

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

## Fourth Session - Tenth Legislature

11th Day

Thursday, February 13, 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 by Mr. J. Gibson (Morse) for an Address-in-Reply.

**Mr. A.W. Embury (A.S.J.R.):** — Mr. Speaker, it's a nice custom in this House of paying a tribute to those in public life who passed away between the sessions. It's a custom that one remembers. I think too, such tributes as we heard the Hon. Premier pay to the former Leader of the Liberal Party in this House, spoken with such obvious sincerity the other day, cannot fail to make their impression upon the Members. Only those who have been required to carry the burden — the heavy burden — of public responsibility know the effort made by their predecessors in office and the heavy toll it takes in health and strength in unrewarded time and effort. Within the framework of our Constitution, the legislative and administrative functions of the Government go hand-in-hand with the functions of our courts. The able men who dispose so well of the many thousands of pieces of litigation which come before them, with their traditional impartialities, also carry a very heavy responsibility to the public, and I think that that responsibility should be recognized more fully sometimes that it is.

But I am thinking particularly about a great judge and Chancellor of our University, Mr. Justice Peter E. MacKenzie. Mr. Justice MacKenzie was born in Ontario — in London, Ontario in 1872 of Scottish and Irish parents and after going to the University of Toronto, passing through Osgoode Hall and practising for a few years in the East, he came West to Saskatchewan first to Canora then called Rat Portage, I believe. Shortly after that in 1910 he went to the city of Saskatoon. He practised there for many years at the Bar. He was appointed the Agent of the Attorney General then and he became a very great leader of the Bar in his day. He was gifted with a very fine presence and a most excellent memory. In his conduct of criminal trials and in his jury addresses, he was a fair and dignified counsellor and he was gifted with unrivalled clarity, tolerance and persuasive talk. He was appointed to the Court of the King's Bench in October of 1921 and proved himself a very fine trial judge. And later in 1927 he was made a Judge of our Court of Appeals. It was while he was Judge of the Court of Appeals that he was appointed Chancellor of our University. I would like to quote to the House the words from the 'Saskatchewan Bar Review' written about him:

He was a great Judge and a great man and his loss has been keenly felt, both in the profession and in the University.

And I might add, by the public too, and by his many friends of

which I have the honor to say, that I was one.

Throughout the years that I have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, and particularly in the early days of our province, Liberalism was the great political philosophy which advocated freedom and who brought in all those who thought in terms of progress and all who opposed the old established interest that their principles of laissez-faire has represented by Conservatism in that time. Did it ever occur to anybody on either side of politics that it was necessary or desirable that the Government should intervene to operate all of the profitable enterprises of the community? In the short history of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, cities and towns and villages have grown up more or less steadily and all the services – commercial services and public services – have been built up. This very building we sit in, today, was built, magnificent as it is, in Saskatchewan. A million people have come to dwell here, a University has been founded, which is now recognized as one of the finest seats of learning in the Dominion. It excels particularly in its School of Agriculture as might have been expected in the heart of an agricultural community.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the point I wish to make is this. Let those who seek to spread dissatisfaction, those who seek to spread dissension, remember that all this is being done in less than 50 years under a capitalist regime. It is worth remembering, in these plans you gentlemen opposite have, men and women who were born and bred in Saskatchewan served to triumph on many a battlefield over those whose environment has reduced them to robot-like automatons under a totalitarian administration. The thinking of a Canadian pilot, Mr. Speaker, in charge of a Spitfire, was not at all like the thinking of a German pilot in charge of a Messerschmidt. The resourcefulness, courage, determination, which is the heritage of a Canadian individual is not found where a man grows up in an environment from which he becomes accustomed to have the government doing his thinking for him.

The Character of a nation is only the sum total of the character of its people and while our way of life may not seem to be as efficient as a planned, totalitarian state, or whatever ism you may wish to chose, I believe there are compensating factors giving our system an enduring strength which far outweighs the brutal, brittle and insubstantial philosophy which follows in the wake of too much government planning.

No one, Mr. Speaker, no one, who has had the opportunity to rub shoulders with a Canadian soldier on a battlefield could escape the marked contrast which exists between our men and those men who served in some of the finest German divisions who were their opponents, no one could escape the contrast between them. It wasn't necessary in a Canadian unit or regiment, to have a member of the Gestapo in every section to force and compel an efficient military performance. It never occurred to a Canadian commander that the men's will was not in the task or that such means were necessary for a proper execution of their duty. Sir, these things are born of freedom – and those freedoms should be matters of deep concern to every man in public life no matter how small his responsibilities may be. It is easy to introduce plausible arguments for the reduction of those freedoms in any sense, but I suggest that each and every proposal to encroach upon our freedoms should be scrutinized with great care before we relinquish our hold upon it. The

**February 13, 1947**

greatest advances both scientific and spiritual have been achieved under our system and that system has traditionally included the right of freedom of enterprise.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, it is true, that great hardships have been apparent under such a system and have been suffered by great numbers of our people too, throughout the march of progress under our system. But these hardships are as nothing compared to the hardships inflicted upon those who have been so weak as to relinquish their freedoms and so weak as to live in a state of terror under a system which forces some other mode of life to come. Now, Sir, people who plan to deprive us of our liberties and our freedoms usually start by taking them one at a time. I am thinking particularly of that portion of the Speech from the Throne which served to indicate the intention of the Government to pass what it is pleased to call a Bill of Rights. A Bill of Rights whereby this Legislature proposes to affirm the inalienable right to freedom of conscience, of speech, of thought and of movement. Those are the words which are mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. Think of it, of conscience, of speech, of thought and of movement, Mr. Speaker, the words are excellent so far as they go, but the proposal is rather more notable for its exceptions than for what it is including. The right of freedom of enterprise has up to this time been an inalienable right of Canadians and a marked exclusion from the so-called Bill of Rights of the right to freedom of enterprise is disturbing to any man who stops to think about the consequences. To me, Sir, it is the thin edge of the wedge to deprive us of our freedom and not a Bill of Rights at all.

I wonder what abuses the Government thinks its curing by the introduction of such a Bill. All the rights they mention have long been cherished institutions in Canada. All the freedoms described in the Speech from the Throne have long been the inalienable rights of Canadian citizens. Wherever a breach of those rights has occurred there has followed a public outcry which has compelled the rectification of such abuses. It is an ominous gesture for this Government to propose legislation purporting to describe democratic freedoms which we have traditionally enjoyed and to omit there from one of the greatest freedoms of all – the right to freedom of enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, I know of nothing which intervenes to restrict the free exercises of the conscience of this Government, but I am beginning to think that they either have or should have something on that conscience.

Mr. Speaker, there is reference to the tax agreement in the Throne Speech. It is one of the things upon which this Government is to be congratulated. I am sure that the whole House looks forward to the time when the Hon. Provincial Treasurer will introduce the matter to the House. It's in the settlement which the Hon. Provincial Treasurer has reached with the Federal Government in regard to provincial treasury bills and natural resources claims and other issues, are things upon which I think the Hon. Provincial Treasurer appears to have done a remarkably fine service for his province. In these and other matters the Hon. Provincial Treasurer has demonstrated a very great capacity. Throughout the two years of my association with him, Mr. Speaker, I have yet to bring a matter to his attention or which has deserving of consideration that it was not dealt with fairly and efficiently, impartially and with much efficiency. The Departments under his

February 13, 1947

jurisdiction and administration have co-operated with the Veteran's organization freely and fairly and I think it my duty to pay him the highest from the veterans for the wholehearted way in which he has endeavored to employ them wherever possible. My experience in all my dealings with him has been one of consideration and co-operation and I say that because I feel that not enough credit is given to those Ministers who do so much for veterans and I am glad to be the means whereby some appreciation can be expressed to them. Now, Sir, these things coupled with his great achievements in the fields of his Department and the vast transactions which have yielded so much financial advantage to the province entitles him as an individual to high tribute from his fellow citizens. I feel that it is a great pity that his great talents are wrongly applied with the financial gains which he has been able to achieve on our behalf are all to be devoted to the ends of socialism or some other ism which will very likely prove to be the destruction of our essential freedom.

On behalf of veterans, I would like to say, too, that the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources has attempted and tried very hard to assist us whenever he can. In one case when we waited upon him he gave us several hours of his time and I think he was instrumental too in finding a partial or an adequate solution to our visits. It is a pleasure for me to pay him a tribute as well and the same thing is true of many other Ministers who have listened patiently and endeavored earnestly to assist the veterans without regard to politics and often without regard to the adding preoccupations which engaged them otherwise. The Hon. Minister of Natural Resources, while I am still talking about him, has busied himself with numerous undertakings. They are so numerous and complex that one cannot in a few moments attempt to make any comprehensive analysis of them. To me it is significant that in each undertaking of his Department he conforms to the general plan for socialism. He retains the ownership and control of his properties in the Government wherever he can and he tries to control and compel the doing of business by co-operatives. While hand in hand with that the Government through its new Department set up for the purpose seeks continually to impregnate the co-operatives with totalitarian ideals or isms, socialism that they believe. In granting lease option agreements to veterans the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources does so on a very fair basis of rental indeed so long as it remains a lease, Mr. Speaker. The option price, that is not to be determined until ten years later and then to read the lease as I understand it, the option price is to be fixed to all intents and purposes by the Minister himself on a basis of productivity. Now in one sense . . . Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister knows the lease as well as I do. The basis is to be one of productivity and I don't suggest for a moment that this same Minister will be here ten years from now, at least I hope not, but he certainly has a great deal to say about it. A copy of the lease was tabled for the last session and that's my recollection of it. But I don't believe, I was going to say that in one sense that system put a sort of a premium on bad farming and I don't believe that that is the vital criticism on it. I am apprehensive, Sir, of Socialist Government whose cry in its early infancy was for lease system of tenure of land whose later efforts have continually been to decry the right of private ownership – what kind of a purchase price do you suppose the Minister has in mind as the option price if it was in his mind? I would rather see, Mr. Speaker, the price agreed upon now while the memory of the sacrifices of veterans is fresh in

**February 13, 1947**

**Mr. Phelps:** — That is not so.

**Mr. Embury:** — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister knows very well that two wrongs don't make a right. You've got an opportunity to do it properly this time if you would face up to it. Many of the undertakings of the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources are well worthwhile. They are not undertakings which tend to put our people with the wrong Government. Quite often when the Hon. Minister goes forward to develop some of our natural resources he is not in competition with anybody and I think more people agree that a development of such assets is well worthwhile. If these things, Mr. Speaker, were being done by a government which believed in free enterprise I wouldn't feel any anxiety about it at all. But still, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman smiles at a very serious matter viewed in a lengthening shadow of a totalitarian threat. Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that I, in company with a great number of members of the public have a great anxiety indeed. Another thing, Mr. Speaker, where these undertakings and enterprises of the Government go forward under regulations, those regulations are authorized and administered for the purpose of conserving and preserving our natural resources. They are right and they are in their place but where those regulations, where the power of the Minister are used under the guise of that sort of a justification and in fact only to dismember some private enterprise then they assume a very ominous complexion. The Hon. Minister believes in socialism and he has been active and energetic in promoting it in the administration of his Department. Ah yes, the hon. gentleman thinks there is some merit in that. Even in the limited responsibilities which I have had, the energetic but misguided man can do a great deal more harm than the man whose energy is not excessive but whose judgment is sound. The Hon. Minister has been called a veritable work horse and the person who called him a work horse reminded me of an observation which was once made about Lord Brown who was Prime Minister of England at the time of the debates on Parliamentary reforms of 1830. They said of Lord Brown that he had such an abundance of restless and tactless energy that if he had been a horse nobody would buy him, that reminds me of the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources. So much for the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources.

The work of the Department of Health, I think there again much good is being done. The hospitalization scheme is a proper field of Government activity and I think most people endorse the efforts of the Government to make adequate hospitalization available to every man, woman and child in our province. In any such scheme in the early stages there are bound to be difficulties and probably great difficulties but we have got to start somewhere and I am sure that those difficulties will be overcome. There has been some criticism that the cost of making that service is excessive but it doesn't seem excessive to me. I think too while talking about the work of that Department, that one could pay a great tribute to the work which that Department has done in promoting the air ambulance of the Government and I think particularly at this time that tribute should be paid, it is a thing of very considerable help to so many of our people who have been isolated in the last few weeks and the air ambulance is a godsend to many of them.

February 13, 1947

The efforts of the Department of Reconstruction and Rehabilitation in the field of housing and in its efforts to co-ordinate through job surveys the information and influence necessary in the finding of employment have been of great assistance to veterans. I haven't seen any politics of favoritism in the exercising of the work of that Department at all. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Premier and the Hon. Member of the Opposition have mentioned a case in the Rosetown district in which it appears they have been informed of a gross abuse of a veteran. Now I am quite sure from my experience with the Hon. Minister of Reconstruction that if such an abuse has occurred he himself would have no knowledge of it. But if these things are true I hope that the Premier will take such steps as may be necessary to correct matters and as he says let the chips fall where they may. I have had sufficient particulars of the affair made available to me to make some investigation into the matter myself and I propose to do so. I make no charges in the matter and I haven't got any political interest in it but as I stated on the first occasion when I spoke in this House I am prepared to fight that sort of thing in the House or out of it and if it be true, I propose to find out whether it is true if I can.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a word or two about the Department of Labour. I'm sorry the Hon. Minister isn't in his place. Let no man suggest to me that I fail to appreciate the case for the unions. They have done an enormous amount of good for the betterment of the conditions of working men and women everywhere. The public knows that, feels that, so long as the unions are democratically controlled by the Canadian men and women who form their membership I have no fear of the Trade Union movement. I've known too many honest laboring Canadian men to suspect them of any desire to sabotage the country. Mr. Speaker, I do feel and I do fear the union where they are dominated by Communists. I fear them when the Communist agitator gets control of them. I fear them when agitators of Communist sympathies and tendencies get control of them. It is not very difficult to recognize the Communists, Mr. Speaker, they aren't hard to find. The cleverest ones hide it, such people are not interested in the laboring men and women of Canada. They are only interested in sabotaging Canada. They are traitors to the people that they represent and they are traitors to Canada itself. I am going to point out what I regard as a significant thing to this House. It is this, no word was spoken by any responsible Minister of this Government from the Hon. Premier down as low as they go, I won't say anything about how low that is, to condemn the Communists, the Spanish activities uncovered last year in Canada. Not one word of criticism. Not one word have I seen reported by any of them, to assist in moulding public opinion in condemning such activities. The omission I suggest is significant in the light of some of the other activities of this Government. They may say it was none of their business and that it was purely a federal matter. But that's not the case, the Attorney General is responsible for law and order in Saskatchewan. They might have to if that sort of thing can happen elsewhere in Canada, and it was the criminal practice, it could happen here, I could agree with the Attorney General . . . well I could agree with him if he said he didn't agree with the early investigations into the matter. I could agree with him if he said that he wouldn't comment while the matter was sub judicious. But the Government which is the proponent of a totalitarian political philosophy would do well to assure the free man in their jurisdiction that they are not allied with the Communists. I would welcome such an assurance and I have yet to hear it from the benches opposite. They say they keep their promises, Mr. Speaker,

**February 13, 1947**

let them denounce the Communists in Canada and all their works. Let them promise that they will not employ them in the public services and let them keep that promise faithfully. Let them at least be as critical of Communism as Capitalism, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I was told in the House the other day when I asked a question about the CCF having given a rebuff to the Communists, given a rebuff to the intrepid men, that the CCF had given them a rebuff. In answer to the question which I asked, I was told that when the Labour Progressive Party – which is the Communist party, approached the CCF to suggest that they join their political forces, the CCF decided that they would not join political forces with the Communists. Now wasn't that noble of them? Wasn't that a patriotic thing to do? It has often occurred to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Communists in approaching the CCF were using pretty good logic from their point of view, because, as far as anyone can discover, there is no difference between the aims and objects of the CCF and the aims and objects of the Communists. I'm aware of the fact and have been for some time that the CCF said they would not join political forces with the Communists; but I have yet to hear a CCF spokesman of any consequence denounce their totalitarian aims and objects, Mr. Speaker. I can readily agree that the CCF would not join political forces with the Communists. I can see why they didn't. It was because the Communist Party has been discovered and discredited in Canada for the aims and objects which it has. What has the CCF done to discourage the Communists from joining the CCF and boring from within as is the custom with Communists. What have they done about that? What patriotic statement was ever made by any prominent CCF to discourage them. They say they won't join forces with them politically, and my hon. friend who answered my question thinks that that is a sufficient rebuff to a party which is nothing more nor less than a foreign 'fifth column' in Canada.

The Minister of Education in his appealing remarks upon this very debate in this House, the other day, gave the clearest possible evidence of his attempts to warp the adolescent minds of the youngsters in our schools. Instead of teaching them, in that book we were referring to, to have a pride in our country and its great accomplishments, what does he do? He prefers the Communist way: To teach them dissension; to teach them dissatisfaction. He calls it 'educational'; I call it propaganda – and so it is, when you labor the seamy side of life as though most Canadians were suffering the social ills he likes to highlight for their inspection. The mind of the irresponsible adolescent is fertile ground for such suggestions. They are a grand lot of youngsters. Don't mistake me; but they don't know much. They have to listen to people like him.

