

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

Fourth Session — Tenth Legislature
7th Day

Friday, February 7, 1947.

The Assembly met at 3:00 o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. J. Gibson (Morse) for an Address-in-Reply.

Mr. A. T. Procter (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, it is not often that the Hon. Premier and myself travel along the road to Damascus together and may I assure him that when one of us takes the wrong road it will not be me.

It is a great pleasure to me today to join with him in the tribute that he paid to my Hon. Leader, Mr. Patterson, who is about to retire from public life. May I also congratulate the Premier on the difference between the tone of his remarks in that regard and that of the Minister of Education who spoke to us yesterday. Sir, it is a matter of great grief to this group that we are to lose our House Leader. I think that the Member for Arm River and myself are now, with his single exception, the Members who have been longest in continuous service in this House and during that period we have been associated with him when he held the reins of office as Premier and even more closely associated with him since this small group has been in Opposition in this Government. There are certain tributes that public men who are to establish themselves in public life must have and our Leader has had all those: honesty, sincerity, judgment and ability. Those who do not have to pass through what this group is passing through at this time will never know how close are the ties that bind us in political life particularly under the circumstances in which we have had to carry on here. May I say to you, Sir, that he will leave public life with an honored name, an honored place and an esteem from the people of all groups of the Province of Saskatchewan that any man might well envy. May I say also that we in this group desire him to know that while we bow to his decision to leave us, we regret deeply, as we regret the leaving of a brother, the fact that he has made that decision. There will be again Liberal Governments in this province when this new party is gone and forgotten. There will not be in this province in the Liberal Party one who is more entitled to honor and consideration, to be held up as an example to those who may come after us, than will be my Hon. Leader.

Now, Sir, I'd like to say just a word of congratulations to one of my own constituents who is here with us again after his second time having engaged in the defence of his country. I refer to the Sergeant-at-Arms, Mr. Mullin. I am glad, indeed, to see that he is back in his own old place here and I hope and I wish for him every success in it.

I now turn to welcome, Mr. Speaker, the new Member from Morse (Mr. Gibson). It is true that I did everything in my

February 7, 1947

power to keep him out of this House and to see that he should not have the opportunity to make the address that he did. Nevertheless having succeeded, I welcome him here. I appreciate the nature and the tone of the speech which he made and may I say this to you, Mr. Speaker: I regret that his innocence, his acceptance of all those things which is so common, is so soon to be shattered.

I noticed that there were three new policies on which he congratulated the Minister of Highways (Mr. Douglas) as having introduced in his road system. Now I am sorry the Minister of Highways is not in his place, but when the Hon. Member mentioned those things I looked to see if the Minister was blushing, but he wasn't. Of course, if he had been as innocent as the Member for Morse, undoubtedly he wouldn't blush. Those three things were: first, the sowing of the slopes and borrow-pits to grass. For his information and so that he will not continue to give credit to his Government for the initiation of that policy, may I say that the first occasion that was done was in collaboration between myself, the then Minister of Highways (Mr. Taggart), then the Member for Swift Current and Mr. Thompson. And a great deal of the credit goes to Mr. Thompson of the Experimental Farm, who suggested that we should sow crested wheat grass to see if it would grow in the clay soil after the top soil had been removed. In fact, there were many of the highways where that was done. The second thing, as I remember it, was that he referred to the hundred-foot right-of-way. Now, again, I tell him that that policy was inaugurated during the period that I was Minister of Highways and, once again, he has wrongfully given — as is so common among our CCF friends — credit to the CCF Government for the good works of the Liberals, and the Liberals were full of good works as you know, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Feeley (Canora): — You need credit for all you can get.

Mr. Procter: — Yes, certainly.

Mr. J. Gibson (Morse): — I did not wish to convey the impression that I was claiming credit to the CCF for inaugurating the policy and I would like to ask the speaker: although he may have initiated it was it your policy to continue with it?

Mr. Procter: — Absolutely, Mr. Speaker, and as a matter of fact this land titles at Moose Jaw was your good job, so I think I ought to publish a second job to be done. And then the third thing that my hon. friend referred to in connection with the Highways Department was the placing of gravel on the new grading. The Hon. Mr. Douglas, the present Deputy Minister and myself — these figures are all in the records. I hope the Hon. Member's disillusionment will not be so severe in all the rest of those things which is credited to the CCF as it has been in this occasion. Well my friend says we never built any grades. I've just received a copy of this Highways statement, a report of the Department of Highways, Mr. Speaker, and I was astonished at the amount of money that they'd spent and the little result they had obtained. If my period in the Highways Department does not show that we built more highways, gravelled more roads and regravelled more roads for less money than any Minister of Highways has ever done, then, Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to be shown by the report where otherwise is the case.

February 7, 1947

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal for a few moments with the remarks of the Hon. Member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Howell). It is not necessary for any Member of this group to defend Mr. Tucker. He has shown his ability to defend himself and I should judge from the type of propaganda that has been going on, just lately, and from the severity of the criticisms particularly from the Hon. Attorney General over the radio — who, I may say, might well be described as a mouse in the House and a lion on the radio — that Mr. Tucker has been getting under somebody's skin at least. Let us see whether the picture presented by the Hon. Member for Meadow Lake is the correct one, or whether what was said by Mr. Tucker presented the correct one.

As I remember — and the Hon. Member may correct me if I am wrong — he stated that the present population of Meadow Lake was 2,000 — an increase, I'm not sure whether it was from 950 or 450 in 1939. I have here, Mr. Speaker, the latest bulletin from the Census Department in connection with the population of Meadow Lake — and I will be glad to pass this to my hon. friend — and it shows that the population of Meadow Lake in 1941 was 971 and in 1946 it was 1,440, not 2,000. Would you like to see it?

Mr. H. L. Howell (Meadow Lake): — I would like the Hon. Member to tell us whether he knows that the boundaries of Meadow Lake have been enlarged twice since then? I gave my figures on the boundaries as they are now. He will probably be quoting two different figures for different sizes of Meadow Lake.

Mr. Procter: — Well, I am quoting the latest reports. It is only a bulletin from the Census Bureau that is not even published yet and I would like to tell my own good friend that I understand that he is one of those himself who moved out and lessened the population of Meadow Lake. However, the Hon. Member is probably a little more interested in painting a good picture than are some of the citizens of Meadow Lake.

Now, I have here statements from three of the leading citizens of Meadow Lake. I may tell my hon. friend at the outset that I am not going to give him the names of them, because I know what happens to business men dealing with this Government . . .

Mr. Valleau: — Not any more.

Mr. Feeley: — You are out-of-date.

Mr. Procter: — I hear the Hon. Member for Canora saying something but I cannot distinguish what he says, Mr. Speaker, which is quite often the case, but I don't suppose it amounts to much, as usual. I know what happens to business men dealing with this Government when they make statements which are not pleasing to the Government. One of these gentlemen says:

The CCF Government have been a calamity to Meadow Lake. This Government has killed our lumbering and is killing the fish business. Take these away and we haven't much left.

Another says:

Every merchant in business in Meadow Lake is suffering.

February 7, 1947

The streets used to be filled with trucks. Now in most days you could fire a shotgun up the main drag without hitting anyone.

The third gentlemen — my hon. friends howled before, how will they like this one?

After two years of lunacy under the CCF, the businesses of this town that are left are losing \$5,000 in business a week and the worst is yet to come.

Now these are opinions of three distinguished citizens of Meadow Lake.

Mr. Douglas: — Are those the Liberal executive?

Mr. Procter: — No, they wouldn't be the Liberal executive. In fact I am not so sure that one of them was not a supporter of yours at one time.

Mr. Douglas: — I am pretty sure he wasn't.

Mr. Procter: — A little further from the information that we have been able to get:

250 men who are engaged in lumbering have been driven out to British Columbia and Alberta; 53 joined in the exodus, with more to go to join their menfolk. Two years ago approximately 15 lumber mills were operating within a radius of 30 miles of the town; today, there is one at work trying to eke out a profit from the price the Government-owned Timber Board offers. Operators can sell to no one else. They said the only alternative to losing money and sawing lumber for the Government is to move out — and they moved out . . .

Not to cut out and get out, but to move out.

. . . Truckers, who used to haul lumber from the mills to the railhead have vanished. Several stores and four restaurants used to stay open all night (and I am sure that the Hon. Member for Meadow Lake will know about that) to feed the truckers; now they close before midnight. They say their business has been cut in half.

Now, I don't want to go on painting a black picture up there. I am just going to read a short paragraph more about it:

Are the fishermen doing better with the Government now operating? They say not. On Primrose Lake (and my friend will know that lake northwest of Meadow Lake) where the CCF Saskatchewan Government is the sole buyer of fish, fishermen are receiving an initial price of seven cents a pound for uncleaned whitefish and pickerel. (You can check this). Last year private operators paid 16 ½ cents a pound. At a meeting at Chitek Lake, 40 miles north of Meadow Lake, a few weeks ago, the fishermen were asked how many preferred to market their fish through the Government Marketing Board; not one hand went up according to one of the fishermen who was present.

February 7, 1947

Hon. J. H. Brockelbank (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Who wrote that statement for these men?

Mr. Procter: — I have already explained, Mr. Speaker, why I am not going to give the names. I have had enough experience of this Government myself to know it is no friendly act to disclose the names of critics of this Government to them.

Mr. Douglas: — They used to get cut off . . .

Mr. Procter: — Well, you ought to know. Now that isn't all. In the last election for municipal office at Meadow Lake, the CCF ran a slate, the same as they did in Regina. If my hon. friend from Meadow Lake were right, one would have expected that that slate would have been pretty well returned to office. There was not a single member of that slate returned to office in Meadow Lake and that, I think, itself is the best criterion of whether or not they are satisfied up there with the CCF Government.

Mr. Howell: — We did not run a slate in Meadow Lake.

Mr. Douglas: — We didn't in Regina, either.

Mr. Procter: — I don't know how my hon. friend knows — he wasn't there, nor hasn't been there, and they tell me that they would like to see him up there so that they could tell him what I have been telling the House.

Mr. Howell: — Will you come up with me?

Mr. Procter: — Well, if you pay my fare. No doubt the Government will pay yours.

Now, just a word about the Wilson lease. My hon. friend from Meadow Lake has missed the whole point at issue. I have read that correspondence, read the file and read the letters from my hon. friend the Minister from Natural Resources office. Lawyers often find that when we get into court the evidence doesn't back up what appears in files. I admit that, but let me say this, that on the file there is one of the most regrettable instances of idiotic bureaucracy or one of the worst examples of an attempt to override a man's just right, that in my experience as a barrister — and I have had considerable — I have ever seen.

