

sibility for the welfare of the people and in order to discharge that responsibility must assume control of all their activities.

It is significant that in reality the Russian people have few of the rights guaranteed to them in their constitution, while the Canadian people have them in abundance, even though they are not guaranteed. The reason, of course, is that material gain and economic security simply cannot be guaranteed by any government. They are the result and reward of hard work and industrious production. Unless the people bake one loaf of bread for every citizen, the government cannot guarantee that each will have one loaf to eat. Legislation can be written, laws can be passed, but unless the bread is produced it can never be distributed.

Why, then, do Canadians bake more bread, manufacture more shoes and assemble more television sets per capita than Russians? They do so precisely because our government does not guarantee these things. If it did, there would be so many accompanying taxes, controls, regulations and political manipulations that the productive genius that is America's would soon be reduced to the floundering level of waste and inefficiency now found behind the iron curtain. I should like to quote Thomas Jefferson who, in his first inaugural address in 1801, said:

With all these blessings, what more is necessary to make us happy and prosperous people? Still one thing more, fellow citizens—a wise and frugal government which shall restrain men from injuring one another, which shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labour the bread it has earned.

The principle behind this philosophy of labour can be reduced to a rather simple formula. First, economic security for all is impossible without widespread abundance. Second, abundance is impossible without industrious and efficient production. Third, such production is impossible without energetic, willing, eager labour. Fourth, this is not possible without incentive. Fifth, of all forms of incentive, the freedom to attain reward for one's labours is the most sustaining for most people. Sometimes called the profit motive, it is simply the right to plan and to earn and to enjoy the fruits of your labour. Sixth, this profit motive diminishes as government controls, regulations and taxes increase to deny the fruits of success to those who produce. Seventh, therefore any attempt through governmental intervention to redistribute the material rewards of labour can result only in the eventual destruction of the productive base of society for more than the ruling elite, and that is quite impossible.

● (1730)

The following is a report as recorded in the *Corydon, Indiana Republican* in 1966 on Socialism in Saskatchewan. It reads in part:

For a period of 20 years, from 1944 to 1964 Saskatchewan, Canada, across the border from Montana, had a socialist government, about the only one in North America, except Castro's. Here is an account of that stewardship in the words of the present premier of Saskatchewan, the Honourable W. Ross Thatcher.

Mr. Rodriguez: No more trips to Cuba, Ken.

Mr. Hurlburt: Not with you. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Thatcher is quoted as saying:

The Address—Mr. Hurlburt

In 1944, the socialists said they would solve the unemployment problems by building government factories. They promised to use the profits to build highways, schools, hospitals and to finance better social welfare measures generally. Over the years they set up 22 so-called Crown corporations. . . . By the time we had taken over the government, 24 months ago, 12 of the Crown corporations had gone bankrupt or been disposed of. Others were kept operating by repeated and substantial government grants.

During the whole period the socialists waged war against private business. The making of profits was condemned as an unforgivable sin. What was the result? Investors simply turned their backs on the socialists. Dozens of oil companies pulled up stakes and moved out. Gas exploration ground to a complete halt. Prospecting in our vast north became almost non-existent.

During the period Canada was experiencing the greatest economic boom in her history, Saskatchewan received only a handful of new factories.

An hon. Member: Did Bob Stanfield write this?

Mr. Hurlburt: No, he did not. A good Liberal premier, Ross Thatcher, wrote it. It continues:

After 18 years of socialism, there were fewer jobs in manufacturing than existed in 1945—this despite the investment of \$500 million in Crown corporations.

During the period more than 600 completely new taxes were introduced, 650 other taxes were increased. Per capita taxes in Saskatchewan were soon substantially out of line with our sister provinces—one more reason why industry located elsewhere.

The socialists promised to make Saskatchewan a mecca for the working man. Instead, we saw the greatest mass exodus of people out of an area since Moses led the Jews out of Egypt. Since the war, 270,000 of our citizens left Saskatchewan to find employment elsewhere.

If there are any Americans who think that socialism is the answer, I wish they would come to Saskatchewan and study what has happened to our province.

The Saskatchewan story deserves to become classic in the annals of political science and a study course in college classrooms throughout the United States.

The economic and social cannibalism produced by this communist-socialist idea will destroy any society which adopts it and clings to it as a basic principle—any society. In Canada we have travelled a long way down the soul-destroying road to socialism.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) and I went to Cuba together this year. We visited Fidel Castro for 3½ hours. We saw where the government had taken over 70 per cent of the land. We found out that they were highly mechanized, with 23 per cent of the equipment being Russian, and that taking the land away from the farmers resulted in a drop in production. My friend from Nickel Belt who represents the socialist party thought this was a great way of life, but I did not want any part of it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hurlburt: As Henry Grady Weaver wrote in his excellent book *The Mainspring of Human Progress*:

Most of the major ills of the world have been caused by well-meaning people who ignored the principle of individual freedom, except as applied to themselves, and who were obsessed with fanatical zeal to improve the lot of mankind—in the mass through some pet formula of their own—

The harm done by ordinary criminals, murderers, gangsters and thieves is negligible in comparison with the agony inflicted upon human beings by the professional do-gooders who attempt to set themselves up as gods on