Mr. Speaker, I didn't make this speech because I thought you people would enjoy it, I don't mind . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — What did you say?

**Mr. Embury:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman appears to ask me what I said. We have a brand new substitute Hansard here and if he wants to know what I said perhaps he'd like to go out and listen to it.

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . that's what you said.

**Mr. Embury:** — Oh no I don't, no I don't. I don't accept your word for that.

Pure matter of opinion, Mr. Speaker, and believe me I certainly hold the opinion that there's no discernible difference to me between the aims and objects of the CCF and the aims and objects of the Communists. I see no difference.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Mr. Embury:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Mr. Embury:** — I have your ruling, Mr. Speaker, thank you.

Let's see where we were. I didn't think they'd like it at all, I know that. If they would agree with it at all. All criticism you make of them that's always destructive. You can't make criticism. Apparently they think it is against the law to criticize them.

Now what is the Hon. Minister of Education doing? He's careful not to tell the youngsters how many millions of Russians were slaughtered in the convulsions through which that unhappy country passed. Doesn't tell them anything about the side of the world at all. He doesn't tell them, on the contrary he doesn't tell them how many little humble men in Canada own frigidaires and their own cars and their own homes too. Doesn't tell them that. And then writes them that book but that's all. He doesn't teach them that pride which we all felt in Canada when we went to school, we were taught at school, doesn't try to do that in that book. He doesn't do anything to inspire their hopes that by their own efforts they can rise to any heights in Canada, he doesn't tell them that in that book. He teaches them that there are no problems in Canada except the problems of the aged and infirm or the sick and underprivileged. That there are no problems in Canada except the problems of the Asians and in France, and the sick and the unrequited. Those are the only problems he can see – dissension, dissatisfaction. He teaches them to be dissatisfied with this great land of ours. He teaches them to think that the efforts of all the productive people in the land should be devoted solely to cure the evils which befall the underprivileged. In short, Mr. Speaker, he falls neatly into the general plan of this Government to legislate only for the underprivileged and never to think of the productive man who must carry this country forward. This Government seems to think that the majority of our people, and they are the productive ones incidentally, that you seem to have overlooked – such people are fair game for them. There is a sort of an open season declared on them and they are held up as examples of the type of person who should be stripped of his assets and his economic securities, then of his business. Now that is not the whole story. That is what is being pumped into our youngsters. That is not the whole story, Mr. Speaker. Look at the rest of us troubled with this policy. We see the Government amending The Elections Act to reduce the age of voting down to 18 years to take an early advantage of that policy. What do you think of that, Mr. Speaker? One of the most sinister . . .

**Mr. Fines:** — It is 18 years of age.

**February 13, 1947**

**Mr. Embury:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the point of purpose.

Last year, no it was the first year I came home, in 1945, this Government did pass an amendment to The Elections Act and they did reduce the age for voting to 18 years. And I suggest that when one couples with that there is propaganda in the schools, it is full of comments and should be said that that was done to take the advantage of such a policy. Where is this right of freedom of speech that we hear these people chant and insult, broadly and generally in the land? Freedom — you do not seem to know what it means.

**Mr. Proctor:** — Mr. Speaker, may I speak? The hon. gentleman on our side of the House has been raising this point of privilege without authority. On many occasions the Point of Privilege, as I understand it, is that if there are motives imputed directly to an individual Member, that he can take advantage of his privilege, that he can rise to correct the statements he has made. But this idea that they can get behind the question of privilege to withdraw the criticism is an unwarranted extension of the principle that has never yet received fair support.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Embury:** — Well, there is one thing about it, Mr. Speaker, these interruptions give me a rest. Coupled then with this policy which has occurred, and which has become apparent, on warping the adolescent mind in the schools, we see this sinister amendment of The Election Act.

Now, the Hon. Minister who complains about this is the very man who said that 90 per cent of our teachers were Socialists. Presumably, then, they will carry out their work better.

**Mr. Douglas (Premier):** — . . . no I won't. I've heard quite enough from you.

**Mr. Embury:** — The Hon. Premier has said that our democracy is clinched. He said it because he must go to the country for re-election when his term comes up. But if these policies do not adversely and unfairly affect the election processes, what is the good of that amendment to The Election Act and this policy in the schools? Few people, Mr. Speaker, in this province know better than the Hon. Premier that elections in this province and almost anywhere in a Democratic country are run by organizations and by propaganda. Usually, fair-minded people only use fair propaganda and they do not tackle the youngsters in the schools. The only people who know that any better than the Hon. Premier, I suggest, in this province, are the group of experts who seem to be assisting him in these imaginations. He says there is no danger because I have the right to free speech, that I am using it. Now let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of this House, that as far as I am concerned as long as I have the right of freedom of speech I certainly propose to use it. But my anxiety is that if this goes on I will not have it very long. This right of mine, this cherished right of mine is an adequate safeguard for our liberty and I hope it will not serve to compel this Government here and now to cease their steady planning to reduce our liberty in a totalitarian state. On more than one occasion, this past year, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education has been

February 13, 1947

accused of communist symptoms – not by me. But he has been accused because of the type of propaganda used by him in furthering his adult education. Any person reading that periodical which he caused to be printed, circulated, and edited by a man called Thompson, I believe, could not fail to conclude that the writer and the editor had Communist symptoms. With it, during the same period, at public expense, the Government caused to be published a pamphlet written by Dyson Carter, an acknowledged Communist. Now, the Leader-Post, both so often maligned and quoted with approval by you gentlemen, will not upon this feature of Government activity on more than one occasion and yet the Ministers responsible both proposed to do so by the Government. By the newspapers as I have stated, they failed as they specificate their lack of sympathy with the Communist ideas of totalitarian state. That is true, Mr. Speaker, that both the Minister of Education and the Premier made statements to the effect that such propaganda was not Communist – they said that – and with respect from Douglas I disagree with both. But that was a typical evasive explanation, in my opinion. Neither of them stated in their explanation which was given to the Press anything about their lack of sympathy with Communist ideals and if you look at those things that are printed that will occur to you as it did to me.

Now, Mr. Speaker, birds of a feather flock together. They say that where you find people of similar tendencies – birds of a feather flock together. Here in Saskatchewan we have retained as a senior Government advisor or leader of the back room boys an experts man called Cadbury, advertised to us as a leading English socialist and laborer – they think they are in the mood – as every person knows the English labor movement and the English Socialists are more mature than they are here in Canada and have long since denounced the menace of Communism. The Communists have been expelled from that movement wherever they can be recognized – and they are not easy to recognize always. Mr. Cadbury, advertised to us as I have said as a distinguished English Socialist, laborite came to Saskatchewan at the time of the triumph of the English Socialist party at the polls. At the time of its greatest trials in office, at the very time when such talents as he may enjoy, the planner in that movement might be presumed to have been of assistance to his associates in England, where do we find him – way out here in Saskatchewan. Now, I do not know whether the gentleman is a Communist or not – I don't know. And it is the very fact that I don't know that I am complaining about. Why shouldn't I know. It is the fact that I don't know whether that man is a Communist, it is the fact that I do not know anything about his background – nobody else does either – that is what gives us the anxiety in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker – that's your re-appointed anxiety. I do not suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this Government should not have its experts and its advisors. One could scarcely imagine a government which stands in more need of experts and advisors. Indeed, my only argument is, Mr. Speaker, that they should have better experts and advisors than the one which they seem to have chosen. That is the ones that we know about, Mr. Speaker. Let us have men of known integrity and ability and not men who emerge from distant places with unknown backgrounds and unknown views upon the question of the properties of a totalitarian state. That is my request of this Government. It seemed to be too much for them.

It is proposed, as I understand it, to extend the insurance benefits under the road accident plan. In doing so, a great many more of our citizens will now be placed in economic

**February 13, 1947**

competition with their own Government. As a garage man, as the Hon. Member for Rosthern was pointing out the other day, a garage man whose trade will be taken away from him when the work is done in the Government workshop or garages. The adjusters whose work will be done by Government appointees, the men who sell these standard insurance policies, these men are not financial dictators, Mr. Speaker. The people of Saskatchewan are not anxious to wage a war on them. The justification for the Government's entry into insurance business is based solely upon the argument that the business is profitable, and that's all. There's no suggestion that the public was not adequately served in this highly competitive business. There was no suggesting or demonstrating to this House that any abuses existed calling for government intervention to strangle and dislocate the economic security of so many of our districts. It was a wise man, Mr. Speaker, who said that if it is necessary not to change – no that isn't what he said, he was wiser than I was, he said this . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — You read the wrong thing.

**Mr. Embury:** — If it is not necessary to change, it is necessary not to change. That's worth thinking about in defining with your experiments. We're not all penny pigs in this province, we'd like to do a little thinking. Think of it, if it is not necessary to change, it is necessary not to change. Private money, private efforts are expended over the years in reliance upon the existing state of the laws and those moneys are spent in building up commercial enterprises within our own community. Any ill-advised or unnecessary change in our laws inevitably results in a hardship to those who are affected and if they are guilty of no abuses calling for Government intervention, leave them alone, leave them alone. Alas, it was upon the insurance debate last year that I heard for the first time, the views of the Premier which indicated long-term intention and his long-term plan. He summed them up in these words:

We will not rest until Capitalism in Saskatchewan has been eradicated.

On the third of April last year, that is what the Premier told the House. Did anyone ever hear anything like it come out of Russia? Did anyone ever hear a Communist talk like that? Well now, let me hear the Hon. Member say whether I'm accusing him of Communism or not. Did you ever hear a Communist talk like that? Yes, I did. I never heard them talk any other way as a matter of fact. Are these words, Mr. Speaker, are these words calculated to inspire confidence in the public, to add that they are not ultimately to be subjected to the totalitarian domination of the Premier's hands and of the hands of his associates? Do you wonder that I expect the anxiety on behalf of the free men and women of the services, Mr. Speaker?

When I first returned to Canada after an absence of nearly six years abroad, I had no intimate knowledge of the plans and imaginations of the CCF party. We became very badly preoccupied without a touch, during an active campaign. It was inconceivable to us over there that any person would strive to impose a government something like the one that we were fighting against or something like the one in Russia. There isn't much difference between them, upon our people at all. It never occurred to us.

During the two years since my return, Mr. Speaker, the plan of this Government which I have attempted to describe, has emerged. The warning which the Premier gave was a sort of a red flag which I have quoted about was the first warning I received to take seriously such a proposal. Today there is no mistaking the plan they had in mind and may I say that it is so distasteful to me that people like me, and there are a great many of them that I consider, that it rises well above politics. No man or woman in Saskatchewan can afford the chance to contemplate these things without thinking very seriously about the consequences. This is no time for politics, Mr. Speaker. This is not the time for Port, or any man of any political party to worry about their political futures either. To you backbenchers of the CCF let me say this, that for the time being, you are the guardians of our civil liberties to restrain the people who seek to work such a plan upon us.

I have the honor to represent, Mr. Speaker, men and women of all parties, in the services and I may say, although there are many Members who don't know anything about the loyalty that is felt between those who serve, I am deeply sensible of the compliment which was paid to me in returning me to speak for them in this House as an Independent. I am very deeply sensible of the responsibilities to maintain an independent position in so doing. Make no mistake about that. A lot of you don't understand about loyalty. I have no political axe to grind in this matter at all, and I have no partisan responsibility or affiliation. Like many of you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, there are a great many of you, I have been opposed in all my life to the principles of the Liberal Party and all its works.

Before the War I was a Conservative and when I lay down my responsibilities in this House, I'll be a Conservative again. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, many of you will think that for that reason I have no political future whatsoever, perhaps you're right, but that's not the point. I would like to be listened to in this House, Mr. Speaker, as a person who is not afraid to say what he thinks irrespective of the politics of the matter and this matter rises well above politics. The fears I am expressing are real fears, not imaginary ones. They are widely felt by those who I have the honor to represent. The Hon. Minister of Reconstruction may presume to say that he's never heard them. He's hear them now. And let me tell him that my contacts among the veterans are just as wide as his are and perhaps a good deal wider. Let me tell him further that he has a political as well as a personal bread and butter reason for defending this Government and let me tell him further that if he presumes to say such a thing to this House, he doesn't know what he's talking about. Today when so many of us have a garage, a shop, a tractor business, a taxi business, or a farm. That is the veterans' point of view. Now look at those that are employed by the large corporations. They don't look on those corporations as financial dictators, Mr. Speaker. They serve their employers faithfully and well, as they did in the Army. They're not disloyal to their employers, as the subversive propaganda of the definite opposite would have you believe. These employers are not financial dictators and the veterans know. The trouble with the Hon. Premier is this: that every time we criticize him . . .

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, when has the Hon.

**February 13, 1947**

Member the right to refer to the slanderous actions of the Government?

**Mr. Embury:** — Are you asking a question or making a Point of Order?

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — I'm making a Point of Order. I don't think you have that right. I don't think the Member has that right . . . Well, Mr. Speaker, then would it be alright for me to refer to the Members in the Opposition as a group of so and so's? . . . No I haven't, no I haven't.

**Mr. Embury:** — Who's making this speech anyway?

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — The Member referred to slanderous, I believe it was slanderous actions or slanderous works of the Government.

**Mr. Embury:** — Could I help the Hon. Member by repeating it?

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Yes.

**Mr. Embury:** — This is the statement.

Those of them who work for smaller employers have still closer ties. They are not employed by financial dictators and the veterans know it. No matter what this Government may choose to say in its slanderous assaults upon the productive men and women in Saskatchewan.

That's what I said and that's what I mean.

**An Hon. Member:** — Upon whom?

**Mr. Embury:** — Upon the productive men and women in Saskatchewan.

**An Hon. Member:** — What was that?

**Mr. Embury:** — I was really referring to the propaganda.

**An Hon. Member:** — That is false!

**Mr. Embury:** — I retract it then. And I'll say the slanderous propaganda put out concerning men and women of Saskatchewan. I have to substitute something. As I was saying the trouble with the Hon. Premier if you criticize him and you criticize his Cabinet he always says it is not constructive or he goes off into some glib tongue about fur-bearing animals. He will find, Mr. Speaker, the veterans today non-fur-bearing animals when he comes to meet them in the future. We all know and we have gained some familiarity with the proposals of this Government. As the plan emerges I charge this Government with a design to assume totalitarian domination of our democracy. They have countenanced and have done these things in succession, they have countenanced communists' activities and not denounced them. They have printed and circulated communist propaganda at the public expense. They have done that, I've said they have done that before. They have

attempted to warp the adolescent minds of our children by teaching doctrines of the Communist pattern, of dissension and dissatisfaction with their country. They have decreased the age of voting to 18 years to take advantage of it.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order I think when the Hon. Member says that the Government has attempted to warp the minds of the school children that he is definitely imputing wrong motives. That should be withdrawn. He might be able to say that in his opinion certain things would warp the minds of the children but when he definitely states that that was our objective I think that is out of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Embury:** — Trouble with you is you can't take it.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — I can take it and I'll hand it back too.

**Mr. Embury:** — They have attempted to warp the adolescent mind of our children by teaching them doctrines of the Communist pattern of dissension and dissatisfaction with our country. They have decreased the age of voting to 18 years to take an early advantage of it. They retain a group of experts, planners and back room boys headed by one whose freedom . . .

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, on another Point of Order, is the Hon. Member reading his speech?

**Mr. Embury:** — . . . headed by one whose sympathies in this regard we are not aware. Slowly but surely in municipal affairs and in educational affairs they encroach upon the autonomy of the lesser jurisdiction to assume a grasping, throttling control.

In the Department of Labour they presume, or seek to usurp the functions of the court by giving a Government appointee, or appointees, at pleasure, the functions of a King's Bench Court to decide matters between subject and subject of a contentious nature. Step by step the plan emerges, Mr. Speaker, to place all productive people in economic subjection to the Government. In economic competition with the Government so that in the end they must fail in private enterprise. The insurance people, the trucker, the garage man, the adjusters, nobody knows who is next at all in this sacred name of charity. Everyone, Mr. Speaker, everyone who agrees with you is a fascist or a reactionary. Where have I heard that before? Mr. Molotoff, I think. They are studying now the means whereby the professions can be throttled and controlled and a Government committee is now, a committee of this House, is sitting to consider it. The authoritative statement of the Premier himself is what I have quoted, we will not rest until capitalism in Saskatchewan is eradicated. Mr. Speaker these are the people who now ask us to give them a pro forma so that they can make a dossier on each one of our children in the schools.

Mr. Speaker, I say beware, you good people of Saskatchewan. The plans on which this Government are embarked are all too familiar. It was not so long ago that we were criticising the German people for not rising up to fight against this sort of

**February 13, 1947**

thing, Mr. Speaker, I didn't go so far afield as the Poe Valley in Italy and friends of mine didn't fight their way to . . . and beyond to put this sort of thing down only to come home to find a group of demagogues cramming it down our throats in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I will not support the motion.