Now, it has been apparent, the serious thing about the Wilson lease matter is this, it has been apparent ever since this Government took office that they were bound to centralize all authority in their own hands, to take it away from the court and from everybody else and to create here in this Government a little despotic body that would settle all our rights. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is it reasonable or fair that the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources should set himself up as judge and jury to decide the claim of a man, his own tenant, against him, the defendant, as Minister of Natural Resources? Yet that is what this Government and the Minister of Natural Resources is presuming to do. Now today, where the House is

February 7, 1947

interested in it — today it is Wilson with the small trapping lease. Perhaps it isn't a matter of great public concern that one individual appears to suffer an injustice to have been barred from his alienable right as a British citizen in Canada and a resident of this province, to take his case to court where not the defendant is going to judge the justice and right of his claim, but an independent judge or possibly an independent judge and jury. Justice and right — and I know the Attorney General will agree with me — in this province do not depend on the size of a claim or on the standing of an individual. It is the right of the weakest to take his case to the courts and to be assured that he will receive there the same treatment as the richest and the strongest and when this Government arrogates to itself the right to forbid that and to prevent that man going to the court, I say, Mr. Speaker, they are doing a wrong thing.

Hon. J. W. Corman (Attorney General): — Is it not a fact that when you were acting Attorney General you turned down just as meritorious claims for the same reason as we did and do not the files in our office show it?

Mr. Procter: — No, there are no meritorious claims at all. There are certain classes of a case that are sometimes turned down. Oh yes, you can laugh. I know what I am saying. There are certain classes of a case that have been turned down but this is a case of a written contract between the Department and this individual. Now, there are certain claims of various kinds that come that are perhaps not so serious. Let me say this to my hon. friend, the Attorney General, that when he sat there as long as I sat in the chair of Minister of Highways he will agree with me — unless he has changed from what he was when he was back in Moose Jaw. I had reached the conclusion that the time had come when this must be changed. There is not one justice for the high, the middle and the low in the Province of Saskatchewan or the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. Corman: — Why didn't you change it?

Mr. Procter: — Because at that time it would take just as long as it has taken you to get around to where you will see what is happening. Better that there should be a few foolish and unjust claims against the province permitted than that one just claim should be refused. I know that you agree with me, Mr. Attorney General, and as your time goes on you will agree more with me. There was only one country where they had the justice for the high, the middle and the low. Remember what took place, Mr. Premier. There was a revolution and it cut off the heads of those men and I hope the people have cut off the heads of these men that are trying to introduce this here.

The Premier of this province is the head of the greatest corporation and goodness only knows how large it will be before he gets through with it. He has never hesitated to go on the radio, to go in the press, in this House, to blast the large corporation for the inequity of their treatment to the smaller individuals. He has held this Government up as a friend of the common man. I have a picture of how the Premier would talk to the Members of this House if one of these corporations would do what he has done here, refuse that poor trapper the right to take his case to the court. And don't tell me that he hasn't got a claim because I know something about what has happened too.

Mr. Douglas: — What is the claim?

Mr. Procter: — That's all right, I know.

Mr. Douglas: — Why not tell us what the claim is?

Mr. Procter: — It is a claim for breach of his lease — damages for breach of his lease — when I say that the fiat's been returned. This Government says, in the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, that it is going to give us a Bill of Rights. Do you blame me, or other Members, for doubting how much faith and how much security it is going to give us in the Bill of Rights? I say to you, Mr. Speaker, never mind this Bill of Rights. Cease to take from us the rights that were earned for us by our forefathers, earned by ourselves by our own blood and pain and sacrifice and cease this type of conduct for petty political advantage. That's my answer to the Member from Meadow Lake for what he said about the Wilson lease. But, Mr. Speaker, we don't waste time on teal when there is a honker around and I am going on to deal with the Premier.

On Tuesday and Wednesday last, we listened for two and a half hours to the Hon. Premier explain that the speech of my Hon. Leader contains nothing that required answering, it was nothing but criticism, unconstructive criticism, I believe he called it. And yet, Mr. Speaker, as the Premier went on and on, I glanced occasionally at the clock and of that two and a half hour address, one and a half hours nearly — it was just a few minutes short — were taken up in answering that speech and when he got through the criticisms of the Hon. Leader remained just as sound and just as unanswered as they had before he started.

Mr. Douglas: — Mostly sound!

Mr. Procter: — Now I am going to say a word or two to the Premier about probably what was pretty nearly the whole of the first 55 minutes and that was his excuse — because it wasn't an answer — to our charge that the public funds of this province are being used for the political propaganda of the CCF Party. He sought to excuse that charge on three grounds: first, that the media of publicity is in the hands of the capitalists in the Province of Saskatchewan and in the Dominion of Canada and that they were the real economic dictators; second, that the Dominion Government refused his Government the right to purchase a radio station over which they could speak to the people untrammelled by this all-wicked capitalistic press; and third, that if he was doing it, the Dominion Government was doing it on a greater scale and they were dispensing Liberal propaganda. Is that, any one of the three of them, an answer to our charge? Let me say, suppose we admit those three things. Does that excuse this Government doing it? We have no objection to my hon. friend the Premier establishing, in fact he has a sort of a one, a press of his own, I refer to the Commonwealth. I don't mind if he makes it a daily or always brings it along provided it is paid for by CCF believers' money, but I, for one, object strongly to having money collected from me, by this Government, devoted to the teachings of principles that, however, they may appeal to some people are to me anathema, and I don't think it is the duty of a government to do so.

February 7, 1947

Now if we admit that the Dominion Government refused the right to purchase a radio station, I can quite sympathize with the ambition of the Premier to go on the air over his own radio station. I rather like to listen to him, he is a delightful speaker. I only wish, Mr. Speaker, that I had half the gift of words and half the ability to put before this House and the people of this province, the schemes that the Premier has and believe me he wouldn't be sitting there today. But, Mr. Speaker, the only thing that I can take from that is that it doesn't justify this Government in using their funds for political propoganda. What it does is to teach you the severest kind of a warning to the Premier that Government corporations such as the BBC and so on, are not immune from government influence and to see to it that to realize that all his own corporations are probably subject to just exactly the same influence.

You know now, I am getting somewhat along in political life and along in years and I have lost a lot of the bitterness with which I started in in my youth and I want to tell the Premier that regardless of what he may think and regardless of what his Ministers may think, not all the good men and all the brains are in the Liberal Party, more than there is in the CCF. Not all the good brains and honest men are in the Conservative Party. But there are men in every party who will attempt to take and obtain political advantage through political influence. It is just as paramount and just as strong and operating just as harshly against every one of these Government corporations. And if he got that treatment, I don't know whether he did or not, I don't admit that he did, I don't know anything about it, but if he got that that's going on in Saskatchewan right today. And then the third one, if the Dominion Government is using public funds for improper political propoganda — and I say to the Premier to make it known to the people of this province — and they'll take care of the Dominion Government just exactly as they are going to take care of you when we make it known what you are doing. And that is a fair proposition.

Now, I say further to the Premier that when the publication of this Government can be taken down and used in a by-election without change as a piece of political propoganda, that publication has gone further than is justifiable in the expenditure of public funds and I understand, I didn't see it, but it was reported in the press and it hasn't been denied that that was done in the last Portage election in the Province of Manitoba. And there, Sir, is the most wrong thing. I have seen this plot coming out into my office, into the offices of my friends — thousands of dollars being spent in that way and it is not right. The Premier cannot justify it and if the Premier is the man that I hope he is, he will see that it is stopped.

Mr. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, a question of privilege. I don't want to interrupt now but when he said there was no denial of the statement that literature had been sent down to the Portage by-election, is quite incorrect. A denial was made.

Mr. Procter: — Well, I didn't see the denial but I am sure the Premier won't deny that the stuff was there. However, they got it and it came out of this Bureau of Publications. Now, Mr. Speaker, the primary industry of this province is agriculture and I, for one, believe this, that my business

February 7, 1947

as a lawyer and the business of every man of the Province of Saskatchewan, can only be successful as agriculture is successful. I am firmly of the belief that too much of the time of this Government is taken up in pressing forward with their socialistic theories and not enough of the time of this Government is taken up in attempting to forward agriculture. Why do I deal with this?

On Wednesday, I think it was, either Tuesday or Wednesday, the Premier charged this group that we had opposed legislation introduced by his Government in favor of agriculture. I throw that charge back in the teeth of the Premier, Mr. Speaker, and I say that any legislation we have opposed from this side has not been in the real interest of agriculture. He sought to justify that by this Farm Security Act and so forth. I say to the Premier, as I have said before, that it doesn't matter a great deal what the Supreme Court of Canada does to that Act, it's a minor matter. Actually I don't think there are a dozen farmers in the Province of Saskatchewan — and we have had dried out areas in the province ever since it was inaugurated — that have received a \$1 benefit under it. There may have been a few in the Farm Loan Board but those are the ones.

An Hon. Member: — The people don't think so.

Mr. Procter: — Let me say this and now I am going to lay politics aside for a moment and talk to the farmers of this House at least. There is one man that is in a position to know what is the real security legislation in favor of a farmer and that is the country lawyer. You know when I first ran, my CCF friends and others, said what is the use of sending a lawyer to parliament to represent a farming community and I would look down over my audience and I would tell them what the charge was and I would say I can see here in this audience, 20 or 30, according to the size, men who have brought their troubles to me in my office. If it is good business for you to come to my office, it is equally good business for you to send me to Regina and try to cure these troubles. And I have been doing it and the honest farmer Member in this House knows it, whatever side of the House he sits on.

Then there were two Acts passed in this House that do constitute the real basic security of the farmers for his home and for his equipment. Two, and they were both passed by a Liberal Government. The one is The Land Contracts Act, that's the Act whereby the mortgage company can no longer issue a writ when they feel like it. They have to go to the judge and show all the conditions and get permission. And the other is the Limitation to Civil Rights Act and that is the Act whereby some fellow who has paid half the amount of his combine can have a crop failure, instead of being liable as he used to be, to have the machine company come out and take it away, can prevent that procedure entirely. And the cutting out of all these inspection fees and the insurance racket that they have in connection with both hail and fire and all these things are written in the Civil Rights Act and they were the greatest Magna Carta of the Province of Saskatchewan's farmers. I say to you men, I say to you men farmers in this House, forget the others for the moment Whatever government, be it Conservative, be it Liberal, be it CCF, that brings in amendments to those two Acts and they'll have to be amended because we are a progressive people, scrutinize those amendments with the closest of care. Because if there

February 7, 1947

is one credit ever to be given to me when I have retired from public life in the Province of Saskatchewan, I hope it will be the recognition that those Acts are on the statute books and that they were put there and that I had a great deal to do with the putting of them there. That is the one credit, Sir, that I do hope, when I am through with this political life, that will be granted to me.

