, we thought, of the reign of law. How simple-minded we were."

Well, there is cause for despair — even looking back as far as the Nuremberg trials; but there is cause for hope, too. Some of the things that lead me to have some hope are: the innate kindness of humanity; humanity's desire to live and let live; desire to help people; the age-old idealistic hope for peace; the prophet, who pictured the day when we will beat our swords into plow shares and our spears into pruning hooks. More people now realize the horrors of war than for a long time because the last war was nearly a total war. We have now hydrogen bombs twice as strong as the one that wiped out an island in the Pacific. We have atom bombs twenty-five times as strong as those used in Japan. And do no let us ever forget that our world is one world, and there is no way we can get out of accepting our responsibility. There is no way we can escape the consequences. When world war comes again (if it does come and I hope it doesn't), it will be more than ever a total war. There will be no safe neutrals, either nations or individuals. We will all

be in that war – we and our children, the old people and all the rest. The Leader-Post, on December 30, on the editorial page, quoted F. Blatchford Ball. Here is a quotation from his article:

“Wars are not run on the lines of Sunday school picnics and you cannot set up a system of international rules to govern warfare; ‘no holds barred’ will increasingly be the motto in any future wars, if we drift into them.”

And I think that is right. War is a negation of law and order; it is the role of the strong. Somebody may say, “Well, poison gas was outlawed during the last war, and we didn’t use it.” That’s right, we didn’t use it, but we used the atom bomb, and if war breaks out again we will undoubtedly use the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb. I think we have to get back to some fundamental thinking. My hon. friends will allow me even to quote Scripture, I suppose, and this is the passage that I would like to quote:

“Put up again thy sword into its place, for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.”

Mr. Speaker, with the A-bombs we have, the hydrogen bombs we have, the aeroplanes we have today both on this continent and in the other hemisphere, these words take on a new meaning and have a new emphasis. It is more true now than ever it was in the history of the world before that whoever takes the sword will perish with the sword. The knowledge of that fact may give us some time, may be of temporary benefit, to stop any outbreak for a short while. When one of our planes takes off with a load of bombs on a mission to drop them on some other country in the world – everybody would say it would be Russia today; immediately that plane takes off on that mission, we are doomed. And the reverse is true: Immediately a Russian plane takes off with a load of atom bombs to drop on the American continent, they are doomed, too. Realization of these facts should not drive us to despair. If they are used properly then can probably give us some time and they should strengthen our determination for positive action to prevent war.

I am convinced, and I think all members of this House would agree, that nearly all the people in the world want peace and security. I do not think that in anyplace you could find masses of people wanting war. Everybody knows the consequences of war; nobody wants it. Then what is wrong? What is the trouble that we appear to be making so little progress towards security and peace? I believe one mistake we have made has been in the general approach to the problem; we have been wrong in many instances. I believe that too many people have lost faith and have come to the conclusion that war is inevitable, and when sufficient of us lose faith and believe war is inevitable, we will have war.

Again, I would like to quote Mr. Blatchford Ball, in the Leader-Post, when he said:

"We on this continent are rapidly being driven by various kinds of propaganda to the place where the average man is convinced of the inevitability of war with Russia."

It is only a little while ago when we were told in the press that we now have on this continent bomber planes capable of dropping atom bombs on Russia and returning without refueling. Why name Russia? Why name any country? Imagine if we saw in a Russian newspaper the statement that Russia now has planes capable of carrying atom bombs and dropping them on Canada and returning without refueling. How would we feel? You see, that is not the way to make for goodwill and peace, to practically point to a nation and say "we are convinced that we have to lick you". I was shocked, about seven years ago, when I made a trip to Churchill on Hudson Bay. There were a lot of American troops up there at that time and I was talking to one of them, and in the conversation this fine-looking American soldier made one remark that shocked me. He said, "We have to lick Russia." When you take that attitude it is probably coming to come true. An American senator once said, "Let's bomb Moscow and be done with it". Well, if we did we would, in all probability, be done all right – both we and Moscow!