**Hon. J.H. Sturdy (minister of Reconstruction and Rehabilitation):** — I wish to join with the other Members who have previously spoken in welcoming the Hon. Member for Morse to the seat in the Legislature. I wish to congratulate him on an excellent speech and commend the intelligence of the electors of Morse in electing so worthy a representative to this Legislature. I wish to compliment also the secretary and the many Members who have spoken before. I wish to commend the work of the three soldier representatives in this House, they have added some fire and – I'm sorry the Hon. Member is leaving. He has added . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — He can't take it.

**An Hon. Member:** — Who said that?

**Mr. Sturdy:** — . . . considerable . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Where were you when you should have been taking it?

**Mr. Sturdy:** — I'm not denying the fact that these soldier representatives are indeed the champions of the returned soldiers. There are twelve, I believe, veterans of the last Great War in this House, they also are the champions of the returned men. I believe that goes for every Member of this House. I'm sorry that the period during which these three Members of the Armed Services will sit in the House is drawing to a close. I look forward to the day when some of them will return, although I hold out very small hope indeed for the return of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, unless he changes his political philosophy.

Now after listening to him I am convinced, as I have never been before, that there is a great need for a Bill of Rights in this province. I'm convinced that should the political party of his faith be elected again in the Dominion Parliament that freedom, such as we have known in the past, would possibly be a thing of the past. Fascism would then indeed be in the saddle. You know it is a strange thing to me, I've always associated freedom of speech as an example with freedom for all people. Now as it appears with the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat and who has left the Chambers would deny freedom of speech to those who are opposed to him in political ideology. Again I would state this to the hon. gentleman, along with Voltaire that great French philosopher, that I hate what you have said but I will defend with my life your right to say it and that is the policy of the CCF. The strange thing indeed when we find in the House of Commons, Mr. John Diefenbaker, Conservative Member for Lake Centre, introducing a Bill of Rights. After listening to this speech today that indeed is sheer hypocrisy. There is indeed need for a Bill of Rights. There are certain areas of this Dominion of ours where the Padlock Law is still in force. Where freedom of religion is challenged and I do think this, that should fascism ever get its way in the Dominion of Canada that this Province of Saskatchewan will be the one mecca for free

men and women in the Dominion of Canada.

**An Hon. Member:** — As long as they kick you out.

**Mr. Sturdy:** — Now I would like to take this opportunity of conveying my appreciation that our old friend, the Sergeant-at-Arms, Major Harry Mullins, V.C. has returned to his old post. He indeed is an example of a Canadian citizen soldier that I admire. He has served in two wars for a period of some nine years, has been given the highest award, the highest decoration and he returns to civil life only asking the opportunity to continue to serve the people of this province in civilian life as well as in war.

Mr. Speaker, I should like also to congratulate the Hon. Leader of the Opposition on the completion of 25 years as Member of the Legislature. As a citizen of Saskatchewan he has achieved the highest honor that could be bestowed on him and in his own life I am sure that he has done his best at all times and under all circumstances. He rendered gallant service in the First Great War and I am sure the people of Saskatchewan will remember these things when he has passed out of political life. I am sure that they will always have a warm spot in their hearts for Bill Patterson. Yes, the member of society, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and as a citizen of this province and as a veteran and for other reasons, the Hon. Member of the Opposition may review the past 25 years with considerable satisfaction and derive considerable happiness therefrom. But as a Member of a pacifist Liberal administration I equally am sure that he must feel that the past 25 years have been largely wasted. As he looks down that long cheerless vista of those 25 barren, profitless years of Liberal administration in this province, he must be overwhelmed by a sense of futility, frustration and despair. Yet he need not despair, a political rebirth is a possibility. In the past many of us have experienced such a rebirth and have gained great satisfaction and comfort to our souls therefrom and a benefit to society.

Now as the Attorney General has said, "You are born into the old parties, you must think your way into the CCF." And if the Hon. Member of the Opposition will in the years that remain with him join the people's movement, that dynamic and purposeful commonwealth, I am sure that he will not only atone for a wasted political past but he will soon be able to forget that long lost weekend of 25 years he spent in the Liberal Party. Now it must be a revelation indeed to the old time Members of the Opposition to witness so much being accomplished in two and one-half years of CCF administration. There is even evidence that they are being blasted out of their old lethargy and slavish adherence to the Laissez-faire and do-nothing policies of the Liberal Party of the past. Even the Hon. Member for Moosomin is catching some of our spirit of positive action and enthusiasm. He keeps shouting, where is your paint factory, come on with your industrial alcohol and even the Hon. Member for Arm River becomes so enthusiastic at times and sits so fairly close to the edge of his chair that we on the right, Mr. Speaker, are in constant fear that he will collapse on the floor. Now the collapse of the Arm River seat is inevitable but we don't think the Hon. Member should be rehearsing it in the Legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a great deal of verbiage has been expended on the informational services provided by the Saskatchewan Government. Government is the most important business in this

**February 13, 1947**

province and the people who own this business of Government and I may add for the first time, hitherto they merely elected us. The people are entitled to complete information as to what is being done. Now a great deal is being done and for the first time by any administration in this Government. And it is this fact that galls the Members of the Opposition and no doubt you have detected, Mr. Speaker, as I have from over here, that that green eyed monster, jealousy, is reflected in the eyes of the Members of the Opposition. As an example, the 52 issues of the Saskatchewan news per year are required by this Government and only one by the past Liberal administration, that merely represents the relative amount of business and work accomplished by the respective governments. More money is being expended on advertising by a single Canadian corporation such as the liquor interests or the CPR and its subsidiaries or affiliated mortgage companies than by the Government of this province. The people know that the money of governments or corporations all come from the same source, the workman, the farmer and the producers and we insist on telling the people how their money is being expended, what they are getting for their money and the Opposition won't stop us ever.

Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to take a part in this debate but the Hon. Leader of the Opposition saw fit to cast doubt on the fairness with which provincial Crown lands have been allocated to veterans, at least in certain instances. I am going to inform the House on this matter. I wish to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that my statements will be properly documented, I shall not quote from anonymous letters nor refer to mythical persons or indulge in fairy stories, that has become the favorite device of the Opposition. When will the Opposition learn that the people of Saskatchewan are interested in facts and not fiction, that political bogeymen frighten the politically immature. But the people of Saskatchewan achieved political maturity in June 1944 when they smashed the political machine and elected a government of the people, by the people and for the people. Also I do not intend to resort to that depraved type of voodooism indulged in by the Hon. Member for Rosthern who even blamed the weather on the CCF, who advocates the removal of certain textbooks from the schools, preliminary to burning them I suppose. That was the favorite device of fascism in Hitler, in Germany, to destroy human advancement, human dignity and freedom.

You know, Mr. Speaker, while exception has been taken to certain passages contained in the present history textbook, 'The World of Today', I would call attention to the fact that I, along with many other Members of this House were teachers in days gone by. Prior to 1933 I was principal of the school at Fort Qu'Appelle for 12 years and I want to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that this was the text from which I was asked to teach the high school grades history at that time. This was the text hoisted on me by past Tory and Liberal governments in the province, on poor unsuspecting innocent me and upon my equally innocent students. Now what do I find, I find that in world progress this text from which I taught 12 years ago contains no less than 53 references to Russia in the index and not four or five as is contained in the text being used at the present time. Now what do I find here, stories in this of the persecution of liberals in Russian – spelled with a small "l" – it tells all about the revolution of the Soviet. It describes in considerable detail the allied intervention that took place in Russia after the First Great War, it speaks of the Bolshevik rule of collectivism, of the peace policies and so on. Scores

**February 13, 1947**

of pages are used to describe Russia in this text from which I taught some twelve years ago. Let's see what they have to say here regarding the peace policies of Russia:

After the launching of the first five-year plan, the Soviets naturally concentrated intensely on democratic policies and left the ideal of world revolution to take care of itself. Not only did Moscow promptly adhere to the Briand Kellog Pact of 1928 which solemnly outlawed war but it arranged especially with its neighbors to bring this immediately into force between them.

It goes on to state here also:

That with the exception of Germany and Japan all Russia's neighbors had signed with her in treaties of friendship and nonaggression.

With France in 1935 she entered into a more positive agreement for mutual support against unprovoked attack. She had now sided definitely with the satisfied states which stands for peace.

Again going through the index I find that whole chapters, whole pages are devoted to the description of Lenin and of Stalin but not a word in all this text entitled, 'World Progress' – not a single word was devoted to Premier King and to Premier, ex-Premier of the time, Bennett. Maybe the historians of the time decided that neither King nor Bennett considered world progress, the title of this book, and so they aren't mentioned in it, or no time devoted to them. What is the matter with the historians of Canada that they didn't recognize the tremendous contribution to world progress by Mr. King and Mr. Bennett?

Now I call your attention also, and I'll read briefly therefrom, chapter 20 of this textbook from which I had to teach the power of the capitalist class. A whole chapter devoted to it, stating that Rome had won the world but lost her own soul. I could give you some excellent paragraphs from this particular chapter. I'll read you one:

The syndicates share no political party, like big business of our time they sought to control or own every leader and party which might be able sometime to serve them. Moreover, small shares of the stock company were widely distributed so that the whole middle class of citizens were interested in one prospect of enlarged dividends. Such citizens could be counted upon to support any project of the money interests with their votes in the Assembly and their shouting in the street corners.

Surely history has repeated itself when big business dominates our Government at Ottawa today and this is the courageous fight that the CCF is trying to carry out and to eliminate this injustice. And so I could go on.

Another textbook that was prescribed at the time as a reference book was that great socialist, H.G. Wells' textbook, 'Outline of History'. Then why is such serious exception taken to the texts which we prescribe and the texts which I have outlined? Now I do not condemn the Liberals for putting this type of textbook in the schools of those days, I merely wish to

**February 13, 1947**

point out how criminally silly and retrogressive they are to condemn us who are trying to broaden education, to include all sides of all controversial problems. That is my conception of education. A study, an examination of all sides of all controversial problems. To teach our youths to examine carefully and to weigh carefully all sides and all the evidence. To teach our youth to be constructively critical and above all to turn to proper authorities for guidance and not be led astray by every demagogue or propagandist that speaks or writes. That is our conception of democracy, of broad education and I do congratulate the Minister of Education in his efforts to bring about just that type of education which our children will be taught. Not taught to think but how to think, not what the answer is but how to go out and find the answer, not to believe even, but how to be worthy of the belief. And I believe that if the youth of this province and this country and the world are taught in that way, along those broad lines, constructively critical that they will solve the problems of this day much better than we have in our generation and that they will give us a world free from the scourge of war.

Now with regard to our land policy, I'm sorry I've been getting around to it rather slowly. I have to take the responsibility largely for that land policy insofar as the sentiment of returned men are concerned. I sat in on all the meetings, I have had some experience of land settlement after the last War because I did receive, I came under the Soldier Settlement Board as a settler on a farm, in this province after the last War and I was determined that we would not run into the mistakes, and we would not foist on to our soldier settlers after this War, the same intolerable terms and conditions that were foisted upon them after the last War. And so all Crown lands are reserved for soldier settlements under a 33 year lease. This lease is renewable and will be held by the veteran as long as he cares to hold it. It can be bequeathed to his heirs, to his widow, to his dependants. Now with respect to the option to purchase which he can exercise at the end of ten years (I'll deal with that later) with respect to the option to purchase of which he can exercise within ten years. The purchase price of that land is the average price of the land in that area and its productivity and it is not the inflated war time prices that exist on land today. I would state also that the rent which is from one-eighth to one-sixth of the crop share, may and undoubtedly will, in many cases, be adjusted. If it is found that a soldier settling in a less favorable part of the province cannot support himself in comfort and in dignity and with a relatively high standard of living, pay an eighth crop share, then that eighth crop share will be reduced. This lease agreement contains a crop failure clause and the soldier settler is not required to pay any rental whatsoever during the crop failure year, or a year in which the crops is less than \$6 per seeded acre.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Who pays the taxes?

**Mr. Sturdy:** — The lessee pays the taxes.

Now Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out also that all the improvements which the returned man places on that land by way of putting more land under cultivation, fences, wells, barns, buildings and so on, are all the property of the lessee of the section. Should he decide to leave, to surrender the lease then he will be paid for all of those improvements and not be forced off as have been literally thousands of men who settled under

February 13, 1947

Soldier Settlement Board land without a cent and compelled to face the future in poverty. Now after quite a long time of negotiation we were able to consummate a deal with the Federal Government whereby a maximum grant of \$2,320 would be paid to each settler for the purchase of his improvements of machinery, and stock. The number of veterans we settled last year in time for the 1946 crop season was 763. At the present time 498 parcels of land are being allocated so that within a space of one year we will have settled some 1,250 returned men and that, I wish to assure the House, after careful investigation is launched and has been settled by all other provincial governments put together in the Dominion of Canada on provincial farm lands. Our policy, and it is our ambition, to settle 2,000 men, 2,000 returned men on Crown land. I want to contrast this policy, this land policy of ours with the land policy of the Liberal Government after the last war in this province. Of course they didn't have a policy, they didn't settle any returned men on farm lands. I have yet to discover where they did anything whatsoever for returned men after the last war. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that they sold . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Who was controlling and owning the school land and farm land in Saskatchewan after the last war?

**Mr. Sturdy:** — I was just going to add that. It is true that the natural resources were still under the ownership of the Federal Government but there was much the provincial government could have done to have assisted in the rehabilitation of the returned men after the last war which they didn't do. Now to compare it with the policy of the Soldier Settlement Board after the last war, what is the record? Some 25,000 men settled on farms, over 12,000 of them were forced off their land or quit in despair and less than 6,000 remain on the land today. Not so long ago a resolution was introduced asking that those soldier settlers who still owed the Federal Government money on account of these farms, and there were several hundred of them, that they be given deeds to the land on which they had worked and which they had occupied for a period of over 25 years. Now it is characteristic of Mr. Tucker that he spoke in favor of that resolution but you are familiar with the procedure, the resolution had to be voted on by a certain time. If the vote hadn't been taken the vote died on the Order Paper. Now Mr. Tucker while hypocritically supporting that motion talked on and on, and how that man can talk and continued to talk under the expiration of the time when the vote was taken, and so the resolution died on the Order Paper. Now this is Mr. Tucker, the self-styled soldier's friend.

I would like to quote from a letter from a returned man. I will give you his name too, this is an old settler, under the SSB, under the Soldier's Settlement Board, he is E.R. Groiley of Clayton, Saskatchewan, and this is what he has to say:

However, if the experience of the old settlers is any criteria then the Saskatchewan Government is to be highly commended for their assistance to the young veteran settlers and their lease plan. They will enjoy (meaning the young veterans) security of tenure and a standard of living and comfort us old veterans never had a chance to even dream of.

**February 13, 1947**

He goes on:

At a trial settlement of 20 settlers being placed on identical land, as to quantity and quality in 1920, 10 on the lease plan such as the Saskatchewan Government has for veterans today and the other 10 on the old SSB plan, the contrast would have been magnificent. The 10 on the lease plan would have said the state is really existing for us, we have security, we have money for improvement, we are enjoying the comforts of life. The story of the other 10 would vary. Six or seven of them would have given up the struggle in despair, the other three or four would say security of tenure at times was not secure, if they had to deal with the Federal Farm Credit Act. Almost all of the 10 could have said we have apparently existed to serve the state only.

Now that is the opinion of one of the old veterans. Now our method of allocating lands. I consulted with the soldier Members in the House, the representatives of the Arm Services, with individual veterans in the Veterans Organization. We drew up this chart and they agreed to it and thought it was the most equitable method of allocating these Crown lands. In the question of service, one point is given for each year in Canada while a man served in the NRNA, three points for each year of service in Canada, five points for each year of service overseas, making a total of 30 points. He was given 15 points if he could establish that he had no resources. We had even doctors and lawyers applying for Crown land. Well those men already have professions, were already presumably re-established and so we allocated 15 points on the basis of need according to resources. Then we gave 15 points for need according to dependants, a man who wasn't married didn't get any of these 15 points. If he was married he got 10 points and one point for each additional child, making a total of 15 points. He was given five points if he resided in the district under certain conditions for a certain period of time. We thought that the men who were living in the district would probably fit into the life of that district better and so have a greater probability for success. Five points were assigned for proximity to the Crown land so that the young settlers could use the machinery of their father or near relatives and then there were thirty points for such factors, such as; qualifications as a farmer, probability of success, initiative and so on. Now this was our method of allocating Crown lands according to the chart.

I want to read a letter from a young veteran of this war who went overseas before the war broke out, he couldn't find employment here and he joined the RAF. He rendered excellent service, made numerable flights over Germany, was eventually shot down, taken prisoner; he is now back in Canada and back at school. I am quoting an excerpt from his letter:

Thanks for the information on land settlement. Your policy to settle 2,000 veterans on provincial land is an ambitious one and I am sure you will receive the support of all the Saskatchewan people. Quite a number of the boys around here are interested and I think we all agree your formula for allocating the land is a fair one. Thank goodness these farms are not the handouts of local Liberal organizations as jobs used to be in pre-war days. Those pre-war days are pretty hard to forget and forgive and there is always the deep

seated fear in the minds of returned men that they may return. This time it is the business of all of us to see they don't

That is the opinion of a returned man who has rendered very gallant service in the past year.