Now, what about this legislation? I am not going to deal with it specifically. I say that today the young man, and I exclude the young men who are coming under the various soldier settlement schemes, unless he has a substantial financial backing cannot start for himself on the farm and that is due to the legislation of this Government. Every year there is an older group of farmers, like yourself, Mr. Speaker, you are getting up in years and the time will come when you can no longer carry on your farming operations and you want to sell. Now, you have probably done it. I see the Premier grins and I know you have sons, if he hasn't. Now, Mr. Speaker, when those men are not fortunate enough to have sons they have to sell their lands and that land and that equipment represents to them years of struggle and years of toil and they are going to make very sure, when they sell that land, that they are going to get enough to keep them for the few years that are left them. Try and get one, except in a case of a relative or close personal friendship, to sell on time in this province or even with a reasonable cash payment. It can't be done. Give the man half cash at least, most of them all cash, an auction sale, it is all cash. Because of the very legislation that the Premier and his Government have put on here, and there are hundreds of young men who are not fortunate enough to have wealthy fathers, who are not fortunate enough to have farmers in the position, fathers in the position to start them up on the farm. Today, as a result of this legislation they have been relegated to the list of hewers of wood and drawers of water where they ought to be on their own and there isn't a farmer in this House who doesn't know that every word I am saying here at this minute is correct and true.

I say further, the Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley yesterday referred to land getting into large holdings. Of course, it is getting into large holdings. Why? One of the reasons is mechanized farming. Yes! The other reason is that it is only these men who've got a lot of land and who have a lot of sons who can afford to buy this land on the terms at which they can purchase it now and there is being created a series of large farms in the province and the young man cannot get a start. Now I don't know, and I don't like to think this, whether this has been, this type of thing, because I can't think that men are so blind that they haven't seen what is going on, whether there isn't behind this some other influence that is going to attempt to bring it into the situation in Great Britain because we are getting there with big landed groups holding land. And this Government has in the past said, oh you fellows were all wrong, they have ragged us for saying they were going to take away the farmers' land and so forth and so on. They said you are just creating a scare to the people and so on, and along with this at the very moment they were saying all that, Mr. Speaker, they told us we are just the same as the governments in England and you notice how closely they are collaborating with them. They have sent over, established over there some kind of an agency, and so forth, although the Dominion hasn't. But at least they have created a very close association with that government and that government in Great Britain has been

February 7, 1947

dealing with this question and they told their people over there exactly the same sort of thing that has been told to these people, our farmers here.

I am going to read a short extract to show you what is happening over there and I am sure my hon. friend, the Premier, wouldn't object to the source of my authority because I understand that the correspondent in Regina, for this publication is one W. D. Stoufville, the assistant editor of the Commonwealth, so the Premier at least and the CCF Party ought to be satisfied that this is a magazine that is not going to unduly represent what is happening in England. I refer to the issue of Time for June 29th, 1947, and with your permission I propose to read three paragraphs, Mr. Speaker: "Great Britain Basic Revolution."

Britain's Labour Government this week proposed a revolutionary act, in its implications the most sweeping Act since the Soviet Government's decree of forced collectivization of peasants in 1929. It was the Town and Country Planning Bill 1947 drawn up by Lewis Silken, Minister of Town and Country Planning. (See that planning all the time.)

Accompanying the bill was a white paper. Three weeks earlier the Government had published its sweeping rigorous Farm Control Bill, with these measures certain to be heartily debated and certain to be passed, owners and users of Britain's land and everything in, on, under or over the land, still they knew what they were up against and it was plenty. Hereafter a great saving wrought with the British instinct for freedom would read: an Englishman's home is his Government's. Planners had captured the Englishmen's castle. These Bills do not nationalize urban or rural lands outright. But they finally and firmly assert prior government interest in all land and its uses and subordinate all private interests to the Government.

Silken's Bill revolutionizes the whole basis of tenure and use of British land. Private individuals may continue to own property and use it for profit unless and until the national or local government chooses to take it from him at a price set by the Government. But from the day when Silken's Bill takes effect private owners may not alter its present use or sell it for any other use without government permission. If permission is granted (note this, Mr. Speaker), if permission is granted and property value is thereby increased, the Government, not the owner, gets the profit in all or in part.

Now, my hon. friends over there have associated themselves very closely with the Labour Government. They have told us that the ideals of the Labour Government are theirs — that they are working in harmony with them, and I haven't any doubt that very shortly after I have sat down in this House they will get up and tell us, oh yes, you tried to scare the people before with all that kind of stuff. Well, I want to say to the people of Saskatchewan, wake up and get scared, because if that Government in Great Britain went in — it is a Socialist Government — and these people here in this House, who lead this Government, say they are closely allied with it and that their aims are the same, that it is not going to be very long before this agitation crystallizes in this province in the same manner that it did over

February 7, 1947

there and that they will be doing something about the large land holdings and the small ones too, and saying, well we are going to look after the whole thing just as they have done in Great Britain.

Now, my leader, when he told about the unfortunate fellow over there who got three months and four hundred pounds of fine, wasn't referring to the Silken Bill at all. That fellow was prosecuted under the Farm Control Bill and that just shows how far that government has gone.

Mr. Sturdy: — The Farm Control Bill, in what year was this passed?

Mr. Procter: — Well now I can't say because I have a hard enough time keeping up to the laws you fellows pass without keeping up with all the laws that Great Britain passes, but I believe the Farm Control Bill enforced over there, now, if it is, there was one before, but I believe that this one has been greatly amended to put through these regulations. Now don't forget that the Farm Control Bill over there was the War Measures Bill, the same as ours under the War Measures Act only they passed different bills. But I don't care who passed it, that isn't the Bill I am talking to you about. I am talking about the Silken's Bill that has just been introduced. The next step that you take, and I say to you Mr. Minister, you cannot have an economy half socialist and half free. You remember that Abraham Lincoln said you cannot have a state half slaves and half free, it's just the same. It may be, I don't say that you gentlemen sitting in those chairs will be the ones. You are a wishy-washy kind of an outfit of socialists in a way, although I'd hate to see anything worse put in. This thing feeds with power and replacing you there with a band of socialists who will go all the way just as they have done in the Silken's Bill.

I wish to God, Mr. Premier, I wish to God that I was 20 years younger and I could throw out these disabilities and I would endeavor to show my hon. friend, who sits in that chair, whether I'd stop him or not.

An Hon. Member: — Sure and there is many things in it that I agree with.

Mr. Procter: — It seems that what the Member for Last Mountain can't understand is when that outfit in the CCF cracks a whip, and I fancy that they cracked it on the Member for Last Mountain by the way he has kept quiet this Session, when they crack the whip those Members have to keep quiet. But in the Liberal Party a man like Geofry Powers or a man like myself can come in here and fight on the floor of the House with their Premier as I did the first Session I was in this House and I wasn't kicked out or disciplined for it. No, no, no I wouldn't be a Liberal if that was the kind of thing the Liberal Party stood for. But you gentlemen do you remember what happened to you out West in Vancouver? Firey Richardson McDonald, was it, in Brandon? Come the day you will crack the whip or get out, that's not the Liberal policy . . . Oh yes, surely, pardon me. I didn't see the Attorney General on his feet, it is so seldom he gets up.

Mr. Corman: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman

February 7, 1947

if the new leader of the Liberal Party advocates the doctrine of party solidarity and explains it as meaningless, every party member must vote for party action even although it be against his conscience and convictions?

Mr. Procter: — The new leader of the Liberal Party did at Ottawa just what I am going to butt right in on my own speech now to tell you gentlemen of the CCF right here in the House, Members who the CCF elected and some of you Ministers and some not, that you are split into two groups and there is about half of you that are neither more or less an advanced Liberal and the other half of you are regular and proper old time socialists. The quicker you get into where you belong and kick the socialists out into one group and get back into the Liberal Party . . . Back is right. Yes, back, back because socialists who have a little bit of advanced ideas and stay there have risen to preferment in the Liberal Party and I am one of them. Don't forget that Mr. Premier. The quicker you men get back in and help us to fight the sooner we will get rid of this curse that has been blasting this province at the time when it should be doing the best and advancing quicker than any province in Canada. And you know you are right, you are split 50-50. Socialists who ought to go on and join the Communists and the other half just advanced Liberals who should be back here with us. You are neither fish nor flesh nor good bred fowl.

You question "solidarity." There is a certain amount of solidarity. I take responsibility for the sins of my party and I claim the respect and take credit for the good things my party has done. My party has never attempted to gag me nor will Mr. Tucker attempt to gag any man in the Province of Saskatchewan. And believe you me Mr. Tucker himself hasn't been one of these gentlemen that they could crack the whip on and you and I both know it. If there has been one independent Liberal in Ottawa, and there has been a lot of them, he is one of them.

An Hon. Member: — Not when they were voting on the taxing of co-operatives.

Mr. Procter: — That's all right. You know, Mr. Speaker, I can get these fellows up on their feet. I think they are delighted to take up my time because whenever I get up to speak they are just like a bunch of wolves, one trying to take a nip at me there and before I can kick him off another is trying to take a nip someplace else. They don't like it because I tell them the truth and nothing but the truth and they know I can back up what I am telling them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to come to this question of Crown corporations. The Hon. Premier brought in certain figures (now don't go away, Mr. Attorney General — you should be able to take it above all others. Come back, come back, don't leave me, I'll miss you.)

An Hon. Member: — Mr. Speaker, please don't stop him on my account, it delights me.

Mr. Procter: — Now I want to deal with this question of Crown corporations. When the hon. gentleman, the Premier, was dealing with Crown

February 7, 1947

corporations I asked him for a breakdown in the figures and you will remember that he wouldn't give them to me. I think he must have had those figures because I don't see how he could get the total of all the Crown corporations without the details of the corporations individually. However, be that as it may, I didn't get them and will have to get that later on but I think I can tell the Premier where the great part of the profits of the Crown corporations is coming from. It will be rather interesting to see how close I turn out to be right and I think the biggest profit maker of the whole bunch is going to be — yes, I'll give you lots of time to take it down — is going to be the Power Company. I think that will be the boss camp of the Crown companies. Then I think the next one will probably be the Insurance Corporation and then I wouldn't be surprised if the third one is the Government Printing.

