

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

Fourth Session — Tenth Legislature

12th Day

Friday, February 14, 1947.

The Assembly met at 3:00 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

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

Hon. J.W. Corman (Attorney General): -- Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Throne Speech. Their speeches were of very high order. I also want to congratulate everyone who has taken part in the debate, the Private Members particularly. Their speeches, I think, at this Session have been above the average and above the high standard which has been set in the previous three Sessions. It makes those of us in the Cabinet, I was going to say it makes us feel better, it may be that it makes us feel uneasy, but in any event we do know that we have in the ranks of the CCF backbenchers, people who can take our places when we decide to retire and the speeches that we have heard here should cause us to look to our laurels and put us on our toes.

I want to join in the regrets that have been expressed at the retirement of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and I say that sincerely, Mr. Speaker. I will feel that I have suffered a personal loss if, as the Hon. Member for Moosomin has suggested, it means retirement from public life entirely; we will regret that.

That is a matter of regret; now I am coming to a few things that I am glad for. I am really glad that the Hon. Member for Moosomin is recovering from his operation and will soon be his old self. I am glad that the Hon. Member for Arm River has learned to smile a little more. I believe I have seen him smile oftener in the few days we have been here than in the three previous Sessions. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, he is learning to appreciate the humor of his own speeches – I do not know. I am also glad for the Hon. Member for Rosthern. I am glad that he has not forgotten his nursery rhymes and knew what he was talking about. It is only fit and meet that the Private Member from Rosthern should be telling fairy tales in the House when his leader is telling fairy tales to the people of Saskatchewan. My most heart-felt congratulations go to the Hon. Member for Athabasca who, I am sorry to say, is not in his seat. I think we all agree, Mr. Speaker, that he has, by remaining silently in his seat, contributed more to the debate than his four colleagues who spoke.

Now, I am very glad, Mr. Speaker, that the nature of what I am going to say, today, does not call for anything that I consider nasty and I start off in a very pleasant note for all my listeners. I am not going, Mr. Speaker, to give the whole of the speech I had prepared and I hope that anyone who finds what

February 14, 1947

I have to say of a nature that is not interesting you will be kind enough to feel that possibly I threw away the best part of the speech. We are anxious, Mr. Speaker, to conclude the Throne Debate tonight and I am going to put off most of what I had to say until the Budget Address. Now my prepared speech – and I use that word ‘prepared’ very loosely – most of us with the work of the Session do not have a great deal of time for preparation, but it was made up, Mr. Speaker, of two parts. I had intended dealing with Opposition speakers, or to put it less personally, dealing with the speeches of Opposition speakers. That is the part that goes until Budget Debate. The other part of my speech, Mr. Speaker, had to do with references, kind and unkind that had been made in this House about my little radio program, “Your Attorney General Speaks.”

Now, I first would like to say that I appreciate the prominence that speech has been given in the House. I appreciate any kind things that were said about it and I accept anything of a critical nature in the spirit in which I know it was intended and I will, Mr. Speaker, try to profit by what has been said. Now, I would like to say here that about that program, Mr. Speaker, I feel very humble. I do not like the job of professional critic any more than anyone else. I think, by nature, I am a pretty easy fellow to get along with, but for four years I had a regular weekly program, “Your Mayor Speaks”, when I was mayor of Moose Jaw and when the CCF decided to put on a regular program, they thought it the natural thing to ask me to take it and I did. And that is the reason that it has fallen to my lot to take those talks. And I want to say I am only trying to do the best I can, in my feeble stumbling way, to counteract and answer some of the criticism, most of it untrue, which appear in the Liberal newspaper monopoly in this province and which is heard over the air from Liberal speakers.

