

*The Address—Mr. Argue*

In commenting on the much mentioned speech, another gentleman who interests himself in social security of a different form, namely, Mr. H. H. Hannam, gave a press report based on press reports of my speech. He asserted that large numbers of Canadians have no chance of ever providing their own security without government help. I submit, sir, that is of course untrue, except in the narrowest personal sense, and even then only for the unfortunate minority. The shattering truth is this, that this condition could become true if we continued to take his advice and the advice of those of like mind. The cost of his kind of security has to be borne by all of us. It could be that his ideas would reduce all of us to a position of dependence on government for any measure of security; and if that happens the ultimate result will be no security at all.

**Mr. H. R. Argue (Assiniboia):** I listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. member for Winnipeg South (Mr. Mutch). I am sure there are many people in Canada who will be sorry to hear him reiterate what he said at the now famous board of trade meeting. He seems afraid of placing more people, as he says, on the government payroll. I am sure that the old age pensioners of Canada would be very happy indeed if they were on the government payroll as are the hon. member and myself. But I would say to him that if he makes many more speeches like that probably the electorate will take him off the government payroll.

**Mr. Mutch:** Will the hon. member permit a question?

**Mr. Argue:** Yes.

**Mr. Mutch:** Did the hon. member get anything out of what I said in my recently concluded remarks which would indicate any unfriendliness on my part, or on the part of anyone connected with me, to the plight of the old age pensioners?

**Mr. Knowles:** No, just unsound judgment.

**Mr. Argue:** As I understood the hon. member, he is opposed to the removal of the means test.

**Mr. Mutch:** I never mentioned it. I suggest that my hon. friend read the speech. If he could not hear it I apologize.

**Mr. Argue:** If I can get nothing more from reading it than I got from listening very carefully I doubt whether it would be worth my time.

As other hon. members have done in this debate, I wish to congratulate most sincerely [Mr. Mutch.]

the mover (Mr. Larson) and the seconder (Mr. Dumas) of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I believe both hon. members did credit to themselves and to their constituencies. I was happy to see the hon. member for Kindersley move the motion, particularly because he comes from my own province of Saskatchewan, and I was glad to see our province recognized in that way. I was glad also to see that a farmer, and a young farmer at that, was chosen to move the address in reply.

I had intended originally to speak on the problem of soil conservation and land utilization and to indicate that we really do need a comprehensive program of forest, land and water conservation. Our resources are being depleted at a rapid rate and it is high time that this government, in co-operation with other governments and public organizations, embarked upon a program of soil and forest conservation. I would recommend to hon. members of the house an excellent article on this subject in the *Agricultural Institute Review* of January last by Mr. C. Gordon O'Brien, general secretary of the Agricultural Institute of Canada. The Agricultural Institute of Canada is composed of some 3,200 trained agriculturists. They feel as an organization that this nation can afford no further delay in dealing with the problem of land use and conservation.

I turn now to the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) made yesterday in this house. I noticed the minister said that he was glad that the press had quoted him correctly during the election campaign and at other times. I was interested to note yesterday that he did not attempt to deny the press reports that have been made from time to time. It seems to me that the Minister of Agriculture says all things to all men. It appears that the Minister of Agriculture, along with other members of the cabinet, was guilty of making statements during the election that they have since contradicted. I should like to quote a statement made by the Minister of Agriculture at Indian Head on June 24, 1949, as reported in the *Leader-Post* of January 27. It reads:

Refusal of the Saskatchewan C.C.F. government to pay its share of the trans-Canada highway is one of the reasons for delay in finalizing plans for its construction, agriculture minister Gardiner told a political meeting here Friday night.

The Minister of Agriculture said that the Saskatchewan government was the reason for the delay in finalizing the plans. I should like to quote from a letter written by the Minister of Resources and Development (Mr. Winters), in charge of the trans-Canada highway, to the