I am going to assign the reasons for each one. First let me say this, that the Power Company was something that we were into. I think it is quite proper and I told the Minister I thought it was the proper thing for the Governments to go into. I am glad to see the extension and I don't know how it is going to work out now that they have taken over Canadian utilities because that was something that serves us and I don't think even under the control of the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources the service can be any worse than we have been getting. Actually there hasn't been a rainy night — I am telling you now so that you will make a note of it — when the electric light didn't go off for anywhere from an hour up and conditions were bad. I think they knew they were going to sell it to you and wouldn't do much about it. Conditions had been so bad that we appointed a committee to see if we couldn't tie up with the Manitoba hydro and if you can't give us any better service than the Canadian Utilities did, I hope Mr. Minister you won't treat us like Wilson, but that you will at least give us permission. If we can get permission from the Manitoba hydro to come in to let them bring a line in and serve us. However, I say that power is the proper thing for the Government to go into.

Now about these profits. Why is there profits in those companies? Well first of all, Members of this House know that the rates of all private — look at the Treasurer, he knows that I am on to him, look at him grin — companies were under control of the local government boards and they were allowed enough, high enough rates to pay a reasonable return on their money. Now, Mr. Speaker, when this Government took over all the power companies they took them over and the local government boards at fixed rates, which allowed for Dominion, Provincial and municipal taxes and there was Dominion income tax and there was corporations tax and the municipal taxes of all kinds charged on those lines and when this Government took them over, those taxes as far as the corporations itself were concerned, became clear profit. I have been told and the Minister can correct me if I am wrong that one of those companies, I think it was the Dominion, paid about \$150,000 of tax to the Federal Government which is clear profit to the Minister and he has got that there.

An Hon. Member: — It's a little high.

Mr. Procter: — He says it's a little high but it is so close to right that there is nothing in it. That's \$150,000 that he just shoved into his right hand pocket and he says that this

February 7, 1947

corporation is making a profit and then on top of that there was the municipal taxes and the provincial licenses and all these things. Now to get the true picture of that power company, what we have got to do and to get the picture for the people of the Province of Saskatchewan what we have got to do, is add up all those taxes and take them all off the profits then see where we come out and then compare, when we have got that all done, compare the rates. While I am dealing with Power Companies let me say this, we come from a poor, hard-working community, a small town and we haven't got much money down there and the Canadian Utilities have been paying taxes to us. Now I suggest to the Minister that he had either better reduce our lights and rates — and he tells us he is not going to — or he had better see to it if he wants any votes for his party in the next election, that the grant that he talks about making in lieu of taxes is at the very least equal to what the Canadian Utilities have been paying in all these towns all over the place. Now, I just point that out as a side line, now we come on to the municipal situation.

These taxes, these power companies pay taxes to the Dominion, the municipality, to the province, it is going to be a serious thing for these communities but as far as the people are concerned, so far as this socialistic outfit are concerned, they are going to present the picture to the Province of Saskatchewan as though that was all clear profit as the Premier said yesterday. But I ask the people of the Province of Saskatchewan to consider those statements in the light of what I have said to the Members of this House in the House, Mr. Speaker, and I go to the insurance company, well by what, with little less than strong arm methods. Because you know, Mr. Speaker, how we fought it here the insurance company took over approximately thirty millions of business that was in the hands of the private companies and when it was in the hands of the private companies whose commissions paid to the agents, took it, now they get the commissions on that thirty millions of business and there will be no commissions. So my good friend, the Minister of Social Welfare, I don't know whether he is the man now in charge of that thing or not, but if he is or whatever Minister it is, has got that in his pants pocket to meet the stormy day and, again, on top of that they pay no license fee, they pay no Dominion income tax, nor corporation tax, no municipal tax and so on. Well, if that company under those circumstances won't show those profits I am not going to be very happy about the 13 per cent the Premier talked about. And then we go back down to the Government Printing Company and I hope I haven't suggested something to the Provincial Treasurer, but I don't think I've got the capacity to do it, I think he thought of it long before I did, that's really a matter of putting money from one pocket into the other. I am quite sure that the Provincial Treasurer has seen the rates the Printing Company charged the Government are high enough to balance the thing out and I am sure that if he hasn't done it, the rate of printing will mighty soon go up after I have spoken as I have in this House. I see him making a note about it and I hope he will tell us which is to be the case when he gets up on his speech to deal with this matter.

Now, I want to leave those corporations with that explanation. Speaking, Mr. Speaker, without any of the information we have been trying to get ever since this Government came into power in connection with Crown corporations, I want to come down to my hon. friend, the Minister of Social Welfare's Automobile, Accident and Insurance Act and I am quite sure he will sit up

February 7, 1947

even more than he has already before I have been going very long. I am going to remind this House, Mr. Speaker, that on speaking on that Bill I said it was the greatest hoax that had ever perpetrated on the people of the Province of Saskatchewan under the guise of an insurance measure. And I say to you, today, that the results as quoted in the statement in the paper the other night appear to have clearly proven what I said then was correct. The premiums collected by this Government corporation, the Automobile Accident Insurance Company are in round figures of \$1,300,000 and the losses paid out are \$160,000 with claims outstanding of \$88,000. Now there will be a certain period of the license year to run yet, there will be mighty few cars and trucks and things running for the rest of that period, but I am going to give them an allowance for that and establish it on a normal winter and take the rates as though it would be about the same. They have paid out \$300,000 and he must give the people of the Province of Saskatchewan \$1,300,000. That's the picture.

You know, Mr. Speaker, when I see the Hon. Minister and think that the Provincial Treasurer rose up in this House last year to tell us about these wicked insurance companies and how they collected this small amount of premiums, this huge amount of premiums and paid out these small payments of losses, I say that when I think of that and then see the picture that was presented here in this House I, Mr. Speaker, almost lose faith in human nature. What would they have said to any private corporation that did what they have done? And then they absolutely step out, we told them they didn't need that, we told them they weren't giving us insurance and they haven't. Why the Premier talked about these private corporations that were skinning the non-fur bearing animals, the Premier and his Ministers rather than elect a skinning knife are skinning out with this corporation to an extent that nobody ever dreamed of, is not content with that, they are buying our carcasses to take the . . . Mr. Speaker, and when they get through with that there is nothing left but ashes and disillusion and that's what happened in connection with this company.

Mr. Speaker, I would not object so much if this proposed relief were going to do something for us. What does it amount to? Small reduction of 50 cents, that's 10 per cent on the premiums on the passenger cars and slightly larger. I will give you the benefit of the raise on the bigger cars, slightly larger on the trucks, you'll still have plenty left and then he talks about the benefits of collision insurance. Well, again, I've had reason to know something about these collisions because people being what they are when there is a collision they try to collect out of the fellow that is in the wrong, occasionally they come in to see me, but I didn't rely on my own information. I give you some idea, Mr. Speaker, how it works out. I have a case right now in my office of a man who had a collision right up here on South Railway Street and they bent in his two fenders. They were badly crashed up and they bent his running board and they sprung his doors and the estimated cost was some \$53. Now what kind of an accident is it going to be that is going to have \$100? And so I went to a garage man and I said to this garage man, "What percentage of collision accidents is going to be covered under the new Bill?" As a matter of fact I went to two or three and the best estimate that I got was that out of 20 collisions there would probably be one where the damage is over \$100 and I expect the Minister got the

February 7, 1947

same information and, again, we are just having a kind of a blanket pulled over our eyes with the idea that we are going to get collision insurance. No man would bother with a private company but the Minister is in the happy position, Mr. Speaker, that he and his confrere and associates can say to it that we can't run our cars unless we take them. I know I prophesized to the Minister that every man that was carrying private insurance last year would continue to carry it and I know I did myself and I wouldn't mind betting that the Minister himself did it too, if he carried private insurance at all.

An Hon. Member: — I didn't pay as much as you did. I got it from the Government Insurance.

Mr. Procter: — Well, of course, I suggested before that being connected with Crown corporations might be a measure of political influence, but I am sure you wouldn't take advantage of that. Well, I am going to have a great deal more to say on that subject when the Minister brings down the Bills.

So, Mr. Speaker, you may prepare yourself to be patient, if possible, to listen to some further words on that subject. An increase in death benefits, how many death benefits are there in collisions. There is a small increase in the major accidents. All these things sound like painting a picture you know, you can bring out the effect with a mighty little paint. And that's what the Minister is doing with his improvements to this Bill. I must pass along. The Premier has referred to what he has done for old age pensioners. Well, if he had told us in this House the plain picture of what he had done for old age pensioners, I wouldn't have said a word about it. And I would have liked to have had time — I am not going to take the two and a half hours he did — I would have liked to have had time to go through the whole thing but Old Age Pensions is something that I happened to have had some dealings with as Minister. What the Premier has done for the old age pensioners is that he has given them a \$3 cost of living bonus and he has given them medical and hospital attention free, with the accompanying eye glasses and so forth. And for that, I commend him, I commend him highly. I commended him last year but I do not commend him for having done what I spotted immediately he got on his feet. Take in the year 1943 as the average of the Liberal pension and compare it with what the pensioner is getting now. I pointed out immediately what the old age pensioner's average was. You can have this copy if you want it, it is right in the report and I think it is in his hands.

Mr. Douglas: — I have it here.

Mr. Procter: — The average Old Age Pension in the Province of Saskatchewan as at April 30, 1944, was \$23.02 as compared with \$17.53 as at April 30, 1943. Why couldn't the Premier have used the last figure available — \$23.02 instead of that \$17 figure? You new Member from Morse, just get onto some of these things and see. You can get away with that kind of stuff but in the country where people don't know about it. You can't get away with it in this House and it isn't proper that you should try to get away with it.

Mr. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member

February 7, 1947

has accused me of trying to get away with something. Now the figures are perfectly clear and if the Member wants all the figures right back. He is not giving the average.

Mr. Procter: — I'll give him the average: 1938 — \$16.44; 1939 — \$16.58; 1940 — \$16.76; 1941 — \$16.93; 1942 — \$17.17; and in 1943 the figure I gave and the figure he is giving now. The average, over the term of the Liberal administration is certainly not \$23, it is more likely around \$18. It was increased just before the election, I grant him that, but I think he must accept responsibility for the other years too. Yes, there is the dirty slur brought before the election. The Minister knows perfectly well that we were fighting for that increase all the time that I was Minister of Old Age Pensions and that that matter was discussed at Ottawa at that conference and we finally got the other provincial Premiers who wouldn't consent to the increase. You talk about how we are under control, why I fought with two of my own Dominion Federal Ministers about that thing. They were from other provinces where they regarded this was unnecessary but what I say to the Premier is this, that in every year we were raising it and raising it and I say to the Minister this, that he does well to boast about this increase but first let me cover up the one point I was going to account for the other dollar because he might as well know I know all about this.