Now the personnel of the allocating committees, they were invariably returned men. A committee of three was set up to allocate these lands, two of them were returned men, very often selected from the ranks of legionnaires. Whalen is an example, of Prince Albert, president of the provincial command of the Legion, he was one of those. The instructions to the committee was that they must adhere closely to the chart and allocate the land on the basis of the marks or the points that each man secured, based on his war service and the other considerations that I have outlined. The committee was warned that they must be able to defend every allocation that was made, that there must be no political interference of any kind whatsoever and we have had remarkable success to my mind because there have only been 23 appeals out of 763 allocations.

Now, in the appeals, six of the original applications were upheld and 17 were reversed so that less than 3 per cent were changed out of the 763. I wish to congratulate the Allocating Committee in this province. They did an excellent job. I wish also to congratulate and express appreciation to the people out there in the country, they exercised very great restraint, with tremendous interest in this land and evidence that the soldier agreed in our land policy is evidenced by the fact that as many as 30 applied for a single parcel of land. I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, that the only interference came from local Liberal henchmen. Now appeals were granted under certain circumstances. Where it could be revealed that the original allocating board didn't have all the facts of the case, didn't have all the evidence or the facts were misrepresented to them or if a sufficient number of people in the area made approaches or such organizations as the Legion and local rehabilitation committees appealed then we would give consideration to granting that appeal. Now the Hon. Leader of the Opposition made reference to three appeals in one rural municipality. He also made reference to some mythical or ghostly personage from the country who allegedly made a surreptitious interview with myself or the Minister of Natural Resources and I wish to state this, in this connection that I categorically deny any such interview. And is as far as the Minister of Natural Resources is concerned, he has never at any time interfered in the slightest way with the allocation of these farm lands. He has kept strictly out. Now with regard to these mythical, these political ghosts they may haunt the Hon. Leader of the Opposition for his past political misdeeds but they certainly don't haunt me. In the words of Shakespeare, "My withers are unrubbed."

Now I'll deal with the cases in question, the only place in the province there was a question placed on the Order Paper relative to a Mr. Westbury of Hughton, so in RM 257 there were three, three of each. This is the case of Gustafason, G.I. Gustafason and R. Restler. I mean there were several applicants for this parcel of land. That's the E½ of Section 11-24-14 W3rd. The first intimation we had that there was anything wrong was when we received a wire which reads as follows:

Combined meeting of executives of Elrose Legion and

**February 13, 1947**

District Rehabilitation Committee met on the 17<sup>th</sup> instant to discuss the question of disposal of certain lands that is mainly the N½ of Section 29 and the S½ of 29 and the E½ of 11-27-14 W3rd, and they find there is considerable dissatisfaction with prevailing in the district on the part of residents and ex-servicemen, as to the decisions arrived at. We therefore regret that (1) land disposal be deferred (2) government direct another committee to sit in Elrose and review decisions made as soon as possible.

This was signed on behalf of the Elrose Canadian Legion by the secretary and on behalf of the District Rehabilitation Committee by the secretary also. We have to give some cognizance to this telegram. I asked that the files be brought to me so that they could be reviewed, and that was done.

Now according to the original allocation this was the story. The three members of the original Allocation Committee were all three returned men. I'm not unduly lading them, I don't think for a minute that one of these three gentlemen would deliberately do anything dishonest. I think they just didn't take all the factors into consideration. There was a great deal of land being allocated at that time. We were trying to get as many boys on farms in time for the crop season of 1946 as we possibly could, and possibly the fault is in part ours that we rushed these allocations. The original allocation committee had ordered the land to Roy Westbury and they scored him 72 points. In spite of the fact that they had scored 76 points for G.I. Gustafason. Now they had disregarded the instructions that they must adhere closely to this chart, and give the man who obtained the highest points, the first chance or he was to receive the land. Their remarks were these:

This committee recommended the allocation of this land to this applicant on the basis of need, qualification and a high point score.

The member didn't score the highest point. With respect to G.I. Gustafason who eventually . . . the land, this is the remark that went out his portion:

This man's father farms a section and he is the only son. We did not consider he had great need for the land.

Now the things that they had not taken into consideration was the fact that although the father did own a section of land, that land was very heavily encumbered and the father was the father of three sons, and I don't think that any Member of this House expects parents to assume full responsibility for the rehabilitation of those whom they had overseas. With respect to service, the man whom they gave the land to had 16 points. Gustafason received 18 points. Well now, it is necessary that we appoint an Appeal Board for the reason that we have received this telegram from the Legion and from the Local Rehabilitation Committee and examination of the records reveals that the land has not been given to the man who had secured the highest points. So we had the case reviewed and in the review the land was given to Gustafason.

**Mr. Embury:** — May I ask a question on that point? Was this telegram

from the Legion sent as a result of the appeal decision or as a result of the initial board decision?

**Mr. Sturdy:** — The initial decision.

**Mr. Embury:** — Ah, may I make that very clear, that is as a result of the initial decision. They objected to the initial decision.

**Mr. Sturdy:** — We examined the other two cases that have been referred to and this is what we found: That in the case of H.F. Molsberry and D.K. Brown the land had originally been given to Molsberry. The Appeal Board sat and after hearing all the evidence they gave it to D.K. Brown. Now, the reason, in this case there are only two points difference between Mr. Molsberry who achieved 78 points according to the original allocation and D.K. Brown, who according to them was entitled to 76 points. On Mr. Brown's chart they wrote this comment:

As the father of this applicant has three sections of land, the need in this case is not considered to be as great as that of the other applicants.

Now again I am not unduly condemning that original allocation committee. What they hadn't been informed of evidently was that Mr. Brown's father would have had the sympathy of Mr. Tucker in this case. Three sections, or rather five quarters of these three sections of land is very inferior land, is practically non-productable. I'll point this out also. According to the finding of the original committee, Molsberry scored 18 and Mr. Brown scored 21 for overseas service. Mr. Brown had been overseas for a period of over four years. Now the Appeal Board said on considering everything they found that according to the chart Mr. Brown scored 81 points and Molsberry 66. There were quite a number of adjustments in these two points and for that reason the land was allocated to Mr. Brown. I have heard since that Mr. Brown has had probably the best overseas record or as good an overseas record as any young man from that entire district.

Now dealing with the latter case, that of L.C. Brown and V.G. Fitzgerald. I'll call your attention to the fact that there is no relationship between D.K. Brown and L.C. Brown. Now the facts of the matter of these two cases is this. The original Allocation Board awarded the land to V.G. Fitzgerald of Rosetown with a score of 62 and placed L.C. Brown second with a score of 62 also. We checked the chart and we found that Fitzgerald who had got the land originally was awarded by the original allocation committee, eight points for service in the army. L.C. Brown who was turned down had 18 points for service. That is he had three years service overseas. Fitzgerald had no overseas service at all. Now, there was this point, that Fitzgerald was a married man, he didn't have any children but he was married, whereas Mr. Brown was not a married man. Now this is what the original allocating committee said:

This man's score (Mr. Brown) is also high, but as he was single while the successful applicant was married, we could not cause our decision to be in favor of the married man.

Well, we do think that a man's army record weighs pretty

**February 13, 1947**

heavily in favor of that man and where there was the case of the difference between eight points and 18 points, a difference of three years service in Canada and three years service overseas and one year service in Canada, that man should be given some consideration. And may I point out this also, that the father of L.C. Brown owns a quarter section of land and farms another quarter section of land. He had three sons in this war, one of whom was killed overseas, the other was in the Navy and the third one was the successful applicant according to the Appeal Board, Mr. L.C. Brown. Now we appointed these allocating committees, these review committees. I'll name the personnel of this committee. The Review Board who sat on these three cases was comprised of Mr. Boucher, Col. Germaine and a Mr. Ritchie. Mr. Boucher had been employed by the Taft Liberal administration for many years, he's an agricultural representative. He had been chairman of Allocating Boards on numerous occasions and had done an excellent job. He couldn't be influenced politically or if he was, it must have been the fault of the people who recently employed him. I received a letter from Mr. Boucher, or incidentally this letter came to my office it was addressed to the Supervisor of Rehabilitation and this is what Mr. Boucher says:

I notice by the papers that during the last by-election (this letter was as far back as July 4<sup>th</sup>, 1946) a speaker intimated that politics had played an important part in the allocation of some of the land in or around that municipality, the RM 257. I just want to make a statement regarding this allocation, to the effect that at no time did any political party try to influence or even suggest interfering in any way with the independent committee's work in connection with these allocations.

The second member of that committee is Col. Germaine, whom many of you must know as a gentleman of integrity, also an employee of past government, high up in the Legion, he was zone representative for probably 15 years, I know, for the Moose Jaw zone. He was on the District Council for several years and he's been the oldest executive member of the Moose Jaw Legion existing, he served for over 20 years. When this question was raised in the House by the Leader of the Opposition the other day, Mr. Col. Germaine, of his own volition, wrote in and this is what he said, the letter is address to me:

I am of the opinion that as a member of the Allocation Board which reviewed the allocations from the Elbow district I should in fairness to the chairman and the other members of the Board, outline to you just what occurred during the sitting of the Board in that district.

And then he goes on to state whom they interviewed, when they went out there, the Legion, the Rehabilitation Committees, the Municipal Council, and so on, in order to get all the facts of the case. He ends up by saying:

I know of no pressure being made on any member of the Board by any political or other organization in an attempt to influence them in the interest of any application, any applicant for land and I am satisfied that the Board as individuals were and are still unaware of the political affiliations of any of the applicants.

**February 13, 1947**

From my experience as chairman of other boards (I will say this, that Col. Germaine had acted on many other boards and had rendered excellent service) on the same work I consider the chairman of this Board, Mr. Boucher conducted the hearings properly and that the awards were made according to the regulations covering allocation of lands. I trust that this may assist in clearing up any misunderstandings that have occurred over allocations made by the Board of Review in this district.

Now the third member of the Board is at present an employee of the Government with the Department of Natural Resources. He is Mr. Ritchie, the Hon. Members of the Opposition must know him because they employed him and he is evidently a good man. I suppose it was necessary for the past Liberal administration to get some good men around them and he had been a Reeve of a municipality, he sat on past boards. I don't know whether he is an ex-service man or not, but I know that he had two sons in this war who rendered excellent military service. He is absent from the city at the present time on holidays, or I think there would be a statement from him too.

Now that is the report on these three cases and I am sorry that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition raised this question, who made this charge, wasn't in here to hear this explanation. The popularity of our Land Settlement Policy is justified too by the fact that over 4,000 men made application for Crown lands. It is to be greatly regretted that we can't meet the needs of all of them but we do set our sight at settling a minimum of 2,000 returned men on to this Crown land. With this in view we have started clearance work and breaking in the Carrot River area. Considerable clearance took place last fall for 800 acres of farm land and 400 acres for roads. There is a crew remaining up there over the winter putting a bridge across the Carrot River and preparing for next year's operations. It is our policy and as far as the settlement of veterans in bush country to clear a certain amount and to bring it under cultivation. We don't want the veterans of this war to experience what those of the last war experienced. Going into the bush country with primitive tools of land clearance, slaving away year after year getting nowhere, discouraged, dissatisfied and you know and I know that some of these men were on relief even after the outbreak of the present war.

We are given consideration to a further land development and settlement scheme at Hudson Bay Junction. With respect to the Co-operative Farm at Matador, the experience there has been most satisfactory. During the few months the boys have brought 2,700 acres of raw prairie land under cultivation, have worked it down, have built four excellent homes with material salvaged from airports, built barns, sheds. There is now a dam there for the irrigation of some 160 acres. The assistance of course was given by PFRA. An excellent start has been made. We are deeply indebted to these young men for their pioneer spirit in demonstrating that co-operative farming is and can be a success. The unfortunate part of it is, I'd like to point out with regard to the Co-operative Farm that their settlement is entirely voluntary. These young men enter that type of farming because they want to. It is in line with, very often with, very much with their experiences in co-operation in the Armed Services and in the training they have received. They have learned to work together, it is a type of work they want and let me tell you that not all the reaction east of the Great Lakes is going to prevent those young men from making a success of co-operative

**February 13, 1947**

farming. Now they have been refused up to date grants in the amount of \$2,320 granted by the Federal Government to returned men who settle on individual farm units. And I'd like to deal with that briefly. I tried to negotiate for these grants but have been refused.

I was invited to appear before a Parliamentary Committee in Ottawa in April. That Parliamentary Committee heard me with great attention and courtesy and then . . . no, Mr. Judsa, this was a subcommittee under the chairmanship of Mr. Judsa, another grit from Manitoba. They brought in a report and this was the heading of the report. They turned it down because this was an experimental venture in the application of the new philosophy of the different social origin. Have you ever heard of anything more absurd than a statement of that time coming from supposedly dignified parliamentarians? State of Proctor is an experimental venture in the application of a new philosophy of the different social origin. Well, I wasn't satisfied, I again was invited down to hear the main to appear before the main that is in July of last year. That Committee was presided over by Mr. Tucker. However, on this particular occasion he asked to be excused from the chairmanship and have someone else appointed. He said that he wanted to speak to me and question me on the matter. I am sure that if the vote had been taken at the end of my presentation that the vote would have passed. If there is any question about it. I asked Mr. Tucker if a vote might not be taken, "oh, he said, no that is not the procedure here, we will have to wait for a week or so then we have all the vote together."

Now the Department of Veterans' Affairs is comprised of some 65, at the meeting that I attended there were only 25 or so present. But when they vote on these facts, Cabinet Ministers and everybody else come in, I trust that they vote along the party lines, and do just what they teach us. However, they leave this recommendation that our Department, that the DVA continue to negotiate with that Department to work out a form that could be used whereby these men could get this practice. Again I went down to the Senate and met with the Director of the DVA, Mr. Burgess, the Deputy Minister, Mr. Walter Woods and the solicitor of the Department, and we expect our Deputy Minister was also along and we have accepted the formula presented by the Director. We presume that the men will get their thanks provided of course that it isn't intervened on nullified by Mr. Tucker, because while he applies he votes against it.

Now in respect to our employment policy, 88 per cent of the males in the civil service out of a total of 1,006 have been employed or re-employed in the civil service since we took office. That is the total number of returned men we have taken into the civil service. Now we don't enquire as to the political philosophy or the political affiliations of any veteran who comes in and asks for employment or applies to the civil service. We naturally assume that they are up to par and 80 per cent of the cases are. Because at the last provincial election, they voted them in heed of the last Dominion election, they voted two to one for the CCF at this time I would like to pay tribute to the splendid work that is being done by the returned men and returned women. We do not think it is a discredit for taking on 88 per cent returned men for the civil service, they have earned the rate by virtue of their ability and their industry and their intelligence to compete in any activity or any enterprise whatsoever. In the university they are doing a splendid job, on the land they are also doing very well and believe me these

February 13, 1947

young men and these young women are serving this province just as importantly and as vitally now as they did in the armed services. And all they are asking for it is not a privilege that they are asking for but it is an opportunity for self-improvement for dignified lives taking an important place in society. And above all they are asking homes especially the married men are asking for homes, the establishment of homes and good Canadian homes and all that that implies. We have employed 200 returned men on our housing projects this year, our demolition of air ports in our reconstruction corporation. Of two machine shops and repair depots we have at Prince Albert and Regina employed from 60 to 70 and these repair shops and machine shops are primarily tended for the training of the employment of returned men and for the maintenance of government machines. Our Rehabilitation division conducts jobs and 1,380 jobs have been discovered since last July and 450 business opportunities have been located for returned men, beside some 150 training on the job opportunities and apprenticeship opens.

With respect to the employment of returned men in the civil service and in our various corporations there is a contrast to the situation which existed under the past Liberal administration and the long arm of the Liberal Gestapo reached out into every town, village and hamlet of this province. I remember I lived out in one of those small towns and when the Liberals took over in 1935 how they dismissed returned men with families, with disabilities and replaced by their own entry. The need for housing in the province has been very great, I won't labor that and the tragedy in the far east. Many of the married veterans who returned have been unable to resume normal family lives and many of them had anticipated their gratuities and savings on expensive quarters. We could say that it was a Federal responsibility and not provincial responsibility that we have done what we could. We have provided some 568 suites in the province and these are very excellent suites. I would ask the Veterans Committee that is being set up in the House to examine it to see what kind of accommodation we are trying to provide for veterans and contrast it with other types of temporary housing while attending university. We have established 170 suites in Saskatoon. We have gone further than that, we have provided them with dining rooms and kitchens, with study rooms and with recreation facilities. We have provided two play rooms for school children. An excellent and wonderful experiment in philosophy, and it has been provided at an expense considerably below their rehabilitation plan. This is the only province that has engaged in emergency housing and the only province that has provided this type of accommodation.