I do not believe that the case is that hopeless. I do not believe we have to give up. Sir Winston Churchill made a speech in May of last year. I never saw it in the paper, but I happened to come upon a part of it, and this is what he said:

"It would, I think, be a mistake to assume that nothing can be settled with Soviet Russia unless or until everything is settled. A settlement of two or three of our difficulties would be an important gain to every peace-loving country."

Listen to this, Mr. Speaker:

"It certainly would do no harm if, for a while, each side looked about for things to do which would be agreeable instead of being disagreeable to each other. We all desire that the Russian people should take the high place in world affairs which is their due, without feeling anxiety about their own security. I do not believe that the immense problem of reconciling the security of Russia with the freedom and safety of western Europe is insoluble. Indeed, if the United Nations organization had the authority and character for which its creators hoped, it would be solved already."

None of us can very well quarrel with that. Since that time a conference has been held, the first one in a long time. That conference did not solve the German problem; but that conference has not been a failure. Further conferences are in the making. When I was in Calgary recently, I picked up the Calgary 'Herald' and I found a short quotation of John Foster Dulles of the United States. He said:

"If conferences can do nothing better than to create new conferences and the new conference can do nothing better than to create more new conferences, the whole conferences method will become an object of ridicule and we with it."

I do not agree with that. The choice we have is whether we will try to settle our differences with conferences or with war. There is no other choice, and if we have any hope of avoiding war we must have more conferences. Sure we must be strong; but "put up again thy sword into its place" – don't throw it away, keep it sharp, but put it up into its place. Let us use our time, whatever time we have, to try to understand those people who might, if war comes, be our enemies.

The Russian people have never tasted democratic freedom as we know it. They have never had the privilege and opportunity of living under democratic freedom as we know it here today. They have not behind them the history of centuries of broadening down and spreading of freedom from generation to generation. Their government – the Russian people look on their government, whether it is good or bad, and they still look on it that way, regarding it as something of a super-natural power, foreign to them, not a part of them. Lionel Shapiro, a journalist, had the opportunity to talk to nine Russian scientists while he was crossing the Atlantic on board ship, and he spoke in 'MacLean's Magazine' about it – in the issue of December 1. And on this very subject he says:

"There is among the people of Russia no sense of participation in the government, not even the illusion of identification with the national will. It seemed to me, after talking to these men, that the Kremlin is something remote, above and beyond the centre consciousness of the people – an inaccessible shrine containing mystic, supernatural beings, who proclaim the laws, fix the national destiny and need not answer to any man on the manner of succession to the office of the all-highest behind the thick walls of the Kremlin."

That situation is different altogether from the way we live and we who have had the privileges of living with democracy, of enjoying freedom, have far greater responsibility than those people who have never had these privileges. Don't forget that.

Mr. Loptson: — You are supporting it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Much more is expected of western democratic people than of people who have never had these privileges of democracy. It is well to understand the people with whom we have to live. Again I want to quote from Lionel Shapiro's article on the nine Russians. Listen, Mr. Speaker, these are the words of one of the Russian scientists. He says:

"The government of the Soviet Union is creating the conditions for peace. How can the government of the Soviet Union wish for war when the country is just now beginning to recover from the last war? There will be war only if the Americans start a war. Malenkov is working for peace. This is obvious to everyone in the Soviet Union; it is not a point that is open to argument; it is too obvious. You must see for yourself what Malenkov is doing every day to create the conditions of peace."

Now I do not believe that that scientist was right in making that statement any more than you do; but the important thing is that we find out what the Russian people are thinking, and if they are thinking and believing things are wrong then we must take steps to create conditions that will enable them to get the proper information – and war cannot do that. Truth is one of the first casualties when war comes.

Here is another extract, it is a short one:

"When a person is invited to the Soviet Union,' he replied, 'he is allowed to travel everywhere except possibility to a few military zones.' Then Shapiro says: 'but he is escorted'. The Russian scientist said, 'If he is an American, yes. You cannot blame the government; it is not the Soviet Union that is surrounding the United States with military bases. There are no Soviet airfields in Mexico and Canada, but there are many American fields all around the soviet border. The Americans have placed themselves under suspicion.'"