At that same conference we raised the income from \$300 to \$425. Now all the adjustments hadn't been made at the time that I left office. I had signed some agreements and I believe it had to be resigned after which is the justification for the Minister of Social Welfare saying that it was done under his reign but everything but the formal affixing of his signature was done and I don't think his signature, as I remember it, is a bit better looking than my own, but the work was all done and the arrangements made. Now, Mr. Speaker, when those adjustments came through the other dollar was accounted for by the fact that we could raise the allowance that much more and that makes the other dollar referred in the difference between \$23.02 and the figure quoted by the Premier.

Well, Sir, about this caveat and he ought to be ashamed to mention the caveat, there isn't a bit of difference in the effect between taking off the caveat and putting on the notice, it has the same effect. It is just a bit of eyewash like so much of the stuff that this Government has done. They have taken off the thing that they call the caveat and they put on the thing they call the notice but the effect of the notice and the effect of the caveat is so close to the same that there is nothing to it. Now, again, don't forget that what never appeared in that figure quoted by the Premier that it was the Liberal Government that got the \$2,000 exempt estate not this Government. But I wonder what the old age pensioner will think about if he happens to pay close attention to what the speaker is saying in connection with him. The same day, I think, the Premier referred to these figures, the gentleman who ran against me and he is a very worthy gentleman, I am glad to see him get a Government position, went into the Government Service. I think he was an awful fool to leave his farm and work for any government and particularly this one, but he went into the Service. The \$3 was a cost of living bonus and in answer to our question I see that gentleman is getting a \$20 per month cost of living bonus. Now \$20 per month is fair for those men, I think that I wouldn't boast as much about what I had done for

February 7, 1947

the old age pensioners. No, I wouldn't boast so much about it. I do say this, that year by year as our finances improved we increased the social services in the Province of Saskatchewan to old age pensioners, to mothers and to widows and so forth and I say that we went ahead with those things at a time when our revenues were so absolutely critical that no man but the financial genius, Mr. Patterson, that sits along side of me could guide this province through those times. I laugh when I think of the Minister of Highways and the happy position he is in. When I saw trays of Government cheques four and one-half feet long, the Provincial Treasurer can go and look in his vault and see the trays yet, filled and signed and set edge by edge in the trays and trays standing that high and we didn't dare to send them out until revenues came in because of the times we were going through. It wasn't this Government's fault and as we got those cheques out of the way and a few of these Bills out of the way before perhaps justly we should have done, we raised these amounts for the social services and you couldn't get up on the floor of the House in those days and say that because it would simply hurt the credit of the province more and more. You, Mr. Provincial Treasurer, go down and get your deputy to show you the trays in which the signed cheques were held for months and then think of the happy position where you are. Yes, if I had been sitting on that side of the House as Minister in charge of Old Age Pensions they would have been rather more than a \$3 increase by now. Now I don't want a purely destructive speech.

An Hon. Member: — Is that a promise?

Mr. Procter: — Absolutely. What I am going to say to you now and I don't know whether you will like it any better than you have liked the rest of it.

An Hon. Member: — I have enjoyed every word of it.

Mr. Procter: — It is going to be something constructive because they have said that there should be something constructive and I am going to start off at a point where the Premier and I were, in one of those few moments, we were sort of more or less together. I wish he were different and I would try and get along with him. I said here that this group in its relations with the Dominion Provincial Conference would see to it that we did nothing to impede his negotiations. I said further that we will assist you in every way when I referred to the Liberal Party at that time and I meant the Liberal Party in this province. I am more than glad to see that the Liberal Party, as it generally does at Ottawa, took the same attitude in trying to get this. I want to say to the Provincial Treasurer and it isn't perhaps all they wish for or all we wish for, but it is a great advance and one that I congratulate them on and having said that I want to say this to them that I hope they won't be like the ungrateful servant in the Bible — the Premier will know all about that fellow.

Now the rural, not the rural particularly, the municipalities have been in exactly the same position with the Provincial Government that the Provincial Government has been in with the Dominion Government. I want to say this, that I don't know how far they are aware of it, but as a result of legislation passed

February 7, 1947

by this Government there has been great additional burdens imposed on the municipality and as a result of other legislation passed by this Government there has been great sources of revenue taken away from the municipalities. For instance, a year or two ago the Provincial Treasurer took all the lands away from the Farm Loan Board and put them into His Majesty's name in right of the Province of Saskatchewan and thereby escaped municipal taxation. And similarly my hon. friend, the Minister of Natural Resources, came down and grabbed off the Canadian Utilities Company and now we will get taxes from the Canadian Utilities and there have been many things like that where the municipalities collected a revenue which is no longer available to them. Now there are other things that have been imposed on. The Minister of Education — and I wish I had time to say a few words to him, too, and it wouldn't be as nice as I have been to the Premier. The Minister of Education remarked that down in the Moosomin constituency there has been a 93 per cent raise in schools that weren't school taxes, I think it was, that weren't in larger school districts and the figure isn't 93.

Mr. Lloyd: — I know the Hon. Member doesn't want to be wrong. I merely said I had taken ten schools which if one totalled them up was a 90.9 increase and that I would not generalize on that and say that there was a corresponding increase in all.

Mr. Procter: — Oh, well, that's pretty close. I'll tell the Minister that there has been a substantial increase in school taxes in every municipality, in every school district practically down there. That isn't in the larger school district because of the fact that we have had to raise the extra money for our teachers and we are glad to do that. And because of the fact that through the years of which I have spoken we weren't able to, and we don't need any Minister of Education to keep our schools in shape, we weren't able to do those repairs. We didn't have the money and as soon as we began to improve, just as this Government raised and improved the social services, so the municipalities went on and the school boards went on to do work that they had had to leave, lay over until they had the money to pay for it. Now, there is all that extra burden and I say to you, Mr. Premier, and to your Government, that it will be an unfair and an improper and a wrong thing if you don't do with those municipalities exactly what the Dominion Government has done with you. At least a third of that money that comes from the Dominion Government should be made available to the local municipalities or failing that you should take off the backs of the municipalities, some of the burdens that are now imposed upon them. Now I can tell the Premier that if he doesn't do it, we will do it when we get back in there. But I say that having received the treatment that he has received from Ottawa he should be just as fair in his treatment to these municipalities. I say to him that at the present time and with prices and costs as they are, it is perhaps possible for our local municipal authorities to carry on, but that it is not possible if we, if anything like hard times of any kind. I say that even now the burden is greater than they should be asked to bear.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to weary the Members and I am certainly wearied myself and I am not in very good shape. I would like to talk to you for another hour like the Premier

February 7, 1947

about some of these statements, but I'll have to bring my remarks to a close. As for the Minister of Education, I am simply going to say this: I was glad he was on the air. When any Minister undertakes to talk to the former Premier of this province and cast the insinuations and the slurs that he cast upon the former Premier of this province, the people of this province will be glad to bear them and I know that they'll resent the Minister of Education's remarks just as keenly, just as deeply, just as sincerely as I do. I want to say to the Minister of Education that it is regrettable that a gentleman holding the views and temperament that he holds and has in the past, apparently should be in charge of the instruction of the youth of this province. I am going to go a little further than that and I am going this far and I am going to say that it will be necessary. I have no children going to school at the present time, but if that's a sample of the kind of teaching that my grandchildren are going to have to submit to, then I shall have to endeavor to correct it in my home which will not make for good relationships between the parent and the teacher.

Mr. Speaker, in view of what I have said I am sure you will realize by now that it is not my intention to support the Throne Speech.

Hon. D. S. Valleau (Active Service Voters Representative): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to begin by tendering my congratulations to the Hon. Member for Morse for the very fine speech with which he started off the debate in this House on the Address-in-Reply. It is always a difficult position, probably no one knows that better than I, because two years ago I was in much the same position and I am quite certain I felt much the way he did. It is always a question whether one should dive into a chilly pool or crawl into it gradually and some people claim that when you dive into it, except for the shock, we are never quite certain just who will win that old argument. Fortunately, or unfortunately, the atmosphere in this House was quickly changed and rather than being chilly I have found it rather, shall we say, heated in the last few days. The Session has reached its mean temperature at a much greater rate than previous Sessions, I believe.

I think that I can join with other Members of this House, the Premier and the Hon. Member who has just taken his seat, in expressing my feeling of regret that a man who has taken part in public life of the province as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, should at so youthful an age decide to retire from public life. It was a surprise to me to hear that he was, when the Hon. Member from Moosomin said, as he did a few minutes ago, that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was about to retire. I found that that was news to me and possibly in that respect he may now be a comrade of myself and the other two Armed Service Members. We also find that our term of life is rapidly drawing to a close and I hope that all the Members of this House will do some thinking about that and at some time in the future be prepared to deliver eulogies to us at some future date. However, I think that we might well make all the noise we can in the time that is left to us and in view of the weather outside I think we should try to add our share of the heat that we can to this Chamber. I do not think, however, that it is our particular function to become engaged in what at times appears to be almost political debates. I am going to try and stick, as fairly closely as possible as I can, to the subject of veterans and the things that this province and this Legislature can do to help

February 7, 1947

veterans. As a representative of the veteran I find that from time to time I must do more than that. As a representative I must try to represent them on all subjects of political import and public importance that come to the attention of this Legislature. We cannot be neutral and we must take a stand pro and con on every issue. Some of these issues are not issues that directly affect the veterans but in this debate as such Members are allowed a fairly wide latitude and I propose to use that width in making a few remarks about the general problem of veterans rehabilitation.

The public attitude during the last two years seems to me to undergo some slight change that the public today doesn't regard the veteran problem with the same urgency as they did before there were so many veterans. There are probably a number of reasons for this, the immediate feeling of relief that the ending of the War has passed a little and it is being replaced by a feeling of general worry about the multitude of civilian problems that face us at the present time. One of the things which we heard some little bit about some few years ago, was the idea that veterans should have a certain amount of preference in employment. The thought was that veterans should come first in the general program of rehabilitation and reconstruction plans in Canada. The main reason that was given for this point of view was that the veterans had performed a service to their country and deserved a reward. I think that probably there were deeper reasons behind this feeling even than that. At the time that the War was still proceeding, Canada was tied to a voluntary system of enlistment for overseas service and many of the men who were serving felt that preference would be shown on their return to the man who had overseas service and throughout the public it was there. I can't say how it started, but I know it was there, that the man who went overseas, volunteered and went overseas, would stand a better chance of securing a job when he came back.