I would like to read a statement here from Mr. Thompson. Mr. Thompson is the director of vocational training for the Dominion of Canada. He states that in some areas in the Dominion it was found that training could not be proceeded with because there was no housing facilities or feeding facilities for the men. He ends his statement with this:

We are indebted to the Provincial Government for assuming their responsibility for making accommodations for veterans particularly at Saskatoon, Prince Albert and Regina.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the very splendid work being done by rehabilitation committees and there

**February 13, 1947**

are some 300 in the province. Some doing much better work than others. I have in my hand a three page report with respect to the work that one of these committees has done in the past three months. This is the type of co-operation that develops into co-operation of the Provincial Government and the Federal Government in doing what we can to secure the successful rehabilitation of our returned men.

Mr. Speaker, there are several other things that I would like to speak about but I'm afraid that I have spoken long enough. But I wouldn't like to close without an expression of profound sympathy for the motherland in this hour of crisis brought upon by unprecedented storms. That she will triumph over this catastrophe we are certain just as she has done in the past. The men and women in Britain, they are heroes all. Now it is characteristic of them that even in this time of storm and crisis that the democratic processes over there must go on and yesterday they had violence in Yorkshire in which the labor candidate was returned by a majority of 15,000.

**Mr. N.L. Buchanan (Notukeu-Willow Bunch):** — Mr. Speaker, I don't think I will have time before supper to complete my talk. However, there are a few opening remarks that I would like to say, and I hope, with your permission, to be able to adjourn the debate until after supper.

At the outset of my remarks I want to join with other Hon. Members in extending my compliments to the Hon. Member for the Morse constituency and I also want to compliment the people of that constituency on the good judgment they used in returning not only an excellent Member but a supporter of the CCF party to this Legislature.

Like a number of the other Members in this House, I spent some time in that by-election. Incidentally, the most of my time was spent in the heavy-land districts of the Morse constituency, from the towns of Keeler to Tugaske, round through there. They had just established a new larger administrative unit in that area and as their land was highly assessed previous to the establishment of this larger administrative unit, their mill rate had been low. With the establishment of the larger administrative unit their mill rates rose, but I know that any Member who has studied the returns of that by-election will see at a glance that the CCF majority largely came from that area. At the same time this is the very area over which the Legge bus travelled. I don't need to say any more about that.

I want to extend a few compliments at the outset of my talk, Mr. Speaker, to Hon. Members of the Opposition and the other party that contested that by-election. It was a clean campaign. To my knowledge, or as far as I know, there was nothing brought into the fight outside of purely election issues. I didn't have an opportunity to attend any of the Opposition's meetings, but I did attend some of Mr. Ramsay's. I spent two or three weeks at the same hotel as Mr. Ramsay and I have only to say that I consider him to be an estimable gentleman and one whom I would proudly welcome into this organization.

I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that we can say too much about our air ambulance service. People in my constituency have benefitted greatly from this service during the past year. It has not been just one occasion, but on numerous occasions people

February 13, 1947

have been rushed to the city hospitals of Moose Jaw and Regina by that service. I remember, last winter, going into the hospital here in the city of Regina. I noticed a lady on a stretcher come in the door and pretty soon in walked a man. I was standing there at the entrance of the hospital and he walked up to me, looked at me, and I recognized him as one of my own constituents. We got talking, and I said, "What are you doing in here?" "Well," he said, "thank God, we've got a Government that considers the welfare of the people of this province! That stretcher case is my wife. Two hours ago we did not expect her to live. I had her in a sleigh down near the village of McCoy." That is way down in the south western part of Saskatchewan. We have seen what a valuable thing it has been in these last couple of weeks. In fact the Leader-Post gave one of its finest editorials in praise of this service.

The Saskatchewan Government Insurance Act is another thing that the people of Saskatchewan have reason to be proud of, and are proud of. I think Hon. Members have seen this little pamphlet that was issued by the Insurance Office and have read that first case. If they haven't I'm going to read it:

A young husband was killed in a collision. To his widow two children and a yet unborn child his death was a tragic loss. They also faced serious financial insecurity. The Saskatchewan Automobile Insurance Act, designed to give protection and security in cases of this kind, helped out. The widow received a cheque for \$5,050. There was \$3,000 for herself and \$625 for each of her children, including the unborn child; \$125 for funeral expenses and \$50 for medical costs.

Mr. Speaker, I know this lady well. It happened in my own constituency. We have just heard an Hon. Member raving to high heavens about the jobs, about the private enterprise that we might put out of business in this. I say to you that the measure of security that these three children received from this Automobile Accident Insurance Act, is worth all of that.

I remember when we were proposing this Act in the Legislature, petitions were coming in to some of the Members from some people in their constituencies. I only received one petition with some 21 or 30 names from the whole of my constituency. Now that doesn't mean that there were no people in that constituency who were opposed to it; but there were only a few of them so much opposed that they were prepared to sign their names to this petition; but since that time, no one could get anyone to sign a petition in that country down there to have us remove this Act from the Statutes of this province.

I want now to go to the Department of Natural Resources. I would like to remind the Minister that we have a lot of valuable resources in Notukeu-Willow Bunch and other constituencies in the southern part of the province. We have volcanic ash down there. We have lignite deposits. We have pigment clays and there is a certain amount of vegetation, of forest wealth – not very large, it is true, but nevertheless it is still valuable.

On the other hand, our soil resources for the production of crops are not as good as we find in other parts of the province. We have less rainfall there than we have in other parts, and our soil is not as rich for the production of grain.

**February 13, 1947**

For this reason we have periodic crop failures. In fact, we have crop failures far more often than do other parts of the province and I think that it is necessary that something be done to give these people in this part a larger measure of security. I will say that the Minister has already taken steps to give employment at some time to a number of people there in the construction of a playground, of a beauty spot, at Wood Mountain. I hope that this development will be carried on. I hope that the project will be found to be a satisfactory one.

The Department of Highways has done a considerable amount of work in the southern part of the province. Highway No. 13 has been built, parts of it, to a very high standard and now No. 2 is being worked on south of Assiniboia. No. 19, a large part of it down there, has been gravelled.

I believe that to the Department of Education goes most of the praise. When Hon. Members of the Opposition rant about the increased taxation, I would like to have them come down and live at Dubuc or Cedoux. Down there in one school we have a mill rate of 28 mills and in the other it is 32. I wish to high heaven that we were in a larger administrative unit there. To the west of us and to the north of us are three large administrative units. Oh, they are having their difficulties, certainly. Anything new is bound to be difficult, anything new we have to learn to operate it. You remember, in the olden days, when the farmers got into the first Model T, the stories which came out of those experiences! Well, we're going to have stories as difficulties come out of all of these things. But eventually these things will iron out and people will see, across this province, the forward step that was taken by this Government in setting up the larger administrative units.

The Hon. Minister of Reconstruction quoted from a textbook that he used when he was teaching school. I, too, used this text, Mr. Speaker, and I think if Hon. Members would take the trouble (I haven't got the text at hand) but if Hon. Members would take the trouble to thumb through its pages, they would find the Mussolini experiment highly lauded in that textbook, and yet there was no cry then of 'propaganda' or 'Fascist propaganda'. Why should there now be any cry of 'Communist propaganda'?

This past year we organized a large health region in our district embracing roughly the constituencies of Bengough, Gravelbourg and Notukeu-Willow Bunch, and I was proud to see who it was that took part in helping to organize this region. It cut right across party lines. The people in that part of the country believed that the health of the individual was far more important than political gain and I stood on – not one but several – platforms holding my meetings, purely political meetings wherein I was reporting to the people of my constituency, and at the same time as I was holding that meeting one of the outstanding Liberals in my constituency was on that same platform helping to organize the Health Region and there were outstanding members in the Conservative Party that did the same thing. We are united together there to go forward to something better than we have had in the past, and this was made possible by the present administration.

Mr. Speaker, I have now completed the introduction of what I have to say and it being now 6:00 o'clock, I would ask that you call it 6:00 o'clock.

The Assembly recessed from 6:00 o'clock p.m. until 8:00 o'clock p.m.

**Mr. Buchanan:** — Mr. Speaker, before recessing I was enumerating some of the things that this Government has done in general, and in particular with reference to my own constituency. Before recess I had a fairly good idea of what I wanted to say on resuming, but after eating the excellent supper that was prepared for us this evening, I find myself in much the same position as a Minister that the Premier often tells about. But he has told this story so many times and it's so old that I'm not going to bore Hon. Members by repeating it. I intend to say something about impressions that I have gained as a private Member while being in this House. When I used to go to school and later when it became my responsibility to instruct others in the classroom, I felt that government, consisting of Members on the Government side of the House and Members on the Opposition side of the House, were there to work at all times in the interests of the people they represented. But I find in coming here that the main thing that is done is manoeuvring for party advantage, and I have found that particularly so of the Opposition in the House since being here. I had expected that the Opposition would offer us constructive criticism which would make it possible for us to so legislate that the people would benefit by having an Opposition here, but I find that such has not been the case. Hon. Members in the Opposition do not seem to understand just exactly what this party is, what it is made of, what the philosophy behind the CCF is. They appear to regard us as just another political party, a party such as they have come to be that thinks of nothing more than its own political fortunes. Now that is not true. The Co-operative Commonwealth Federation is not the idea of one person nor is it the idea of a few people somewhere in Canada. The CCF came into being out of the needs of the people of Canada. Certain economic conditions produce certain political ideologies. Just as certain climatic conditions produce certain vegetation, so do economic conditions produce political parties to cope with economic situations — and that is what has given birth to this party. I have no doubt that, in the past, the same thing gave birth to the Liberal Party, to the Conservative Party. Otherwise, they would not have come into being. To say just when or where the CCF started, no one can tell. The history of the progress began when the first man came on this earth; it has continued down to the present and it will go on and on and on. The CCF, the progressive party of Canada today, came into being or started when the first sod was turned in Canada, when the first factory whistle blew. My father, our parents came to this western country years ago. They had little but health, energy, youth and boundless ambition with which to hew out a home in this wilderness. But they found, when they came here, that there was somebody else already waiting for them. They found that interests closely allied to the grain trade, powerful industrial and financial interest, exacted a tribute from them. So they did everything they could to better their conditions and overcome the difficulties caused in the marketing of their grain by these grain companies in collaboration with the Canadian Pacific Railway and so came into being the territorial grain growers. One of the men, one of the leaders largely responsible for the organization of that company, was that grand old Liberal, Mr. Motherwell; another man, Mr. Partridge.

Now I am not going even to suggest that the leaders of these progressive movements began the philosophy which we now

**February 13, 1947**

have in the CCF, but they started the germ which has eventually grown into the CCF. They started this course of progress in this western country. They organized a co-operative grain elevator system, but they still found that it was not enough. They found that they had to do more than accept delivery of wheat. They found that they had to sell that wheat; that they had to have markets to which to sell that wheat. They found all kinds of difficulties that they had to meet, and some of them they could not overcome in the organization which was the United Grain Growers at a later date. Then, during the war of 1914-1918 (and I remember parts of that quite well) progress was for a while stilled in western Canada and across the Dominion. All of our energies were bent towards a successful conclusion of that war. But the farmers on the plains here found that while during the war there was a price ceiling on their products, when the war was over there was no floor to take its place and prices slipped to an all-time low. A wave of protest spread over western Canada and to the industrial East and you will remember, Mr. Speaker, that during those years, in 1921, we sent 65 Progressives down to Ottawa from the western provinces.

Now these men were largely a protest group. I will not say that they did not accomplish anything while they were in Ottawa. They did. They accomplished many things. But they were not enthused with one ideal. They did not have an ultimate objective toward which to shoot. Each one went down there carrying the burden of his own constituency on his own shoulders, and there was little co-operation among them.

Well, you know what happened. You know that, one by one, the leaders of this group heard and heeded the cry that was extended to us from across the floor, the other day, to come back into the Liberal fold, and they did so; but the ideals that they were striving for lived on.

The Wheat Pool came into being, the greatest organization of its kind that ever existed in the world and it solved another of the farmers' problems; that of keeping control of his product from the time that he seeded it in the spring until it was finally delivered on the markets of the world. It gave him a great deal of help, but it tried to function within a capitalistic economy racing towards ultimate catastrophe – and we had the 1929 calamity.

Now all these years there was a group of Progressives that maintained the ideals that are presently found in this organization, headed by Mr. Woodsworth, Bill Evans, M.J. Coldwell, George Williams, Andy McAulay and people like that. These people kept that ideal alive and during the late 1920s and the early 1930s when we saw the failures of capitalist economy to provide the necessities of life to the people all over the world, these men tried to get a political party organized and out of various organizations – farmer organizations, labor organizations – across this country grew what is today the CCF. They met in Saskatoon, the farmers and the UFCs. While the UFC itself decided not to go into politics, a large number of the leaders there decided to form a party.

Now, at this time, labor was experiencing the same difficulties that farmers were experiencing and they saw a possibility of co-operating with farmers. They had been told, and farmers had been told, that it could not be done, that their interests were opposed to one another. But labour leaders

**February 13, 1947**

knew that, when they got enough money for their toil, they could eat, and farmers knew that when labor could eat, they could sell their products. So they decided that their problems were the same; and they met together here in Regina. They formed then the Farmer-Labour group.

While this was happening in Saskatchewan it was also happening all across the Dominion. Interested leaders of farmers and laborers all over the Dominion asked that this be made not only a provincial party, but that it be made a federal party as well and they requested that another convention be held in Calgary.

This convention was held there and there the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation came into being.

The CCF contested the elections, for the first time in this province in 1934. We only elected at that time, five Members. They were known as the 'quintuplets' at that time. Now, I believe to a certain extent in political justice, Mr. Speaker, and today we see five 'quintuplets' over there again but of an entirely different complexion from the quintuplets that occupied those seats in 1934; just ten years. And today, once again, we on this side of the House are hearing the call to come back to the good old Liberal fold.

Mr. Speaker, that was not a slip of the tongue on the part of the Hon. Member. Not at all. That is a cry that MacKenzie King has given to our national leader. It is a cry – though far different from the Rt. Hon. James G. Gardiner's cry – that he would sooner see a Tory Government in office than a CCF Government. And so we have the two extremes; MacKenzie King on the one hand inviting CCFers to come into his government; Mr. Gardiner on the other hand saying that he believed in reaction, that he would sooner see the reactionary forces, the most reactionary forces of capitalism in power than see a CCF Government in power.

Mr. Speaker, I have no worry about Hon. Members in this party, today, listening to the call of those who may rightly have claimed to belong to the party who gave us birth. I have no doubt as to what their answer would be, because you see, Mr. Speaker, we have something that they cannot understand. We have a heritage of disillusionment. We have a heritage given to us by those old Progressives of the past, the men and women who sacrificed so much in this world's goods, in physical discomfort, both big men and big women, little men and little women, travelling over this country, organizing the Progressive organizations during all those years.

I remember in 1924 where I was raised on a farm, how these men were going out soliciting contract-signers for the Wheat Pool. I remember that my father was the first contract-signer to support this. My grandfather was the first delegate to be elected from that district. Impressions gained in youth do not readily leave a person, Mr. Speaker, and I have very vivid recollections of those days.

The philosophy of this organization was set out in the preamble of the Regina Manifesto and I do not think it will do any Member any harm to hear that Manifesto quoted in this House. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am going to read the preamble to that Manifesto:

**February 13, 1947**

The CCF is a Federation of organizations whose purpose is the establishment in Canada of a co-operative commonwealth in which the principle regulating production, distribution and exchange, will be the supplying of human needs and not the making of profits. We aim to replace the present capitalist system with its inherent injustice and inhumanity, by a social order from which the domination and exploitation of one class by another will be eliminated, in which economic planning will supersede unregulated private enterprise and competition, and in which genuine democratic self-government based upon economic equality will be possible. The present order is marked by glaring inequalities of wealth and opportunity, by chaotic waste and instability and in an age of plenty has condemned the great masses of the people to poverty and insecurity. Power has become more and more concentrated into the hands of a small, irresponsible minority of financiers and industrialists and to their predatory interests the majority are habitually sacrificed. Then private property is the main stimulus to economic efforts. Our society oscillates between periods of feverish prosperity in which the main benefits go to speculators and profiteers and of catastrophic depression in which the common man's normal state of insecurity and hardship is accentuated. We believe that these evils can be removed only in a planned economy and a socialized economy in which our natural resources and the principal means of production and distribution are owned, controlled and operated by the people. The new social order at which we aim is not one in which individuality will be crushed out by a system of regimentation, nor shall we interfere with the cultural rights of racial or religious minorities. What we seek is a proper collective organization of our economic resources such as will make possible a much greater degree of leisure and a much richer individual life for every citizen. This social and economic transformation can be brought about by political action through the election of a government inspired by the ideal of a co-operative commonwealth and supported by a majority of the people. We do not believe in change by violence. We consider that both the old parties in Canada are the instruments of capitalist interests and cannot serve as agents of social reconstruction and whatever the superficial differences between them they are bound to carry on government in accordance with the dictates of big business interests and finance. The CCF aims at political power in order to put an end to this capitalistic domination of our political life. It is a democratic movement, a federation of farmer, labor and socialist organization financed by its own members and seeking to achieve its ends solely by constitutional methods. It appeals for support to all who believe that the time has come for a far-reaching reconstruction of our political and economic institutions.