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that when an American senator says, 'Let's bomb Moscow and have done with it', that when we are brandishing our swords, our weapons, and saying we have planes that can bomb Russia and return, they have some grounds for believing that. I hope they are wrong. I believe they are wrong; but that isn't the important thing. The important thing insofar as making progress towards peace is what they think and we have to do something about that to create better feeling. So there are these two main points to remember: first of all, the relations between the Russian people and their government is not like ours at all; and secondly, this belief of the Russian people that the Americans will start a war. As long as they believe that we won't get very far.

We have thousands upon thousands of Russian people living here in Saskatchewan who came to this country from Russia years ago. Quickly they fitted into their place, took part in our democratic procedure and they are good citizens. You cannot tell me that all of the fundamentally good ones came to this country, and all the fundamentally bad ones stayed at home. They are misled, I believe, sadly misled; but fundamentally, people who are as good as the people who came here, people who want

to do their part and who want peace and security . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Who misled them?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, they have been misled for centuries. The Czars misled them and then the dictators; the modern dictators misled them, just like Hitler misled the people of Germany. But the fact that they are misled does not make it any more right for us to kill them off. The Liberal party is misled too, but I don't want to kill them off. I don't even want to dissolve them.

Mr. Loptson: — You can't!

Mr. Danielson: — You don't have to worry about that.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I want to read to you again that quotation from John Foster Dulles, and instead of using the word 'conference' I am going to use the word 'war' and see how it fits:

"If war can do nothing better than create new wars and the new wars do nothing better than to create more new wars, the whole war method will become an object of ridicule and we with it."

Is it not fitting? What we want is conferences, and a chance to talk, to remove that suspicion. If we on this continent are under suspicion that we are going to attack them, before we can get any place with making peace and security in this world that suspicion must be removed; and that can only be done by our relations with them, by conferences and by talk. International insecurity is the greatest weapon, the greatest power that any dictator can have and if we want to make any dictator subject to the scrutiny of this people, the greatest thing we can do is to remove the threat of insecurity. As long as the dictator in Russia or anyplace else can make the people there believe that the United States is going to attack them he can get away with that dictatorship, and the people of Russia will never think of any change of form or any advance in their government. They haven't got time. They are afraid. Fear will have conquered. And it is for the very same reason, because of the fear and the cold war, that Senator McCarthy in the United States gets away with his stuff, too. He could never get away with calling the leading men in the nation traitors if it were not for that fear and the cold war. That is the only reason he gets away with it. So if we are not in favour of dictators let us take away, to the greatest extent we possibly can, any suspicion, any fear, that we on our part will attack.

This world set up the United Nations in 1945, and it is good to look back at its origins; and I just want to read very briefly from the U.N. Charter. Listen to the first sentence:

"We, the peoples of the United Nations, determine to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" . . .

And then later on:

"and for these ends: to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, and to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and to employ international machinery for the promotion of economic and social advancement of all peoples . . ."

Sure, it is idealistic. I think it is practical too, provided the United Nations has power to carry out some of the responsibilities which have been laid on their shoulders.

In the generation before, we organized the League of Nation with the highest hopes, but with moral authority only, or almost only moral authority, and we gradually saw it fade out of the picture and fail. The United Nations has a little, but not much, more than the same moral authority which the League of Nations had. I was reading a book by Albert Einstein recently and I want to give you one to two short quotations from his book. Albert Einstein, one of the greatest minds in the world today, says:

"The United Nations organization is now in the process of being tested. It may eventually emerge as the agency of security without illusion that we so badly need, but it has not as yet gone beyond the area of moral authority as, in my opinion, it must."

And again he says:

"There is, in my opinion, only one way out. It is necessary that conditions be established that guarantee the individual state the right to solve its conflicts with other states on a legal basis and under international jurisdiction. It is necessary that the individual state be prevented from making war by a supranational organization supported by a military power that is exclusively under its control."

And again he says:

"We shall be able to solve the problem when it will be clearly evident to all that there is no other, no cheaper, way out of the present situation."