A second reason that people at that time were willing to adopt the idea that veterans, that preferential treatment for the veteran, was that civilian societies throughout the world had possibly what I might call a subconscious fear of the veteran as a group. I am not going to try to psychoanalyze society. I think that as a class the non-veteran or the civilian class of society has a slight fear of the veteran as a class and for this reason also it was suggested that preference should be given. I think neither of those reasons are basic, neither of them are the two reasons why preference should be given if preference is given. The vast majority of the veterans who enlisted and who went overseas did not enlist because they desired any preference; they didn't enlist because they wished to have a job when they came back; they didn't enlist because they wished to be put in a position to cull the rest of society. It is difficult, again, to say why any one man enlists but veterans are the few enlisted because of much higher reasons than simply that of personal advancement. I would say that it is not correct to suggest that veterans are selfish pressure groups. Many times in history groups of veterans have aided the organization and establishment of new forms of government. Some of these have been progressive, some have been reactionary. In knowledge of economics and government the veteran is neither ahead nor behind the average of the particular community in which he finds himself. The significance of the part which the veteran plays in history and in his relationship to governments is the strong sense of solidarity and comradeship which veterans feel

one to the other. The habit of submerging individual desire for the common good.

One of the earliest examples of veterans solidarity that I can think of is the March of the Ten Thousand Greeks under Xenophon. Other examples, the leading part that the veterans in Russia played in the Soviet Revolution, the revolution at that time commenced in the navy. In Germany also, in World War I was the main or one of the factors which helped to bring that war to a close was the revolution of serving them in the German navy. Economic dissolution that followed later and the veterans in Germany came to support the Nazi philosophy there. In the United States the veterans, as groups, have taken an entirely different form. They haven't been political groups, they have been more of a pressure group which acted as a means of securing particular veterans' benefits for particular purposes. This was true from the earliest time of the Grand Army of the Republic which obtained probably the world's best pension schemes for American veterans and set a preference for all the world, to the later times, of the soldier bonus marches where the veterans exerted a pressure upon the governments without actually endeavoring to take over the governments or to change the governments. The point I am making here is that in each of these communities in early Greece, later in Russia, in Germany and in the United States, the veteran movements have assumed the character of the national community in which they were. In Greece, the veterans had a group for the democrats because Greece was a democracy at that time. In Russia he tended to become a revolutionary, in Germany he eventually adapted a fascist outlook, in the United States he stayed out of politics but acted as a pressure group in the same manner as the labor unions and the business organizations and the farmer's organization in the United States.

What I am suggesting is that the veteran possesses in common in all these cases, a common solidarity, a comradeship and a continuing sense of community, that in each case he is no better, no worse than the civilian community and his thinking is similar to civilian thinking. That the significance to us of the veterans as a group, wherever we find them, is that they share the price of political or economic thinking common to the society existing in the time and place where the veterans find themselves. They bring to this outlook the power of organization based upon the feeling of comradeship and brotherhood which they share among themselves as veterans. Unfortunately, many people today are half afraid of this solidarity of veterans and I have found that even in Saskatchewan and even in Canada, people will say to me that a veteran's organization or a feeling of veterans solidarity or the continuing of a veteran outlook is something which may be dangerous and in doing that they can point to the experience of Europe where military organizations composed of ex-soldiers have often helped in the establishment of totalitarian states. I suggest that that is a false outlook, that in Canada wherever veterans' organizations arise they will assume the characteristics of Canadian society and similar approach to the civilians of Canada, the fundamental difference will be that the veterans will have a greater sense of comradeship but another respect if veterans' societies become better or become worse it will not be the fault of the societies themselves, it will be the fault of our community, our civilians and our total community. Again, there is the problem of the preferential treatment for veterans, the pressure groups, a veterans' organization and a group of veterans which suggest that certain things should be done for them as veterans and I am going to suggest that in this respect they are no different than

February 7, 1947

labor union, for example, which suggests that the Factory Act be amended to bring certain advantages to a factory or to factories in general or similarly the labor union might obtain a collective bargaining agreement with an employer which puts it in a good position in a factory, thereby improving its working conditions. When the labor union does that we do not suggest that the rest of the community has suffered but because the labor union has improved its one position, it is discrimination against those workers who do not have collective bargaining. We agree that each step taken, even if it is taken by a pressure group on behalf of its own members, is a step leading to the general advancement of the community because it attempts to raise our sights to improve our outlook.

Similarly, the farmer's organizations did their struggles when they established co-operatives, wheat pools, when they pressed for farm security legislation and for wheat boards. All these social approaches which they carry out on behalf of their own members are steps which if the total are something to improve the outlook of the community, then it is discrimination against those members of the community who do not belong to that particular pressure group. The same applies to veterans' organizations where veterans struggle for decent pensions, for housing conditions and for a proper system of land settlement. In all of these cases, the veterans struggling for progressive ideas on behalf of their own efforts are not restricting or discriminating against the rest of society, in fact, I think that if we looked at every advantage that has been brought to the community by the actions of veterans' organizations and veterans' groups of unofficial organizations, has tended to improve the lot of society, that each concession granted to any group in the community in the end raises the total value of all things in the community. It is possibly a slight step from this to veterans' preference. I personally do not favor the carrying of any preference to any group to an unlimited degree, but I feel that where veterans have suffered a real disability, either by physical handicap or by the handicap of actually being away from the scene, for the years they spend in the court room, that some measure of compensation is due to them and that is the basis upon which I justify preferential treatment, whereas the basis of say the desire of reward for their services.

When the veterans enlisted they did not say they were enlisting because they expected rewards but many civilians, as well, made sacrifices during the War. We cannot adopt, in the future, a policy of rewarding people because if we come to another war I am confident the civilians will be by far the greater, by far make the greater sacrifices or even if we come to the struggles of peace time, which today take on the aspect of war, we find civilians making sacrifices and if we are going to try to reward every citizen in society according to the sacrifice that he or she makes, we are setting for ourselves an impossible task. We might better try to rehabilitate and reestablish every individual to the point that they can become successful citizens in society. That is the basis upon which I justify preference in Civil Service and various types of preference of that nature to the veterans who were overseas. It is making up to them for the time which they lost.

The Veteran's Land Act and measures of that nature I think are things which are beneficial to the whole community and even although at the moment they do not apply to all the young potential farmers, they are developing administrative experience

February 7, 1947

and other types of experience and each man as he becomes a successful citizen in the community is helping all the other citizens.

I do not wish to labor this point because probably I think that we can agree that most Members of this House, in fact all the Members of this House, will agree with everything that I have said. I merely thought that it would bear a repetition because in the West you must, I have noticed, it may be that I am supersensitive or that I have been looking for things that weren't there, but I feel that I have noticed a slight change in the attitude of civilian society to the whole problem of veterans re-establishment. Again, I think that there is an advantage in veterans holding themselves together and coming into the community as a group. It is much easier for a veteran to readjust himself to civilian society if there are other veterans around him.

The most outstanding example of that is the veterans in the universities. We can imagine the spectacle of what a man coming back from the War and going into the university by himself among younger students and trying to go through that university. The difference of age alone, without considering the difference of experience, would present terrific problems to him but we are successfully giving large numbers of veterans the chance to attend universities because they are doing it in a group, they don't have to join the secret societies or the fraternities or associations. They have their own fraternity which is greater than any of the old-time fraternities of the university. They are serious and hard-working, but very good students. They don't have to learn how to live with people, which it has been said is one of the functions of the university, the veterans have already learned that in the school of hard knocks, but I would suggest that this experience, which we are having today in our Canadian community of veterans attending university, is something that is going to profit all the veterans who are attending and in addition it will be of an incalculable profit to the universities themselves. I think that it will come to lead to a greater spirit of democracy and fraternity upon all the campuses or campi — I should use the proper plural, all the campi of our universities and thereby the community itself will benefit by the spirit of comradeship which veterans show as well as the veterans themselves.

I have already referred to the fact that veterans as a group, the pressure of the squatters, for example, and the veterans who marched into the old Vancouver Hotel and the continuous pressure all across Canada, has led to a public appreciation of the necessity of housing which we didn't have before and probably this appreciation will carry over even when the immediate problem of veterans' housing is solved. We will become housing conscious and thereby the whole community will benefit. Another example which springs to my mind is the Matador Co-operative farm. I am not going to speak at much length on this because there is a resolution coming up in the Order Paper which will probably give us a better chance to go into this whole question, but I feel that in Saskatchewan and Canada as a whole, but in particular Saskatchewan, our agriculture industry must progress and we cannot define at any time what the ultimate limits will be. We can't go back into history and find out what they are, we can only learn by our experience, an experience of men who have learned how to have a feeling of comradeship and who co-operate together, in helping to develop

February 7, 1947

a new type of society. At first it appears, to the rest of us, they have been shown great preference in the loans that have been made to them and the efforts that have been made to help them get established. I suggest that that preference in the end will react to the benefit of our whole community and will do more to assist in improving agricultural conditions in Saskatchewan than any other thing that we can do, but the evidence of veterans settling and agricultural settlers throughout Saskatchewan, as a whole, is something that is going to improve both research and scientific agriculture and the sociological point of view involved in agriculture.

The whole problem of land settlement is a very involved problem. The Hon. Member from Moosomin has referred to conditions in England and to the new agricultural policy of the British Labour Government in England. I don't like to deal with contentious problems. I am a very non-contentious person but I feel that we must study agricultural settlement in various parts of the world because as a veterans' representative I cannot overlook agriculture as in this province it is a very fundamental thing. Nothing else will go as far or could possibly go as far towards re-establishing veterans in this province as agriculture and I am just wondering if the situation can survive.

While I was in England, for some little time, I travelled about occasionally and I noticed the type of farms they have there, it was something that I have never seen before. When I left Saskatchewan to go to Ontario I noticed the farms were much smaller and totally different to the type I was used to and I thought to myself, 'my I would like to go to Ontario and buy a lot of these farms, lump them all together and show them how to farm.' When I went to England and saw their little checker-board farms there, I thought, 'what could Saskatchewan farmers show them here!' To tell the truth these reactions are proper reactions because conditions in different parts of the world dictate the type of agriculture which exists there but in England the feudal system or the old system of land and aristocracy had developed a type of agriculture which is completely different to the type of agriculture which had developed in Saskatchewan from the homestead system.