Now, from the very nature of things, Mr. Speaker, I have to refer, in those talks, to Mr. Tucker and I can assure you I shall continue that practice and I would like to know what is wrong with that. The Liberals made him the biggest issue in provincial politics when they told us that he was chosen to lead the Liberal Party out of the wilderness or bullrushes – I have forgotten just where Moses . . . In any event, was chosen to lead them out of wherever the Liberal Party is now. Now, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing personal in my feeling towards Walter Tucker and I mean that. I do not know him well. I believe if I did know him I would like him. But we must remember that both Mr. Tucker and I are in politics for keeps and neither of us is asking or giving quarter. Now I also want to say here that no Member of this side of the House has ever questioned Mr. Tucker’s personal courage. He has proven that. I salute him for it. Political courage is another thing and I submit, Mr. Speaker, is a proper matter for scrutiny and a proper matter for comment. We should also remember, in this connection, that Mr. Tucker is himself pretty handy with the barbed words and the retort discourteous. I am pretty sure that he can look after himself without any help in this House from just small evidences of which I seem to have seen. But the point is, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberals made Mr. Tucker the main issue of the day and I would suggest that if the Liberals would give us a real constructive program with more meat in it and less Ottawa in it we would be able to deal with it and would not have to talk so much about Mr. Tucker.

Now, I enjoyed the speech, that’s not just the speech of a

February 14, 1947

few minutes ago, but the speech of a few days ago of the Hon. Member from Moosomin, very much. I am not just sure that when he turned from hunting deer to going after a honker, wasn't it, I am not just sure that he used good judgment. He did not, as you know, Mr. Speaker, even ruffle the feathers of that honker. But in that connection the Hon. Member can console himself with the fact that a lot of other experienced parliamentarians have had no more luck with that honker than he. Now, I never try to draw fire to myself but I believe the hon. gentleman would be better off if he confined his efforts to smaller things – that takes in myself. He is more at home in directing questions aimed at myself in connection with my radio program. And, Mr. Speaker, that's all right. But, while I don't think it, a lot of people in this province are thinking that Mr. Tucker found himself alone, unable to cope with those talks and consequently called on assistance from his lieutenant in this House and they also think that in this criticism they are hearing the master's voice from Ottawa.

Now, the reference to that radio program gives me a chance, which I appreciate, to advise the House that we are still doing business at the old stand. The program goes on every Thursday night over CHAB at 9:15 and it gives me a chance to say that those programs are supported by the voluntary free-will contributions of the little people of Saskatchewan – not the vested interests of Toronto and Montreal who support the Liberal broadcasts. Now, Mr. Speaker, both programs sign off with the announcement that these talks are supported by contributions from the people of Saskatchewan and that is true of CCF radio talks. If these contributions, these voluntary contributions, ceased the talks would cease. But, Mr. Speaker, that is not true of Liberal talks. They, like the babbling brook, would go on forever from the donations of big business.

Now, in further reference to these talks, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Moosomin quite properly, quite truly, drew attention to the fact that I talk more on the air than I talk in the House. Now I admit this is true, I plead guilty and I am glad the matter was brought up so that I might say something about it. I could talk more and oftener in the House, perhaps not as much as the Hon. Member for Moosomin does, or the farm Members of this House would never get home to look after their farms, but it may be that there is a happy medium between his volubility and my slowness about sticking in my verbal foot every time I see an opening. I could also indulge in more desk pounding and fist shaking than I do, as the Member for Arm River does, but I have never found, in public life, that you have to resort to physical hysteria to get things done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is however, another reason for my comparative silence. First, as Attorney General I have a lot of legislation to get through and rightly or wrongly when I first came here I decided I would do in this respect pretty much as my immediate predecessor Mr. J.W. Estey did and avoid unnecessary controversy in court. You will notice that he wasn't talking all the time; he wasn't quarreling or bandying words all the time. Now that is one reason that I am not as talkative as I might be. There is another reason, Mr. Speaker, I have at times been about to rise in this House and enter into the free-for-all that was going on but it seems that almost always when I was about to give way to that impulse, I would see the Hon. Member for Moosomin on his feet entering into the wrangling and quarreling. Now you know that we both belong to the same profession, the legal profession, and I have,

February 14, 1947

Mr. Speaker, a log of solicitude and respect for the reputation of that profession and after hearing and seeing the hon. gentleman in action I have always said to myself, "Keep your seat Corman. It isn't fair to the Saskatchewan Bar Association to have two of its members, both in the same day, making exhibitions of themselves."