I think that is true. Today, the nations are better prepared to wage war than they ever were at any previous time in the history of the world, when we had what was called peace. I think it is probably true that either the U.S.A. or the U.S.S.R., on fairly short notice, with atom bombs could destroy numbers of cities in the world, probably half of the great cities of the world. I am not suggesting that we scrap these armaments now; but I am suggesting that, if we rely on

national armament to establish security and peace in this world, we are going to be tragically disappointed. In all past history great armaments, in every case so far, have eventually led to war. The old theory of the balance of power finally breaks down. It may give us time; it may postpone war, but it certainly can never bring peace and security to this world. Again, I would like to quote from Mr. Einstein, very briefly, and he says this:

“However strong national armaments may be, they do not create military security for any nation, nor do they guarantee the maintenance of peace.”

I do not want to weary you with the story, but I think it is evident to everyone that the solution is not in national armaments; that we must have an international body with an effective police force to maintain peace in the world. And right here on this question there comes a test for us. We think we are advanced, we think we are progressive in our thinking. Are we ready for the test? – because the United Nations cannot get any more power than it has today unless somebody else gives up some power. Before the United Nations can have more power, the nations will have to surrender some of their sovereignty, and the nations will have to admit that they no longer have the right to declare war, that they no longer have the right to maintain armaments. That may be still quite a long way piece off, but let us not kid ourselves that by national armaments we can obtain security. Disaster will probably be just as great for the victor as for the vanquished in the next war. I was glad to hear President Eisenhower reported, the other day, as emphasizing the importance of the United Nations as a place to carry out certain ideals and objectives. If we could really get operating the ideals and objectives set out in that Charter it would be worthwhile.

I was glad to hear our own Prime Minister, the Rt. Hon. Louis St. Larent, reported as saying that the nationalist government of China does not represent the masses of the people of China. He said we must recognize the government China gives itself. Let's not be foolish about these things; let's recognize facts. The nationalist government of China is on the Security Council and what does it amount to, today, on the island of Formosa? In all probability there is where it will always remain. You see, we ‘missed the boat’ when we let the Communists conquer the revolution in China, and if it had not been for some of the ultra-reactionaries and had they not been willing to take the advice of Stilwell and Marshall, the generals who were operating in Asia, that revolution in China, which was a necessary revolution, could have been taken over by the western world and made into a democratic affair. Instead of that, the ultra-conservatives would have nothing to do with it, and the Communists walked in and took it away from us. The skies are dark today, Mr. Speaker, very dark.

Mr. Danielson: — Where was Great Britain at the time?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . and there is no use kidding ourselves that our world problems are well on the way to solution, because they are not; but there is, undoubtedly, some gleam of light.

Again let me say “put up again thy sword in its place.”

Where is its place? I think its place is in the hands of the United Nations, and I hope that, some day, we can used the sword which represents the power behind international law and order in the United Nations. It isn't going to be easy. We may fail. I don't know; but I do feel that there is hope, that there is a chance; and as long as there is the faintest chance I think it is up to us to do our best to see that we win. We will need skill and knowledge. We will need love and brotherhood instead of hatred. We will need above all faith and courage, instead of despair and fear, if we are going to win.

I mentioned before that these matters are not provincial affairs, but I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what will it profit us to save our province and to lose the world? What good will development of resources do? What good will health services do, if we lose this cause in the world today? I believe that in every provincial legislature and in every parliament, someone should speak in support of our national government doing good positive things for peace. We should have no division on this question. I do not think there is much difference in our philosophy on it. None of us agree with dictatorships. We all believe in democracy; we all want peace and security for this world, for ourselves, for our children and for their children.

I have tried to talk on this subject because I believe it should be mentioned and not just as a Canadian citizen but as a citizen of the world, and we have to regard ourselves as more than Canadian citizens – as citizens of the world. For truly, we, the citizens of the world, today hold our fate in our hands as we never did in the past. We are the master of our fate; we are the captains of our souls.

The question being put on the motion for the address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, it was agreed to by 39 votes against 9.

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