

*The Address—Mr. Coldwell*

construct buildings for one another and produce food for one another. In that way we would not be so dependent upon our foreign markets. We are down on our hands and knees today praying that Russia will not raise the iron curtain, and that Mr. Stalin will not put his arm around Mr. Churchill and say, "Nonsense; rearmament is over." Because, if he did that, what would happen? The English would be buying wheat from Russia, and other commodities from other places. In those circumstances what would happen in this country with its population of fourteen millions, and now keyed up to supply forty millions or fifty millions? All hon. members know what would happen. We would see one of the greatest slumps Canada has ever experienced. That is what would happen, and those are the facts.

There is ground for criticism when we see the government hesitating to pay the veterans that to which they are entitled, and when we see the government procrastinating about the building of a dam to which the people of Saskatchewan are entitled. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I say nothing could be more appropriate than to visualize and to hear that popular song, "Sailing down the river on a Sunday afternoon," because that is exactly what this government is doing.

**Mr. M. J. Coldwell (Rosetown-Biggar):** Mr. Speaker, rising to speak in the debate at this stage I wish first of all to say that we, too, support the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch). We were disappointed when no legislation was foreshadowed in the speech from the throne which would give any hope to our veterans, their dependents and widows across the country at a time when the mounting cost of living makes it necessary to do something more than has been done for them.

So much has been said about it, and so many excellent and eloquent speeches have been made, that I intend merely to leave the matter there and to add that we are wholeheartedly in support of the subamendment and will vote for it, if it reaches a vote. I would hope however that the plea made this afternoon by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low), that the government give an assurance to the house that this will be done now, would make the pressing of the subamendment unnecessary. That, I suggest, would be a most satisfactory outcome of the moving of the subamendment.

What I would say particularly this afternoon is this, that I think sometimes members in all parties are something less than generous to those who have preceded us in the

house, and perhaps to members of other parties and groups in the house, when they attempt to take to themselves credit for the successful fruition of seed sown and projects suggested by persons other than themselves or their parties.

Last night I listened to the opening remarks of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Martin). I did not hear all that he said, because I could not remain longer, but I did hear him give deserved credit to Senator King who piloted the first old age pension bill through this house after, indeed, the Senate had turned that legislation down at the beginning. But may I remind the hon. member that that legislation was promoted, not by the Liberal party, but rather by two hon. gentlemen who were elected by the citizens of Winnipeg to represent them in this house. They were a former member for Winnipeg North Centre, in the person of the late J. S. Woodsworth, and a former member for Winnipeg North, Mr. A. A. Heaps, who I am glad to say is alive and well.

Those of us who know the story, of how that bill was introduced because of the necessity of obtaining the votes of these gentlemen in 1926, know where some credit at least should be given by those who today take the credit for this legislation. I remember very distinctly myself in 1925 being a candidate for parliament and being defeated—yes, and indeed losing my deposit—in the city of Regina. At that time I was urging the bringing into effect of old age pension and unemployment insurance measures. As a matter of fact I had just returned from a visit to Britain, and I remember the extent to which it was said that I had picked up these ideas in Britain, and that Canada, a new country, had no need for this kind of social legislation which had originated in European countries.

And so I say that when we are thinking of this type of legislation we should remember not only those who finally had the opportunity, after long years of public pressure, of putting the legislation on the statute books of this country. Let us also remember the efforts of those who pioneered such legislation in days gone by.

On Monday evening I listened to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), who made this statement regarding the South Saskatchewan river scheme, in which some of us have been interested for the last thirty years or so:

The reason that I immediately agreed is because I have been the promoter, so to speak, of this project. Everyone admits that, both east and west.