The homestead system was a method of settling farmers under a system of capitalism. In Britain that system had never existed; they had the testate remains of an old system of feudalism, and today, as it was in the War, the feudal system itself operated to sabotage agricultural production. In the War, very strict measures were taken under their various control Act and I remember reading quite a few cases of farmers who complained about the unjustified rules and regulations put out by the Churchill Government compelling them to grow more. In one particular district south of London, I forget the name of the county, about 300 farmers got together one Sunday — and by farmers I mean the men who actually worked the land, the tenants — they got together and lined up and marched abreast, across the moor, across all their farms shooting every fox they saw. The foxes had been trying to get into the chicken houses raising havoc with the hens and cutting down agricultural production and generally interfering with production which was desperately needed during this War emergency and actually letters were written to the English newspapers protesting on behalf of the fox hunting gentry, but these actions were something which should not be allowed because it was going to destroy the traditional delinquent. I felt that that was a completely

February 7, 1947

wrong point of view and I felt a great deal of sympathy to these small tenants who owned their land to the extent that they are allowed to work it, they are allowed to pay the rent, they are allowed to sell their produce, but under their system the landlord owned the hunting rights and they weren't allowed to poach even on their own land. It was a question just who owned the land, they did the work but the landlord held the title.

A change has long been overdue in England and I am not going to suggest that I am confident to say what that change is. I am not sure that anyone is confident to say what the change is, but some change is about to occur that was obvious to us during the War, some change is about to occur which will see that the land of England can feed the people of England. I was struck by the vast stretches of land potentially capable of great agricultural production but which were not being used to produce and I hope that they can begin to produce.

Today we must have a great deal of sympathy for Britain and for England; they are going through a terrific after the War crisis, an industrial crisis which has been catching up to them for probably 20 years and was accelerated by the War and by the loss of the revenue from the colonies and the fact that they made such tremendous sacrifices and sold all their capital in order to carry off the War that we have just come through.

Today the radio carried the report that all supplies for electricity for industrial concerns for London and the midlands had been shut off and that is a tragedy which we can even conceive. I suggest that we allow them to work out their problem of carrying out production without criticizing from our point of view here, remembering at the same time that whatever happens to agriculture in England is probably not applicable here. I would not like to go back to the system that they had during the War. I wouldn't like the feudalistic system which they had before the War and I certainly don't think that the system, which they are working out now, is a system which we would ever adopt in Saskatchewan. I think that we are going to desire some type of agriculture which will mean that our farmers will not be left isolated and ready to starve to death or freeze to death every time we have a blizzard such as we have today. We must develop a system which they can live in communities or develop a system of roads where they can still remain in communication.

Our agriculture must go forward but I think we must look within our own boundaries to the solution and as the man who is hoping to become established under the Veteran's Land Act, if I can become successful in finding anywhere to become established. I am very greatly interested in this whole problem of land settlement but as I said before there is a resolution coming up on the Order Paper and we will be able to debate the problem at greater length there.

I would like to mention a word about the allocation of land, provincial land, to veterans in this province. Possibly I'll be closer to the statements embodied in the Throne Speech if I do that. It seems to me that one of the places where the Veteran's Land Act might have fallen, we can't blame the Veteran's Land Act because it was something above and beyond it, but one of the reasons that it hasn't been able to function as successfully or as rapidly as it might have has been the fact that in many parts of the province the land was selling at a

February 7, 1947

terrifically inflated price, at least to me coming back after being away for a number of years. When I left, land was selling in our district for an average price probably of about \$4,000. Today it is selling at an average price per quarter section of \$8,000 and that's cash on the line. I don't blame it on the Farm Security Act because there is so much cash in the country that if one man doesn't pay they can get cash. That situation could have been avoided possibly if either the Wartime Prices and Trade Board or some other agency had clamped a ceiling on the price of land some time ago. I am just not sure whether it is administratively possible or not, but I think that something should have been done to discourage the inflationary tendency in land prices. I won't say land values, because I think that there is some little difference between land prices or values in this particular case.

The second thing, aside from the price of wheat, the second thing that encourages inflationary tendency in the price of land is the fact that there is a great deal of ideal capital about today and the capital usually looks for a place to invest itself. Of all places in which to invest capital today land is by far the most profitable. Even in depression times you have a third crop share agreement and an investment in land. That is if you put your money in land and rent the land for the third crop share you will have an average return capital much higher than the interest rates which are payable today. If we invest, to figure things a little more carefully as some of them probably do and I am not one of them, so I could explain how they do it.

You sell the land to the tenant instead of renting it to them so that the third crop agreement and the money coming to you will be payment for capital and therefore deductible for, or not taxable, for income tax purposes. It is quite true the interest of the agreement for sale will be taxable but this will serve to help to keep the bad out of the entire income tax bracket until such day as the income tax does go down. And over a period of years I think that it has been proven by history that the third crop share agreements never do pay for the land, so the man who is selling the land on the agreement for sale remains the landlord, but he is in a much better financial position. This factor, as well, is intended to cause an inflated price in the value of land. So long as there is ideal capital looking for a place to invest itself, land values will remain high.

One thing I think which could discourage this would be that some convention or law or something of that nature, which would set the standard rate of rent much lower than the third crop share. I am suggesting that possibly the one-sixth, one-seventh and one-eighth which are the rental charge from the Crown land delegated to veterans, but those I think may possibly be too high. I think the whole problem will have to be gone into very carefully. If prices should drop in the future I am certain that those rentals will probably be too high. But I do think that the public, through the Legislature or through the Executive Branch, should have some voice in deciding what rentals are from time to time rather than the purely arbitrary system which we have been using for probably 12 or 15 years ever since we gave up the half crop share idea.

For this reason I think that the allocations of veterans' land, the Crown Land Delegation Policy, which undoubtedly has

February 7, 1947

been beneficial to veterans in general because it will have a deflationary effect. The fact that one-sixth crop share is the share that they are paying will gradually lead the one-sixth crop share to be considered a better type of rent than the third crop share and they transfer itself into the civilian community to the extent that the rent payable on land will come down. This will have a greater effect than anything else which could possibly be done to lower the price to which land is selling for at the present time.

I think that I can agree with some Members who have previously spoken and suggested that some method also should be worked out to prevent land accumulating into large holdings. The income tax has the effect of doing that to quite an extent and various other measures could be taken to discourage large holdings of land. I won't deal with that in detail at the moment because I want to refer, again, to something that has been said in regard to the allocation of land.

I regret, very much, having to bring this up at the debate that such charges have been made and statements have been made at this Legislature about allocation of lands to veterans. I feel that it is something that cannot be overlooked. The Leader of the Opposition made a very serious charge that political favoritism has entered into the allocation of some of these parcels. The Premier stated in answer, I believe, that he would favor an investigation of these charges and he went further and said that he was prepared to ask for the resignation of any person who had been guilty of such practices. As a representative of the veterans I am of the opinion that if such is the case, to use the words of the soldiers, would be a very bad show. But I do not believe in convicting anyone without giving them a fair hearing.

I am going to ask that the Premier make it a motion, setting up a Veterans' Committee of this Legislature, representing all parties with power to investigate all things with concern to veterans under the jurisdiction of this House and to bring back a report to the Assembly. I would suggest that this committee investigate any such charges that can be made and investigate the whole set-up in veterans' affairs, everything that concerns allocation and all other types of things that are of concern to the veterans and bring in a report to the Legislature. I am not suggesting that this committee be set up alone for the purpose of investigating these charges. I was going to suggest that such a committee be set up in any case even before I heard such charges, but I think that a committee of this nature would be the proper place to investigate the whole affair.

Mr. Douglas: — Have you any suggestion as to the personnel of such a committee? In Ottawa, for instance, the custom for some years even before the war was to have a veterans' committee made up of the veteran Members of the House, so that the size of the committee might vary from one Parliament to another because of the number of veterans today. Have you in mind a committee like that made up of veteran Members of the House or some outstanding committee of a stated number?

Mr. Valleau: — I would like to suggest that this committee could have Veteran Members of the House and I would like very much to see other Members of the House on it as well in order to sketch the interdependency of the veteran and the civilian as well. I would

February 7, 1947

like to see the civilian members taking an interest in it as well as the veterans. They might take too narrow an approach if it was made up of veterans only. I was going to say, further that I think that moving a committee of this type is the responsibility of the Government. It obviously involves the spending of monies and couldn't be moved by a private Member, and I think that it is up to the Government, if they so desire, to consider what personnel of this community can best be spared from other committees and to talk it over with the various groups and to work out some arrangement.

I will be satisfied with whatever the Government decides. I was going to say some number of other things but I think the time is getting on and I think there are going to be many other opportunities for speeches; however, I would like to say that, in general, the tone of the Speech from the Throne seems to represent at least an attempt to strive for the establishment of a community in which the principles of comradeship will be the governing factor. As I have stated, the veterans' schools, as such, are something in which the comradeship is the most significant thing of all. I feel that if the Speech from the Throne leads to legislation in conformity with the general tone of that speech and if we scrutinize the legislation carefully in this Legislature, that it will undoubtedly lead to action in the Province of Saskatchewan, which will, in general, tend to improve the lot of the veteran and also involve the civilian in the community and, therefore, I feel that I can quite sincerely report a motion for the Address.

Mr. A. C. Murray (Gull Lake): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this motion, I sometimes think that we, in this Chamber, don't follow the same practices as we or I do on my farm. Back on the farm we do very little talking and try to get a little bit of work done. Possibly it is a good thing to put in considerable time here, but as far as legislation that is being brought in, we who are Government Members are probably repeating ourselves because, as we all know, that is, the ones that attend conference regularly know, that these pieces of legislation have been thoroughly discussed in conference. I believe I have heard said in this House something about that and I want to say as one that is always on the job, unless, again, something very serious prevents me, I am going to try to be there and that is the case. I believe by the Speech from the Throne that there is no drastic legislation, as the Opposition might call it, being brought in. Possibly that is a good thing. It might give the Opposition some chance to catch up on some of the legislation that has been passed in this Legislature.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to offer my congratulations to the seconder of this motion and for the Address, the wonderful Address they gave, but especially to offer my congratulations to the Member for Morse. I had the pleasure of putting in a few days in the Morse by-election. I know some of the things that were going on in the Morse by-election; some of the propaganda that we had to combat. I am not going to go into that, but some of it was really ridiculous. I believe that the other party found that the people living in the Morse constituency would not take that type of propaganda as easily as they had thought. People in this province, I am glad to say, are beginning to be educated a little bit better than what they were years ago.

February 7, 1947

I want to say that in that by-election, I had the privilege of attending a meeting held by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I can't say that he was very rash in his statement about the Government, or about the legislation that had been passed in this Legislature, but when he mentioned different pieces of legislation, in particular the larger school administration districts, he said: "I want it understood that I am not against this," but I believe since convening of this Legislature, he has pretty well said he is against this. But I would like to thank the Leader of the Opposition. When I asked a question after, at the end of the meeting, he made his audience acquainted with me and told them who I was. I would suggest, though that if he had invited me onto the platform we might have had a little more enthusiasm in his meeting. Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that I noticed at that meeting. I had been, for the last few years, rather busy and had not been able to attend any meetings but CCF meetings. At that meeting, after the question period, the chairman closed the meeting. I had, as I say, been attending CCF meetings where, at the close of the meetings, we passed the hat around and took up a collection to pay for the hall rent and what expenses we might have. I was quite willing to put in my two bits to help to pay for that hall rent, but I didn't have the privilege of doing so. I am beginning to wonder, Mr. Speaker, after going home and thinking about that, if the Leader of the Opposition ever, at his meetings, had to pay for the hall rent. I happen to know that some of that comes rather high.