Each and every one of the Members on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, have subscribed to this Manifesto or we would not be here – the organization which made it possible for us to come here is an organization built around that Manifesto – an organization dedicated to the principles that that Manifesto enunciates.

February 13, 1947

It is interesting to watch the shifting of political alignments from time to time. We witnessed in this House just before recess something which I never expected to see – a man (and I wish he were here, Mr. Speaker), a man who put on the King's uniform and lead men, our own boys from these Canadian Prairies, overseas to crush Fascism and comes back here to this House and in his speech enunciates the very principles that we fought to destroy. I do not like to say this in the absence of the Hon. Member and for that reason I am not going to say as much as I had intended to say, but I would like, if the Hon. Member were here, to ask him, where was his voice when the boys were riding the freight trains? Did he cry out then against the capitalist system which condemned them to poverty and ill-health? Not at all. Where was he and his voice when we were shipping loads of Canadian nickel to Hitler, to Mussolini, to Hirohito? Did he cry out against those men who made huge profits out of arming the enemies of our country, so that they would be able to destroy our youth? Where was his voice then? Now he comes back, Mr. Speaker, and raises the old cry that was raised by the Liberal Party in 1934, a cry which the people of Saskatchewan are no longer afraid of; a cry that damns the men that he lead for, in effect, he says that those young men who went overseas from this province were supporting a political party with Communist principles, because it is a matter of history now that the majority of soldiers from Saskatchewan, a large majority of them, supported this party and will continue to support this fight. I would ask the Hon. Member where he would have been, where we would have been if it had not been for the 18 year old boys over in the battlefields of Europe? Those boys were capable of carrying the responsibility of our democracy on their shoulders. I trained with them; I know them and he says that their brothers, who are every bit equal to do the things that they did, should not have a vote in this province, at the same age.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to note the difference in the gallant and Hon. Member's attitude since last year. Last year he supported the Speech from the Throne which proposed the very things he is condemning today. He gave his vote for that speech, last year. What is the reason?

Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps we can find the reason in this. Mr. Tucker was interviewed in Saskatoon and was asked what he thought about the possibilities of the Liberal and Conservative parties getting together in the ballots. Of that interview, this is what it said in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, dated January 24, 1947, on the third page:

Asked about the Liberal party's relation with the Progressive Conservatives, Mr. Tucker said that his policy was to let each constituency decide for itself. This was his stand, and he would live up to it. I hope they will pick persons who believe in our principles and policies, he added. In other words, I hope they will choose Liberals.

Mr. Speaker, we always said right from the time we first entered the political arena, that the day would come when the political instruments of private enterprise would join forces in order to prevent the coming into power of a party which put the people's interest foremost. Today, we see that thing developing. The CCF has already compelled a marriage between the two old parties in two of our provinces. Today, these two

**February 13, 1947**

parties (I don't know which is male and which is female, which is the prospective bride and which may be the groom) are very bashfully proposing matrimony in this province.

I have here a letter from a field organizer of the Progressive Conservative party in this province (and I might say that if any Hon. Member wants me to table this letter, I would be glad to do so) in which the field organizer of the Progressive Conservative party states:

Recently proposals were made by the Liberal executive of Notukeu-Willow Bunch constituency to Conservatives in the constituency that the two parties unite and run an independent candidate in the next provincial election.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there it is as they said it. They are trying. How they will succeed I do not know because in the past they built up smoke-screens for the benefit of the public and quite often so trod on one another's toes in doing so that they became very bitter friends. How they are going to be able to dissolve divergence and come together in holy matrimony is beyond my comprehension. But it will happen; it will happen. Once again, Mr. Speaker, I listened very quietly to the Hon. Member while he spoke. I didn't interrupt him and I would ask that he not interrupt me.

I would like to quote another interesting letter that came in just the day before yesterday to a Member in this House in relation to the good old Liberal Party. He says:

I cannot understand for the life of me how any man with the intelligence of a common billy-goat would ally himself with the parties that have not, in all the past 40 years, made it possible for the laboring class to live in decent homes with conveniences so that they could get some comfort and a little pleasure out of life instead of merely to exist. I do not mind if you sling that into their teeth from me. Take a look at the mansions in the city. Who lives in them? Retired farmers? Not if I know my onions. These chisellers have been allowed to keep labor as poor as church mice as long as possible. The world co-operation is a new one to them – at least they would not have any one know that they knew the meaning of it. In the past 40 years most of us farmers have not gathered enough wealth to enable us to move out to the chicken house yet. Just tell them Liberals that we are not . . . (then he said something unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker) enough to work another 40 years for them and live in the old hen house.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the sentiment of the people of this province. I will support the motion.

**Mrs. B.J. Trew (Maple Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this motion I shall endeavor to repeat as little as possible as what has been said already. But I join with others in congratulating the mover and the seconder of the speech on the quality of their speeches and in welcoming to this House the Hon. Member for Morse. As to the remarks of the Opposition, these have been ably answered by many speakers. In listening to the Hon. Member for Moosomin claiming

**February 13, 1947**

credit to the farmers of Liberal administration for doing everything that has ever been done of any value to the farmers in the province. I could not but be reminded of the ostrich burying its head in the sand and refusing to face the facts of life. The statement that land could not be bought without full, or almost full payment, I agree with today; but most decidedly that situation is not caused by any protective legislation passed through this Government in this Legislature. It is by reason of the fact that there is so much money available for its purchase and such a demand for land that no seller needs to accept part payment.

My experience as the wife of a soldier settler after the last war would lead me to think that one factor is the buying up of available land from speculation hoping for resale under The Veteran's Land Act. The CCF could just as logically claim all the credit for the improved value of land today. I was reminded of the fact, the other evening that back in 1935 under the previous regime a friend of mine went to the bank for a \$100 loan. She had clear title to a quarter section of land that had cost \$3,000 in 1927 but on this security she couldn't borrow even \$100. Now the CCF doesn't claim all the credit for the improved value of land today. The situation as it is today with regard to price of land and its availability to the returned man, makes me very glad that in our province at least a study is being made and action is being taken towards co-operative farming as one of the solutions. I believe that some form of co-operation in farming will prove to be the answer to the problem of economical production with a high standard of living for the farmer and his family. And I welcome the information that is being given by various Government Departments on different types of co-operatives. Particularly valuable too is the practical experience being gained by co-operative farms already in operation. Coming from a part of the province where there has been for some years an increasing trend towards excessively large holdings with its consequent lack of opportunity for the son of the small farmer and returned man and by the way, they are very often the same person to get established in farming. I am keenly interested in the solution to this question.

I was interested too in the statement of the Hon. Member for Moosomin with regard to the wonderful amount of work done on highways, the extensive gravelling and the 100 foot right-of-way construction under his regime. I am sure the residents of Maple Creek constituency, Mr. Speaker, if they listened to that broadcast, must have rubbed their eyes and wondered why someone hadn't awakened them to what was going on in their province. You know people have been congratulating the CCF Government up there for the new type of highway construction and in my innocence I have been accepting the congratulations of my constituents. But I think surely both they and I can be pardoned when we remember that construction work that was undertaken in my constituency strangely enough just prior to the election of 1944, was done using the narrower right-of-way. If bigger and better roads are built elsewhere in the province they must have been or the Highways Department employees would have been out of a job, can we be blamed for not knowing it. After all after so many years of Liberal Government most of us were not financially able to travel very far away from home. It affords me great satisfaction to be able to report to the House that excellent construction work has been done in the past year on Highway 21, the one that I have mentioned to you as a lifeline of Maple Creek constituency, a lifeline that has

**February 13, 1947**

been very sadly neglected in the past. Last year in this House I made the pleas that highways such as this one serving a large area and a population with no outlet by rail be given priority in snow clearance over those that are served also by rail. While I cannot say they are given priority, Mr. Speaker, I was glad to hear Monday evening from a resident of that area that even then the part of the highway from Maple Creek to Golden Prairie was already open and that regular trips of the Government snowplow were being made on it just as on number one. Since I am sure that I make at least as many demands on the Minister of Highways as any other Member of this House, I want to give him this commendation now.

There is another item on which I must congratulate the Government. Mention was made in the Throne Speech of the classification of the public service and the adoption of a new pay schedule and the Provincial Treasurer in his statements to the House told us that the principle of equal pay for equal work had been agreed to. This affords me considerable personal satisfaction as possibly some of you may recall when amendments to The Public Service Act were before this House two years ago I moved the following:

No person shall be appointed or promoted to or dismissed from any position in the public service or in any way discriminated against with respect to terms of employment or rates of pay because of sex, race or religious opinions or affiliations.

I did this, Mr. Speaker, with the hope that even if amended, if it was at least the principle of equal pay for equal work would be accepted by this Legislature and so it was. While it is a matter of regret to me that the principle of no discrimination with regard to sex was not agreed to and with that, Mr. Speaker, I will have more to say. I am proud to be a Member of what I believe is a first Provincial Government in Canada to award this measure of justice to its women employees. At the same time I hope they will make sure that in classification the same fairness is shown and that the benefits conferred on women by the pay schedule not be nullified by automatic lower classification of the women employees. You know we are a suspicious bunch. In this connection I was interested to read in yesterday's Leader-Post of the placing in the Archives Division of the Legislative Library of a historical document. It is the original petition to the Government and Legislature of Saskatchewan asking that full franchise be granted to women. For many of the names and details of the illustrious Saskatchewan women who signed this petition, I refer you to yesterday's editorial page but I mention it here because of the coincidence that now almost exactly 31 years later to the day the final granting of franchise to women was on February 14<sup>th</sup>, 1916. We have in this province taken another step forward in women's long hard road to emancipation. But I want to say again some of the things I said two years ago in this House and have been saying at every opportunity since then outside of it. I take the stand primarily that when we have a cause such as this, provided that in case of emergency a married woman shall be appointed to or continued in the public service only when she has had special training or has technical or professional for the better performance of the duties of such an appointment. By the way – oh, my seat mate is here, I was going to say that she evidently couldn't take this, we are refusing women the same rights as men and we are according them something less than full citizenship. However, I must recognize

February 13, 1947

the sincerity of many people who would concede this but who say we are working now within a capitalist economy and they give two arguments that they feel are sound. First, that married women working increase unemployment and second that it is unfair for two incomes to be coming into the same home, particularly in times of unemployment and depression.

Now let us examine those two arguments. First, that married women working increases unemployment. The problem of unemployment, Mr. Speaker, cannot be solved by denying work to specific groups. The logic of this objection would imply the Scotsmen working increases unemployment or persons over forty, or non-veterans. There is a danger of married women on these grounds may lead to more sinister discrimination against other groups besides deflecting our attention from the real solution of unemployment. The planned provision of proper and suitable work for all who desire it. Denying employment to married women results in a serious loss to society. It seems ridiculous that after women have been trained and have gained a few years of experience in diverse fields, all those who marry should be confined to the single occupation of housekeeping, irrespective of their talents and qualifications. The Saskatchewan Reconstruction Council headed by Dean F.C. Kronseth of the Law School in its report to the Government in 1944 pointed out that in the professions of nursing and teaching, particularly much valuable experience and continuity is lost by the policy of refusing to employ married women. The Council went on to add that in a democratic state it is submitted there is no justifiable reason for denying any citizen the right of employment merely because of marital status, if that individual wishes to work and is able to obtain employment. I should also be noted that married women who work often create employment, many of them employ housekeepers and home aids, by the way if you know of any I wish you would tell me because I would like to employ one. Moreover, they patronize bakeries and laundries and other service industries to a greater degree than do women whose households are self sufficient.

Now we will take the second argument that it is unfair for two incomes to be coming into the same home, particularly in times of unemployment and depression. And that is really a dilly of an argument, if you will excuse the slang, Mr. Speaker. Discrepancy of income between family and family is a very serious aspect of the whole capitalistic system and its a phase of the need for socialism. However, to pick upon this particular group of families where the double income is at least earned and double services are rendered is most illogical when no exception is taken to a highly salaried man also having income from shares and investments. And when it is not expected that a man who marries a woman with a private income of her own which is not earned should resign his job. Nor is there any objection to two or three incomes coming into the same home when the unmarried sons and daughters are working. It should be noted, moreover, that the combined wages of a husband and wife often are less than the income received by other families. They will pick some particular case where they consider the woman does not really have the economic necessity to work. Discrepancy of income in the community is a matter which should be dealt with in the short run by taxation and in the long run by fundamentally more equitable distribution of wealth. The fact that objections are seldom made to married women working for fees as doctors, private duty nurse, writers, artists, singers or working as office cleaners, scrub women, laundry

**February 13, 1947**

hands and in other such poor pay long houred jobs among which I would include Members of the Legislature show that this is clearly an economic question where there is little compensation, there is little objection. It is just one more example of allowing ourselves to be divided one against another while our exploiters continue to rule. I hope that the day is not too far distant when the more progressive minded Members of this Assembly will see the light. I am not blaming them too much, for the habits of thinking of long years are hard to break. This applies, Mr. Speaker, to be absolutely fair, equally to women, many of whom have accepted an inferior position, politically and economically, without realizing all its implications.

The Adult Education Division of the Department of Education has received some hard knocks from the Opposition at one time or another, but there is no doubt in my mind as to its performing very useful work. Recently, I undertook to find out some of the things they were doing that were of real practical value to the homes of our province and here are a few of them: There were classes held from September 1<sup>st</sup> to December 31<sup>st</sup> of 1946, most of them continuing now, in music appreciation at Battleford and Watrous, interior decorating at Watrous, home nursing at Watrous, Strasbourg, Cupar, Alsask, Star City, dressmaking at Kamsack, Cupar and two classes at Govan, plain home sewing at Cupar, child psychology at Melfort, art in action at Lanigan, Lawson and Wadena. One very important item in the preparation of bulletins, one of these which I received on community centre planning appealed to me particularly. In reading it over I noticed this sentence, "You will remember the farmers and farm women who come into towns evenings and weekends. They need rest rooms, perhaps a nursery or game room for small children. A library which can double as a reading room, checker room or sewing room. They will need a hall available for meetings and so on." As I read that, my mind for the moment left the overall picture of the community centre with its many possibilities for good and went back to a letter I had received this fall from the co-operative union of Saskatchewan. This letter drew to my attention one comment made by members of the co-operative ladies tour which visited Saskatchewan from August the 8<sup>th</sup> to the 13<sup>th</sup> of this year. While many of the comments and remarks of the visitors were most favorable to Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan co-operatives, one or two were unfavorable. In particular, the inadequate rest room accommodation in the small towns was noted by our visitors. We all must recognize the truth of this criticism. The small town which provides any accommodation is the exception rather than the rule. Many homemakers clubs have been concerned over those needs as outlined in the paragraph I read – rest rooms, nursery or game rooms, libraries, etc. To those interested I commend a helpful advice of these bulletins.

Mr. Speaker, because I believe that to live intelligently in the world today we must have books, and because I want to see the facilities of good public libraries extended to the rural areas of the province, I welcome the assistance which our Government is prepared to give in the establishment of regional libraries, helping with the cost of the initial book stock and paying parts of the cost of the service. Miss Marion Gilroy, who is Regional Library Supervisor, is making a survey of library facilities in the province and of areas which seem most favorable for the successful establishment of the first regional library. The proposed area to be served, I understand, would correspond largely to that of the health region. Miss Gilroy's pamphlet "Books for Today's Needs", gives information in a clear, concise

February 13, 1947

manner to anyone interested. Before I leave this department, I would like to mention a course that is being given in Saskatoon. Last year, I had something to say about the need of raising the status of domestic workers and suggested the twofold way of achieving that – to include domestic workers in all the benefits of labor legislation, show them we consider them an essential and important part of our economy and by giving them training so as to make them skilled labor. As a part of training to discharged women under the Dominion-Provincial Canadian Vocational Training Program, the four months course in homemaking was given in Saskatoon last year. This course is being continued this year with a majority of civilian girls as students. The graduates are in great demand as ward aids in hospitals and sanatorias, hotel workers and domestic workers. It is the only school of its kind operating in Canada under this plan and I believe it should be continued. Girls live in residence at the homemaking centre and are paid \$9 a week, \$6 of which is paid in board and they get excellent training.

I have said nothing, Mr. Speaker, of the benefits being derived by the children of the province under the larger units of administration. You know my views on that. But when we consider them, the equalization grants to poorer units in order to bring up the standards of education offered children in the less fortunate areas; the grants being paid schools for additional training equipment; one wonders how members of a party who went in power neglected education, to the extent that the Liberal Party did, can have the nerve to talk about this Government not accepting our provincial responsibility farther. I would like to cite one instance of the low opinion the banks at least had of the degree of responsibility the former Liberal Government was prepared to take for education. In the year 1938, our school board of a consolidated school district which received besides Teachers' Grants, Van Grants, wanted to pay the teachers a little money before they left for their homes at the end of June – they had not been paid anything since January – so the board went to the local bank asking for a loan of a few hundred dollars on the security of the Teachers' Grant and the Van Grant which were due the school board from the Department and which were expected in a month. They were refused, and it was not until the chairman of the district gave the bank clear title to half a section of land as security that they were able to obtain the loan. Who was assuming, Mr. Speaker, the responsibility for education then?