In my farming operations it was coming on towards harvest time. I had a piece of harvest machinery ordered. I knew what the price was when I ordered it and finally it was delivered to me. I went in to pay for it and the price that I had to pay was \$360 more than the price when I ordered it. Now I haven't heard of any delegation of machine companies going to Ottawa to get a raise in price. I haven't heard of any commission being set up to see if the machine companies were not getting enough for the machinery. But we had to pay that rise in price in machinery! After that, Mr. Speaker, I began to wonder. In place of the two bits I was willing to put on the plate to help to finance renting of that hall, I began to wonder if possibly I had to pay for all the hall rents.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been much said here in the Legislature about the absentee Leader of the Liberal Party. I am not going to dwell very much on that but I would like to say just a few words about it. I noticed in reading the Leader-Post following what Mr. Tucker had to say at some of his meetings, he had a meeting in Swift Current last fall and he told the people at his meeting, as reported in the Leader-Post, about Government Crown corporations that had been set up by this Legislature. He said that all Crown corporations, including the Horse Packing Plant here in Swift Current don't employ any more than 270 employees. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what kind of an audience he had there, but I know that the Horse Packing Plant at Swift Current alone (Mr. Tucker in speaking to an audience in Swift Current should have asked some of them, the figures of employees employed at that plant), at that time, or previously, had employed as many as 310 employees. So he was very wrong on his statements there.

Let me tell the Member for Arm River that if it hadn't been for this Government helping start that Horse Packing Plant, there wouldn't have been a plant there. I am sure of that because this Government knew and could see the need of that plant. Some

February 7, 1947

two years ago, up in the country I live in, you could travel across the country at this time of year and see horses by the hundreds, 200 to 300 in a bunch. You don't see that today. The farmers have got something out of those horses and the people of Europe have been able to get some food.

We will take Mr. Tucker's record on the vote for co-operatives. I attended one of Mr. Tucker's meetings in this city here some time ago and at the end of the meeting, in the question period, things got rather warm for Mr. Tucker. In fact the lady in the chair adjourned the meeting because she thought the questions were going to be too tough for Mr. Tucker. But coming back to the vote on co-operatives, a man represents a constituency in the Province of Saskatchewan, one of the leading co-operative provinces in Canada, and then he goes down to Ottawa and votes for taxation of the co-operatives. I believe his explanation was, in this meeting, that he didn't want to go against the Government. I wonder if that was the only reason, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if he wasn't thinking of some of the financial interests in Canada. There might be something in that. But then, Mr. Speaker, let me quote one last thing about this gentleman.

About a year and a half ago, I believe it was in October, a Private Member brought in a Bill, a Private Member's Bill in the House of Commons. It was a motion by the Member for Battle River, Alberta. Just let me read the motion:

That in the opinion of this House, the Government should take into consideration the advisability of giving clear titles to soldier settlers who on March 31st, 1944, held land under contract with the Soldier's Settlement Board.

I took the trouble, Mr. Speaker, some time ago, I believe a year ago, to go through Hansard and look up some of these records. I noticed some time ago that I still had this in my notes and I hadn't used it. Let me say this, a Private Member's Bill, I believe, has to be voted on that day. But here is what happened.

Mr. Tucker took the floor. He didn't want to give the Soldier Settlement Board's members any relief from their indebtedness. He took the floor and I counted the pages in Hansard, five and a half pages, that it took to write what Mr. Tucker had to say. Some of the other members, it doesn't say which ones, hollered out five minutes to eleven o'clock, that you had five minutes to take the vote. Another hollered up you had three minutes, but Mr. Tucker didn't sit down and let them take the vote. He talked until he talked the Bill out. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that a man of that calibre doesn't want to take a seat in the Province of Saskatchewan, to come into this Legislature.

Some of these men that settled under the old Soldier's Settlement Board owe money and some of them have for some time. Some of them have tried to raise families through dry years, and still have a debt piled up against them with no relief, thanks to Mr. Tucker.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Leader of the Opposition, in his speech, mentioned something about the saw-fly control that was put on a year ago, two years this spring, I believe, about being pleased to appoint CCF men. Apparently we have no saw-fly

February 7, 1947

down in Cannington constituency or they have never appointed any of these committees, otherwise they would have known how these committees were appointed. I would like to say that the farmers met in the town or wherever they decided to meet and appointed the men, a man for each township, and then a supervisor. That was done by the farmers themselves. I would also like to say that they weren't all CCFers that got that appointment because a great many of the CCFers are busy men and they haven't been out looking for these little short-term jobs. Unfortunately, I know a few cases where they were not appointed that way and unfortunately they were Liberals, in the majority, that got appointed and I am telling you that they didn't make a very good job of it either. If the Opposition would like the names of some of these boys I can give them to them. The speeches we have had by the Opposition, I am sorry to say, have not been very constructive, mostly destructive. I don't know why they can't try to help the people of this province. They surely agree, not in public, but in their own minds, that we of the Legislature and the people's Government are doing something for the people of this province.

The Member for Morse mentioned here a few minutes ago in his speech about when the Liberals get back into power. That is what they are thinking about, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about that. Is it any wonder that they are not agreeable to the Government setting up Crown corporations to do something for the people? Would you go back into the questions and answers, to a question asked by the Member from Wadena. Just look back and see what the answer to that was. You can see if they ever thought they would get back into power why they wouldn't want to have any Crown corporations. They know that they wouldn't be able to run them efficiently. They certainly didn't run that very efficiently, only for my friend in Winnipeg.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe possibly the Leader of the Opposition has something to say about what the Premier had said some time ago in some speech about what was ahead of us. A short while ago I had an argument with him, and he was a good Liberal, about what might be ahead of us and he tried to tell me that while we were on the road to better times, things were going to be much more prosperous than in the past. But, Mr. Speaker, let us whip through some of these so-called questions.

I remember something about what happened after the last War and I want to say here that there are certain cushions, shock absorbers as you might call them, but we may not have the same thing quite as bad as we had, but I can see, Mr. Speaker, things stacking up that just don't look too good. Controls are being lifted and inflation is going on as fast as it can. I was one of these unfortunate ones, Mr. Speaker, that helped to build and maintain some of these monuments that the Member for Wadena, I believe it was, mentioned the other day on the corner of one of the streets downtown. In fact I helped to maintain several of them and it took me a good many years to get out from under their thumbs. I don't want to see, Mr. Speaker, my fellow human beings go through what I had to go through. I think, myself, that a person should be able to enjoy things as they go along, the good things of this country and not have to worry as some of us had to do in our younger days and can only enjoy those things when we become old men, that is the ones of us that happen to be a little more fortunate than others. Possibly I have heard some of them mentioned here and I believe the Member for Morse mentioned about socialists, some

February 7, 1947

of them were just advanced Liberals and some of them old-time socialists. Well, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, I like to class myself in that category that has never had any allegiance with one of the old parties. I remember when I was about so high going to school, we used to have our little fights about the Liberals and Conservatives but when I got out of school I forgot about them. I began to get my eyes opened as to how this world of ours was being run and if I needed anything to convince me any more than what I saw at that time as a young fellow, when we came home after the last War that really convinced me. That is why I happen to be representing the Gull Lake constituency in this Legislature, because I had been thinking along a little different line than some of the other people in that constituency.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a few minutes to say something about the Gull Lake constituency. I always like, and am proud, to get back to the Gull Lake constituency because I believe that we are possibly a little more progressive in that part of Saskatchewan than most of the rest of Saskatchewan, that is, progressive minded at least and I'll give you some reasons why. I believe two of the five first CCF Members to sit in this Legislature came from the southwestern part of Saskatchewan; that is one good reason. Let me give you another one; the Swift Current Health Region was the first region to set up medical services, full medical services, for the people of that region, and let me say that the people of that region are proud of what they have done. Yes, we even have Liberals that are quite well satisfied and I believe we have some Liberals in the executive up there, possibly a little different type than what we have across the way, but they are quite progressive minded. Only they have that, I can hardly explain what it is, but their grandfather told them they should vote Liberal and they still vote Liberal. I say that we are proud of that health region. The board on that Swift Current Health Region has done a wonderful job. Possibly there is a reason for that region being set up there. We had several municipalities that had municipal health schemes that possibly helped them along, but those are some of the reasons why I say we are possibly a little more progressive minded than the rest of the province and if you need one more I can give it to you.

We have no constituency represented by a Liberal Member in the southwestern part of the province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the time is getting on, pretty close to adjournment and I don't intend to take up much more of the time. I could go on and mention some of the different services that this Government has given to the people, possibly not free, as the Opposition might say, but they are glad to pay for them. Let me mention one thing that is a great thing for the south end of the Gull Lake constituency — the Air Ambulance that has gone up into that country a great many times. I noticed in the Leader-Post on last Monday, I believe, that they were slated to go up there. I don't know if they made it or not, but they have made a great many trips. One lady told me, she said if it hadn't been for the Air Ambulance I wouldn't have been walking around today. I can say that is a fact for a great many more, that have been taken out of there.

As is generally known, the southwestern part of this province is quite a ranching country. I am sorry to say that this past year, yes, past two years, part of the Gull Lake constituency have been hit by drought, the constituency being about

February 7, 1947

140 miles long. Naturally we have the good stock and the poor stock, but there is lots in there that have been hit very bad especially this year. Then, as I mention, being a ranching country the winter we are having is going to be very hard on ranchers. I don't know yet what is the outcome, a great many of them have gone into what you might call mechanized ranching, doing their haying with power machinery, hauling the hay with power and a great many of those ranchers have their hay out some distance from the ranches. If they are getting the weather we are getting here, and they had some of it, I am afraid that they are going to take tremendous losses. Let me say, too, that it is not altogether the ranchers' fault for not having the feed that they might have had because of this past fall, I'm sure I am safe in saying, was one of the worst falls that we have ever seen there. Possibly the year before was pretty near as bad but I believe last year was one of the worst. A great many of them cut their hay and it rotted before they could get it into stacks, turning it time after time and finally it wasn't worth putting into a stack. So I think if this weather keeps on, the ranching country is going to be very hard hit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with those remarks I will support the motion.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:55 o'clock p.m.