Turning now to the Department of Public Health, I should like to comment on the Member for Rosthern's criticism of the hospitalization plan. I am sure in his heart he knows he was unjustified in mixing up two problems – that of providing hospital beds and that of seeing that everyone in the province who needs hospital care has access to the existing facilities. The Government is doing much by the way of grants, plans of building and expert advice to aid union hospital districts to build and equip more hospitals. It is also paying for care in some hospitals outside of the province. But the object of the Hospitalization Act, which came into operation on January 1<sup>st</sup>, is to make provision that when any resident of Saskatchewan needs, in the opinion of the doctor, to go to hospital he may do so without worrying as to what it will cost him. It is another step to saner and better ways of paying tribute to the Air Ambulance Service. Because of the fact that we have hospitals fairly close at hand and daily train service, it is not being used very much in my part of the constituency of Maple Creek. But the recent shutdown, a neighbor of mine was flown into Regina by the Air Ambulance and when I visited

**February 13, 1947**

her the other evening in the hospital she told me that although she is still a very sick woman she is firmly convinced that had it not been for the Air Ambulance she wouldn't be on this earth now. Mr. Speaker, she is just one of the many who have cause to thank God for this humanitarian program of the CCF Government. There are many less spectacular activities of this Department, the increased immunization of children, the attention paid to nutritional need of school children and others and the work being done in health education are examples.

But now, Mr. Speaker, I come to a subject about which I am not so happy but which I feel reference should be made. You and the Members of the House may have noticed in this morning's Leader-Post these headlines, "Sale of Liquor Still Increased – Nine Months Total Near \$20 Million." and if you continued to read you found that in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1946, the people of Saskatchewan drank almost \$7 million worth of beer and spirits, more than they did the year before. And that already in nine months of this year we have reached almost this amount and have three months yet to be reported on. In this respect we in Saskatchewan are in line with the rest of the continent as witnessed from Ottawa on January 8<sup>th</sup> by Canadian Press. Elbow bending by Canadians has reached a new peak of vigor in the year ended last March 31<sup>st</sup>, as was disclosed this Tuesday. All time record quantities of spirits and beer went down the hatch in that period. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics announced though, Canadians hoisted somewhat less wine than in the peace years of 1940 and 1941. Roughly speaking and I want everyone who has been complaining about high taxes for social services in Saskatchewan to note this, roughly speaking every man, woman and child, in other words that mythical average Canadian tossed off half a proof gallon of spirits, 12 gallons of beer and nearly half a gallon of wine during the year. In doing so he paid out in excise tax, import duties, license fees and other Government charges about \$12 per person. From the Winnipeg Free Press I have this editorial:

By the middle of last year over twice as many boys under 18 were being arrested in the United States for drunken driving and three times as many girls for all offences as in 1939.

Two surveys, one by an insurance company and the other by a State Government found over 50 per cent more convictions for drunken driving in 1946 than in 1945, a startling figure. The head of the Psychiatric Institute of Chicago Court says that where fifteen years ago one out of every five alcoholics was a woman, now it is one out of every three. A recent publication of the Public Affairs Committee, incorporated, estimates that twice as many children die in alcoholic families each year than in other families. These bits of evidence and the present unprecedented and growing sums spent on liquor in the United States, two and one-half times as much as is spent on education suggests the social cost of drink. Whatever else may be said of it liquor consumed in its present volume and manner involves a huge social waste and liability. It will remain so until people learn how to use liquor more moderately or to leave it alone. Speaking of the waste in money alone, because I imagine that an extremely small proportion of the sums spent were spent for any useful purpose. Can you imagine what a happy position we would be in if that money were available for socially useful purposes and please don't any one suggest that women waste a lot of money on useless things. I have heard criticism for instance of the

February 13, 1947

amount spent on cosmetics but I am sure that most people would agree the results of that spending are in most cases more pleasing to the eye than the alcoholic source. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to treat this subject lightly. In a recent issue of Health News Letter by the Division of Health Education, the book, "What Price Alcohol" by Robert S. Carrol, M.D., was recommended for reading. In this book I found expressed far better than I could many things worth hearing, I quote:

The mode is influencing pro and anti-alcoholism are as deep seated as human instincts, cheap to produce, easy to diversify with an available market of possibly 50 per cent of the population, defended by advocates as brilliant as the legal profession evolves, fortified by social influences as powerful as wealth, favored by historic precedent and above all backed by mass capital which can dominate the press, invade literature and enblazing its wares in a hundred types of publicity, alcohol today commands unequalled propaganda.

I first saw England from an Imperial aid liner. As we approached Croydon Field we beheld an airplane ribbon across the afternoon sky, in silver letters across a background of London smoke an advertisement of a popular whiskey. Last fall the noisy exhaust of a circling plane drew the attention of 60,000 who were giving their Saturday afternoon to witness the keen rivalry in a keen football game. Trailing the machine was a 100 foot pennant, "Blank Beer is Best". I quote this, Mr. Speaker, because it illustrates so graphically the forces that are aligned against those of us who deplore the place alcoholism has taken in our economy and would do something about it. I want those who haven't already done so to notice in how few of our magazines are to be found stories in which drinking is not taken as a matter of course. That might prove the truth of either one of Dr. Carrol's statements concerning social influence or the domination by the press and literature. Probably it proves both. We are today doing much to encourage more helpful ways of living as I have mentioned. Something has been done in this province, in this particular branch of health education. For instance, the Department of Public Health has acquired two prints of the 16 millimeter sound film, "That Boy Joe" which deals constructively with the related problems of juvenile delinquency and consumption of alcoholic beverages by minors. Schools, community leaders and groups or organizations may borrow the film for local showing by writing to the Saskatchewan Film Board, Regina stating the date or dates on which it is to be used. I have permission to use an extract from a letter received by his mother from Lieutenant Rex Dolan, somewhere in Germany or Holland:

One thing I have discovered during my fighting days was that my non-smoking, non-drinking habits stood me in good stead. I discovered that when put to the test your stability varied almost directly in relation to those two habits. I found such to be true with one or two exceptions in my platoon, of the 30 men in my platoon, eight were heavy drinkers, do you know that every one of those eight men was taken out as a battle exhausted case. I have approximately 10 men on whom I can always count to be steady, seven of these ten men do not drink and all ten of them smoke only moderately.

Here you have the testimony of one of our fighting men that

**February 13, 1947**

he was more efficient because of leaving liquor alone. I could bring before this House much more evidence of the huge social waste involved in excessive use but I do not think it necessary. What I would like to do, Mr. Speaker, is to offer a constructive suggestion, again I quote from Dr. Carrol.:

We have seen the passing of the methods of intolerance, even those inspired by humanitarian and near righteous sentiments. Intolerance breeds counter intolerance. We are unable today to control the problems so interwoven with the nations economics, so intensified by moral idealisms, so impregnated with questions of personal rights, so clouded by ignorance, misunderstanding and misapprehension, personal pride and resentment. We find ourselves facing an organized underworld strengthened by a semi-liaison with a social fast set. The legal restraints of prohibition failed but science will never remain passive while a drug is daily corroding man's very sanity. Let us in our province make available to our children in our schools at an early age the true findings of science with regard to this drug.

Yale University is sponsoring a new course in education, the national committee for education and alcoholism financed by the University. We could use its findings as a basis for up-to-date instruction. I would suggest too we make use of posters, also of some of the dangers into which society is plunging. Mr. Speaker, I would like to see some of those liquor profits about which the Provincial Treasurer speaks so regretfully used to do a job of educating and I believe he is willing so to use some of them. No one realizes more than I that heavy alcoholic indulgence is symptomatic of poor personal and family adjustment, unsatisfactory community conditions, ignorance and social economic factors, some of which I have mentioned. So on the preventive side I class, too, all efforts to build up a juster economic life. To encourage a family life, that will train the children for social living and will help them develop into mature, well-balanced persons emotionally. As citizens of Saskatchewan we have a duty to help each of our communities provide healthful recreational facilities. I believe very strongly that the best way to keep out evil is to leave no room for it. The expulsive power of good, I believe it had sometimes been called. One more thing, Mr. Speaker, and then I shall sit down. I may have seemed long winded tonight but I don't often inflict my speeches on the House.

Some references have been made to the fear that civil liberty is at stake in this province. The Government's actions have been challenged in these grounds. I would like to quote Senator Arthur Roebuck, who is not I believe a CCF:

There still remains another civil liberty which is frequently overlooked in this Connection, it is economic freedom. The right of the ownership of oneself and in consequence the products of ones labor. Economic freedom in its broadest aspect is still to be obtained. By that I mean the right to retain the full value of ones labors and to prevent the acquiring of wealth by anyone without giving an adequate consideration in return.

This economic freedom, Mr. Speaker, is what we are striving

to give the people of Saskatchewan as an addition to the political freedom which they already enjoy because I believe that the principles of socialism which I hold dear, and I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that I am proud to be one of those unregenerate socialists who will never go back to the Liberal Party. I shall support the motion.

**Mr. F.K. Malcolm (Milestone):** — Mr. Speaker, first may I join in congratulating the mover of the Speech from the Throne and congratulating the Member for Morse for having been successful in the Morse by-election and in entering this House as a representative of the group that has formed this Government.

I would like also to congratulate the other Hon. Members whom I have heard and I have enjoyed the speeches very much. I think perhaps we might gain a little time if we would have less heckling and perhaps stick a little more closely to our work at hand. The Throne Speech has been very well debated from all angles. I wish to concur with the sentiments expressed on this side of the House and particularly do I wish to congratulate the last speaker, the only lady Member, for the excellent address she has given us. I feel like others, that I do not want to overlap, having concurred in the sentiments that have been expressed from this side, and I would like to give you a few of my impressions, Mr. Speaker, of the Throne Speech, something of our own group and speak a work or two for my constituency.

The Milestone constituency, which lies just south of Regina, just eight miles to the north border, is some sixty miles in length and 42 miles wide. It has five railway lines running through it, the centre one being known as the Soo Line from Drinkwater to Yellowgrass. Milestone constituency is a rather important constituency for several reasons. I do not intend to enumerate them all. It was considered, I believe, one of the strongest opposition seats. Indeed, I was told many times after I was nominated that if the Milestone constituency went to the CCF then the whole province would go. It is a part of the Federal constituency of Weyburn, formerly held by the Premier as we know and you will readily understand that the people there are pretty well schooled in CCF ideals. It was one of the first constituencies to respond to the call to finance the Co-operative Commonwealth movement in Saskatchewan. In the 1944 election and in 1945, and just by way of interest in about three weeks or thereabout, in the fall of '43, some \$6,000 was subscribed to the constituency funds alone, much more than that to the larger work in the province and throughout the Dominion. And much of this came in \$100 subscriptions and a good number of them came from those who had always supported the old order.

About 60 per cent of the constituency of Milestone is of good heavy wheat land; there is some ranching; considerable stock is produced; there is an important clay plant down at Claybank where various clay products are made. It is chiefly a grain farming constituency. It produces some of Saskatchewan's finest wheat and incidentally some of the largest farm income cheques for Mr. Abbott. But possibly 40 per cent or more of the constituency is not so fortunate, because of lighter land and consequently poor crops at times. Many of the people there have suffered a great deal of hardship like others in the poorer sections of Saskatchewan.

In that constituency you have several co-operatives. One

**February 13, 1947**

of these, just in passing, one of these, only 30 odd miles from Regina, had a one-half million dollar turnover last year. Or at least in one year's operations. In two years hauling of supplies, this co-operative paid out \$70,000 in gasoline tax. This hauling incidentally was done mainly on comparatively dry roads because in that soil, like the Regina soil, roads are impassable in wet weather. If the Minister of Highways were in his seat I would just like to remind him that the people down there would like some gravel on the main road outlet at least.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the majority of the citizens of Milestone constituency would have me say to this Assembly that the Throne Speech, under discussion, contains a report of this Government's main activities, forecasts a program of action, which is most encouraging. When we were elected 2½ years ago, the people of the province wanted action. They wanted a Government which would plan and work for the people of Saskatchewan and many thousands of Saskatchewan citizens rallied to the support of the party really of their own creation. After many years they finally succeeded in electing this Government which is responsible to the Saskatchewan people, who through their conventions year after year, various organizations, their findings ever since this country opened up, through these conventions they laid down the program for legislative action. This Government and we who are elected to support it, are expected as far as it is constitutionally possible to carry out the program. I'm personally glad, Mr. Speaker, to have been associated with the Co-operative Commonwealth since its beginning, because I believe it is the nearest, in its basis at least, to a Christian society. I've never claimed that it is a cure-all in its first stages and I don't think anyone else does. Nor do I claim that the Ministers in this first CCF Government in Canada are free from mistakes and I don't think they claim that either, in their administration or interpreting our policy. But I do claim that the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation is the basis on which a true democracy shall be built, I should say, is being built across this country. For a special privilege, economic exploitation will not further be tolerated with all its results.

My memory goes back just a few years when I was associated with young people, boys and girls, young men, by the hundreds who had no employment. I know dozens of couples, I was associated with them and they with me, who wanted to set up their own homes, who didn't have the price of a marriage licence, much less a job and an opportunity which was their birthright. Incidentally, that is why I am interested in the political life of this country.

I would like to submit to this House, to the Saskatchewan people, that this Government in action, I believe, is forming the foundation of the society of abundance which is in the future and will be realized. As I see it and I've travelled a little and read a little, it is the nearest of anything yet accomplished by the common people to social democracy described by Lincoln at one time as rule of the people, by the people and for the people. And as a farmer representative, I want to spend a little time in talking as a farmer because some criticism is often raised that this Government is doing nothing for the farmers.

As a farmer representative I want to say that I believe that the Farm Security Bill is a good piece of legislation and that it is appreciated by many in my constituency as well as by

those in other parts of the province, especially in drought areas by farmers who are trying to make an honest living and liquidate their old debts. The majority of such farmers, I'm sure, welcome the financial arrangements which this Government has made with Ottawa, not only in the millions of dollars reduction in the provincial debt, the liquidation of the old lease charges, for which the farmers got no returns in those years with which to repay those debts, but also do we welcome the agreement with Ottawa to progressively liquidate over a period of years the entire provincial debt of the Dominion, to the Dominion. I believe I speak, not only for my constituents but also for the farmers of Saskatchewan as a whole when I say that we want to get out of debt individually, municipally and provincially. We want to stay out of debt by establishing an economy in which long term debts for established farmers will not be necessary in the future, which will give the farmers their just returns for their labor and their products and with a system of national credit which will be sound and fair for all who need it. It seems to me that we cannot too often emphasize that this is primarily an agricultural province and it seems to me with the Minister a practical farmer, notwithstanding what some have said, that we may look forward to increased security for basic industry in Saskatchewan. So far as this Government is concerned at least.

I think further that the farmers will welcome the appointment of and the practical services of some 36 agricultural representatives who are specially trained and at the service of the farmers in this agricultural province – not to boss them – as some would have you think, but to help them, give them advice and work with them. We note too that so far 19 district boards have been appointed on the recommendation of the Advisory Council under the Agricultural Representatives Act. The Throne Speech also mentions that 325 agricultural improvement committees have been organized in rural municipalities and local improvement districts. This branch of the Department has developed the agricultural program in co-operation with the Federal Government and the University of Saskatchewan. Surely, Mr. Speaker, there should be nothing wrong with that anyway. Under this set-up we are advised that major agricultural improvements are to be undertaken and with this new army of 325 interested and locally elected committees to work with our leaders and our specially trained personnel it seems to me that this Government is planning, as far as provincially possible, to put agriculture in its proper place in the future.

Resolutions on the Order Paper pertaining to agriculture indicate further that the Government and its supporters are concerned about the future of the Saskatchewan farmers. Then in addition to the legislation to aid farmers and production in their business, the Throne Speech forecasts legislation to further security in health and social services, of which much can be said and will be said, I've no doubt, during this Session. This is also designed, Mr. Speaker, to benefit farmers along with others and I think I'm safe in saying that that includes and perhaps especially, the air ambulance giving that service to farmers throughout the province.

The Automobile Insurance Act is to be widened to include collision benefits. I may say that several in my constituency have asked for that and I believe that it will meet with the approval of the majority of the farmers.

**February 13, 1947**

The field of education that was so ably presented to this House by the Minister has undergone numerous changes. We have reports of what has been accomplished so far to equalize educational costs, to extend the principle of educational opportunities which is part of our program. An example of this extension work particularly in the North was properly praised by the recent editorial in our daily paper. In my constituency a considerable area has had its taxes raised as a result of this larger unit. Quite naturally a few of these whose taxes have gone up have opposed this, particularly in areas where little or no school taxes is being paid. I have found in my contacts that the great majority have accepted the change as a part of their just responsibility. If the mill rate is too high, or educational expenditures too great, or the expansion too fast, that's a question for the larger unit board, elected by the people who set the mill rate. I think in most cases these larger unit boards across the province are doing a good job. They are making many improvements in administration, which are very much needed and some of them have been long overdue. And I'd just say, Mr. Speaker, in passing that in some 25 public meetings in my constituency last year at which this, among other things was discussed at length, most of the people expressed approval of the larger unit plan and expressed themselves as being prepared to let the results speak for themselves in the days ahead.

I'm glad that this Government is taking a practical view of the natural resources development. As I recall some years ago the main argument when these resources were returned to the province, was that they might be developed and utilized for the people of the province. This, Mr. Speaker, is now being done progressively by this Government.

And I want to say another word about highways. I think my constituents welcome the announcement in the Throne Speech of an extensive road program which will emphasize the building of market roads. Like other parts of Saskatchewan, several market roads need to be built or rebuilt in my constituency, especially in the south and southwest municipalities where they have had very poor roads for a long time. I'm pleased to report to this Assembly that last year through the co-operation of a number of rural municipalities running north and south the Minister of Highways has arranged with the municipal councils concerned to build market roads which we hope will finally become all-weather roads. Now these roads will serve a number of towns in the large area to the southwest part of the constituency as well as other areas farther south in the province.

I would just like to pass this comment, that a great many people are aware that the Soo Line Highway No. 39 which carries a very heavy traffic has been in bad shape for several years and that at times some parts of it has been impassable. Now, we understand that this is a part of the dominion-provincial highway system and that the building of this highway was held up last year because of the breakdown of the Dominion-Provincial Conference. Our constituents are anxious that this road be completed as soon as possible. I'm given to understand from the Minister of Highways that it will be definitely undertaken this year. There are certain other market roads which become almost impassable with wet weather, they need rebuilding too, and in stating this we realize that other areas in the province are also in need of roads. My constituents, I submit, out there are pleased that in the first two years or so in office this

Government has already given some much badly needed roads to the people of the north.

I wish to make reference, Mr. Speaker, to the physical fitness and recreational program that hasn't been spoken of at any great length, I don't believe. It has been set up by this Government under the Department of Health. This, as I see it, is a very worthy effort and I think it will be well spent money building strong bodies as well as healthy minds. The boys and girls will result in a more responsible citizen in the days ahead. This physical fitness program, or plan, in co-operation with the homes, with all existing organizations throughout the province, with various jobs and in co-operation with the teachers in the Department of Education, will, I think, give boys and girls a greater opportunity to build for themselves not only better bodies and minds but also a more sound moral judgment, and a greater self control. In this connection may I quote one of two things for the information of the House, in case there are some who have not taken the trouble to look this up:

The Division of Physical Fitness has been very successful in the year 1946 and the functions of the program include the giving of publicity to recreational problems and to good work that is being done in the recreational field; provision of a reference library and film service to recreational groups within the province; the stimulation and support of special projects in the field of physical fitness and recreation with a view to making these self-sustaining as early as possible.

As an initiative in calling together groups which have a common interest in the field of recreation and helping them to co-ordinate their work, the Saskatchewan Recreational Movement which is a proper title for the Physical Fitness and Recreational Division, I understand, has 6 field representatives and the accomplishment of one representative in the Prince Albert area alone is typical of the type of activities which are expected. I have no doubt the Hon. Minister who represents Prince Albert will know something about what is going on up there. Now I'll just quote two or three things:

Seven key centres have established recreational councils all of which are active. One centre has appointed for the first time a full time recreational director. Three centres for the first time have operated a full scale summer playground. A District High School Athletic Association has been formed, has laid plans for organized sport of every description, juvenile midget hockey as an example. High school board is planning construction of a new school gymnasium. Physical educational classes were organized for men and women at the provincial jail. Weaving instruction classes were organized for women, a drama school, a leather craft class, young peoples clubs and organization of various kinds.

This is merely a sample of what this Department is doing, something rather new in the experience of Governments. And I'll say this, Mr. Speaker, that in my noted experience, first in one of the other provinces, associated with the juvenile court when that was first established, and then in 20 or 25 years with young people, boys and girls in this province. And it seems to me that this Physical Fitness Program will pay high dividends, especially so in view of the common evils and

**February 13, 1947**

temptations of our time that boys and girls must face and which many of us did not have to face, in forms of commercialized pleasure. Some of which is not always the best. And may I say to those who may feel that this is not a definite part of a provincial government's responsibility, is it not better that we provide a child with an environment in his leisure time, in co-operation with his home and school and all the other organized groups, in which he will develop a healthy, or more healthy body and mind and a more sound moral judgment, resulting in better citizenship, rather than to spend, as we often have had to do in the past, or have done, if necessary hundreds of thousands of dollars to bring him to justice and punishment after he has made a mistake? I know many such boys in this province. I submit that both juvenile and adult crime is mutually a result of a poor environment. Indeed that has been borne out by juvenile court Judges in a number of provinces and states in the years past.

And just in connection I would just like to refer to an article in the Leader-Post of the other day, February 11<sup>th</sup>, where it is suggested a 300 per cent decrease in the number of appearances in juvenile court of youngsters charged with crime since 1944 in Regina has been announced by Mr. Rowe, who is Superintendent of Children's Aid Society. I want you to note this credit was given to the Regina Police Department, to the YMCA and the handicraft centre for their work in helping to take up the spare time of these youngsters and help them to bring about this reduction in crime. For those who do make a mistake and get into trouble I'm pleased to note, Mr. Speaker, that a Royal Commission on Penal Reform has been set up which I think has done a wonderful job and I congratulate the Government in having this investigation. I note that the Government is planning a more effective program of correction and rehabilitation and I won't take time to tell some interesting stories of my personal experience with boys who got off on the wrong track and who are a sort of trouble to the nation, to the state, when if they had had the proper environment they might have been a real asset.

May I leave this thought with you, I would like to have said a lot more but I think this Throne Speech has been well debated and perhaps I should leave what I have to say to another time on this subject. But in commending this Government for its pioneer program in this connection may I suggest this, that our boys and girls are our real assets, no province, or nation is stronger than the physical, mental and the moral fibre of its young people. As our boys and girls are, so shall our province be and to my mind, physical, mental, moral and spiritual education is the answer. Mr. Speaker I shall support the motion.

**Mr. W. Burgess (Qu'Appelle Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended taking part in this Throne Speech Debate but something after the style of the story they tell of the Irish girl, one girl leads on to another. This Irish girl had been accused by her mistress of stealing and, of course, she didn't approve of that. She said, the mistress called me a thief and I called her a liar and she called me a double thief and I called her a double liar and one word led to another until it ended up by me giving her notice and her pointing to the door.

February 13, 1947

Now it seems to me that these Throne Speech Debates have a little tendency in that direction. Certainly it has had that effect upon me. I have found it necessary to speak and ask the indulgence of the House for a very few moments to deal with one or two questions. I don't intend to cover, if possible, much of the ground covered by other speakers but I would like to just associate myself to this extent with those who have spoken before in congratulating the Member for Morse in succeeding to win a seat in this House. I imagine there will be times when he will wonder whether he won or didn't; whether he got something or didn't; but for all that it is definitely an honor to be chosen by the people of your constituency to represent them in this Assembly.

I don't propose to go into any lengthy words of commendation to the Government. My commendation will be reserved to supporting them in their useful endeavors. Anyhow, I'm not so constituted that I find it easy to be a hero worshipper or to stand in holy awe of superior minds that happen to be chosen to Government. Now it was a habit of the old political parties to take their leaders and build them up as being some sort of super men. We all heard of the Dunning Government and the Gardiner Government and the Martin Government and so on. These were extra-ordinary individuals around whom a political party was built and it was sort of the duty of the rustics, like the words of the poem, they were supposed to gather round in awe and gaze and wonder that one small head could carry all they knew. Now, I don't look on the gentlemen opposite in that respect at all. I think they are a bunch of ordinary decent individuals activated by high motives. Certainly I haven't yet been able to discern the little horns coming out of the sides of their heads but if I do I'll try and knock them off. Certainly the CCF as a government or the CCF as a party are not above criticism. They shouldn't and they don't claim that they shouldn't be criticized and I do believe that at times the Members of the Opposition groups in this House have performed a useful service in criticism. I could wish that they would confine themselves to that type of criticism to a greater degree than they do.

I have often envied a little the Members who sit in this in between section. It seemed to me they had a dead game cinch. They could sit there and they could vote for legislation that appealed to them and no one could accuse them of being party members. They could use their good judgment, they could vote for it. It wasn't just because the party brought it in but because they thought it was good. Or they could vote against it and the papers wouldn't headline it as though it was some terrific unheard of thing that a member of a political party should happen to show a certain amount of critical judgment. To me they had a nice position, like the story the Premier tells about himself, where someone told him he had a good job and he hadn't better mess it up, I think they have a good position and they shouldn't mess it up either but that's their business and they are quite capable I suppose the way they see best.

Now, I would like to deal with just one of the criticisms of the Hon. Member for Moosomin. It wasn't a criticism. It was a statement he made which he apparently has some sort of a catalogue of the members of the CCF and divides them into two groups. He doesn't call them the sheep and goats, he says the Socialists and the advanced Liberals. Now, of course, it would be very interesting to see whose names are on either side but it was a nice statement for him to make because those who are

**February 13, 1947**

Socialists or who claim to be Socialists will not be offended at being called Socialists and those he calls Liberals won't be insulted because the Hon. Member from Moosomin wouldn't be meaning to insult anyone when he called them a Liberal, especially an advanced Liberal. I was somewhat amused at that because he invited the advanced Liberals to come back to the Liberal Party. Now why should advanced Liberals go back? Why shouldn't the backward Liberals advance, that would be my idea of a better plan. But as I said the constructive criticism of a party I think are all to the good and should be levelled at the party and this Government freely and fully.

The thing that made me get to my feet tonight is due it seems to me to be a prevalent attitude that our party of Government are most often criticized for the things of which they are not guilty. We are criticized and we were criticized this afternoon as being lacking in democracy and being some sort of communists and in advancing the argument the Hon. Member used a number of illustrations. He said, for instance, that no CCFer had raised his voice or made any statement condemning the Russians at the time of the spy inquiry. Now, it seems to me that it is a very wrong inference to draw from that, if it be true, that the members of the CCF approved of the Russians if they did have spies. It might perhaps have been rather more due to the fact that I fail to see how any liberal-minded person or any believer in a rule of law and justice could be at all proud of our own country in the methods they adopted in carrying on the spy inquiry. We might have felt that if we started to deal with the question at all we would find ourselves in a big long statement rather than a short one and thus the subject was best left alone and as he suggested where we might best mind our own business. As far as I'm concerned and I think this goes for the members of the CCF as a whole, we don't approve of spying by one nation or another whether that spying is done by the Russians or anyone else. We believe the best interests of the common man the world over will be achieved by an attempt to understand one another and to use one another as decent honorable people ought to use one another and that doesn't include spying. I would suggest for those who haven't read it that they could secure a copy of "Cry Havoc" which was published in MacLean's magazine 12 or 15 years ago that it would be useful reading because it would perhaps make us understand that the international troubles of this world are not and cannot be safely laid at any one nations door. We have too many glass houses to be absolutely safe in throwing stones around.

Now another suggestion was made that the CCF are somehow or another allied with the Communists. In fact, the inference is pretty clear that our party was a Communistic party. The fact that conventions of the CCF have refused time and time again to align themselves with the party are not accepted even as evidence. Now I wouldn't for one moment accuse my Liberal friends of being pro-Russian because Tim Buck advised the Labor Progressive party to vote Liberal. I think the Liberals are a pretty fair bunch of people, a lot of them anyway, very misguided sometimes, but they are not even people with horns on and it wouldn't be fair to accuse them of that, but is it necessary that the CCF or anybody else becomes a red baiter in order to prove to the world that they are not Communists? Do we have to stand up and shout, Bolsheviki, Bolsheviki, at everybody that we disagree with because we want to propagate the idea that there is something very wrong about Russia. As a matter of fact, the people who use that argument at this date, an

February 13, 1947

argument that was getting out of date 15 years ago, remind me of the King of France of whom it was said that they never forget anything and they never learn anything. The Russians have a right to work out their salvation – I hope they are successful, I hope that the Russian people evolve a form of government that will give them liberty, that will give them opportunity, that will give them decency and a good standard of living. I hope we will be able to do that too and I think we will be able to do that best if we don't close our eyes to the facts of the world situation.

I believe that our children deserve to know what is going on in the world insofar as it can be presented to them. It isn't good enough to teach the children of our schools a jingoistic nationalism that my own country never made a mistake and that every other country in the world was always wrong. By the same token, Mr. Speaker, I am not one of those who claims that my own country is always wrong and my own country is always right. There are two extremes to which this sort of thing can go but I would like to commend the Minister of Education for putting in the schools textbooks that insofar as textbooks can be secured, give the pupils of the school factual information about the world in which they live. I would suggest to him that he not be alarmed by anybody who belonging to the old school of politics shouts 'Bolsheviki' at him just because he does that very necessary and sensible thing.

The thing that attracted me to the CCF personally was its democracy. That is why I am amused when it is accused of being undemocratic. It seemed to me to offer the most favorable vehicle to which an ordinary person could have a little bit of weight in the affairs of government. The CCF was built by people who believed in democracy before they believe in anything else. Democracy and co-operation are almost unanimous terms. If we believe in democracy in politics, we believe in co-operation in economics; we believe in team work to achieve desirable results. Now, if our Government has at times heard, and, Mr. Speaker, I believe it has, I believe it has heard it at times, but those errors in my opinion have been the errors of honest men who perhaps did not know too much about the subject they were considering and were carried away by a little over-enthusiasm for the need that they found existent. Now, if they had always taken my advice they would probably have made some mistakes too, Mr. Speaker. That is the strange thing about ordinary people. It is just possible that I was wrong and they were right, and it is also possible that organization is nothing to be afraid of.

The Hon. Member for the Mediterranean area this afternoon suggested that the back benchers in the CCF have a responsibility that they ought to assume to safeguard the liberties of the people of Saskatchewan. Well now, Mr. Speaker, if the liberties of the people in Saskatchewan are in any danger he could not have picked a better group of people to safeguard them than the back benchers of the CCF. Or if he could have picked a better group, it would have been the people in the country that organized the CCF. We're not going to go too far in the wrong direction without being checked and I want to assure him that he need not worry too much about that.

You know, I would not want to impute any wrong motives to anyone, but it is a fact that a group of people finding their special privileges being attacked have a tendency to think those

**February 13, 1947**

special privileges are not privileges at all but rights; that they have been given some sort of divine rights; and they have the habit of calling names to the people who attack them; they call them atheists or Bolsheviki or cads or agitators or what not; they call them any names they can lay their tongues to and they shout very loud in defence of our way of life. The slave holders of the southern states did that. The people who had child laborers in the factories and mines of England did that. They argued that the people who were advocating things different were all those other things – agitators and atheists and they did not believe in their Bible, and they did not believe in that or the other thing, and that if they were given any power of government, well the country would certainly now go to the dogs completely. Now, that old fashioned idea, I suppose, will never die out – not completely. It will be forced back by the army of progress. Reforms will be instituted and then when the reformers of another generation come along with some more reforms, the reactionaries, I won't call them Fascists, the reactionaries will die fighting to protect the reforms that they died fighting against the generation before. That has been the history of the race. There is just one other point that I want to deal with in connection with the speech that we heard this afternoon. Mr. Speaker, I am personally sorry that the hon. gentleman used the argument (I know he is not present here at this time) but I am satisfied of this that an honorable and gallant gentleman such as he is will himself be sorry for forgetting his dignity of the position that he occupies as the representative of the finest group of constituents that it would be the privilege of any man to represent. Furthermore, being a man educated in law who realizes and must realize the principles upon which British liberty and British justice are based, that he would by inference, and I think, Mr. Speaker, by inference suggest that a gentleman who is presently in the employ of this Government, who before he was employed by this Government was employed by the Government headed by Mr. Churchill, and who was honored and privileged to represent that Government in a very high capacity in the city of Washington and who arrived in Saskatchewan before the Labour Government was elected in England and it is suggested to us that he is likely a Communist picked out of the Labour Party and made his get away to Saskatchewan. I know the statement was not definitely made, but no other inference could be drawn from the words of the gentleman speaking. He is not even accused of anything except by suggestions. Surely, it is the fundamental right of Britishers that they be considered innocent until at least they are proven guilty. I say I am sorry that the hon. gentleman used those arguments at all this afternoon.

Now, as far as the policies of the Government are concerned, it is generally recognized in this House and it is recognized in the country, that the social welfare legislation of the Government has been good. It is, of course, subject to improvement, but even the Members of the Opposition have commended it. I do not propose to re-state those good deeds. I propose to reserve my criticisms and my commendations for the Bills which will be presented, but for the time being at least, Mr. Speaker, I shall support the motion.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:10 o'clock p.m.