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems it was possible there was another insinuation in reference to my radio talks and that was that I was afraid to say in the House what I am saying on the air. I don't believe the hon. gentleman meant that. I believe, from knowing each other in law practice, he knows that whatever my shortcomings I try to live both in private life and in political life so that I can look any man in the face and tell him where to go and that phraseology is out of deference to yourself. Now the only way I can really stop any feeling that there may be that I am talking behind people's backs and am afraid to say in the House what I said on the air, is to say some of those things in the House which I have said on the air and I am about to do that. I would like to draw attention to this, however, for the life of me I don't know how much better Mr. Tucker will feel if I say them in here rather than say them over the air, because as far as I know, Mr. Tucker is not in the House.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to this House and ask the Opposition what they are going to do about what I said in my second radio broadcast, entitled, "An Open Letter to Mr. Tucker." It starts off:

Dear Mr. Tucker:

In extending to you my personal congratulations on your elevation to the leadership of the Liberal Party, I am taking the liberty of passing on a few friendly words of advice and counsel.

I go on to say, on September the 26th last:

It is only fair to tell you, Walter, that you will meet opposition not only from those in the province who do not believe in the Liberal policies of wait and see, but also from Members of your own party who resent domination from Mr. Gardiner in the interests of federal affairs and in the interests of his own campaign for leadership of the Federal Liberal Party. Many Liberals in Saskatchewan feel that this province is important enough and capable enough to be allowed to run its own affairs and should not be made a catspaw in the game of federal politics. Neither Mr. Culliton nor his followers take kindly to the measure of control and dictation which Mr. Gardiner exercised over the convention at Saskatoon which chose you as leader. Both you and I will agree that to call it a shotgun election is going a little too far, but there it is, Walter, and it is only fair that you should be warned. It is hard for your friends to disabuse the minds of Saskatchewan people, including many staunch Liberals, of the conviction that Mr. Gardiner forced Mr. Patterson against his will to resign and that Mr. Gardiner was responsible for the withdrawal, from the field, of useful Mr. Motherwell, who up until the last was anxious to have his name go before the convention.

February 14, 1947

I might say here, Mr. Speaker, that the discontent referred to on September the 26th over Mr. Tucker's leadership has made itself manifest in many ways since. His meetings have been failures and I understand that the breach between him and Mr. Culliton, backed by the home rule Liberals of Saskatchewan, has widened into a gulf.

You also have a battle on your hands, Walter, to explain to average Saskatchewan folk but why the Liberal Party has fallen under the complete domination of lawyers. Far be it from me to say a word against them myself but the fact remains that ordinary men and women feel that a lawyer-controlled and lawyer-dominated party is not really trying to be progressive but is pretty well rooted in practices of the past. Without precedent, they say, a lawyer doesn't move and many of our problems here in Saskatchewan must be attacked and solved without resort to reported cases and precedent. Frankly, Walter, the common people of Saskatchewan cannot understand the lawyer complex of the Provincial Liberal Party. At your convention in Saskatoon you had four important officials to elect – a vice-president, a provincial leader, a president of the association, a vice-president and a president of the young Liberal Association. Now, for the leadership of the Party, only two are considered worthy of nomination – yourself, a lawyer from Rosthern and Mr. E.M. Culliton, a lawyer from Gravelbourg. As you know, the lawyer from Rosthern won out by a narrow margin over the lawyer from Gravelbourg. The important offices were filled as follows: President – Mr. H.C. Pope, K.C. lawyer, Moose Jaw; Vice-President – C.R. Davidson, K.C., lawyer of Regina; President young Liberal Federation, Mr. MacFarlane, a budding lawyer, that is a law student of Nokomis.

When you return to Saskatchewan, Walter, you will have to explain why neither agriculture nor labor, nor the great middle-class was considered important enough to merit consideration in filling the high offices of the Liberal Party. As part of your job, you will have to argue that the CCF in Saskatchewan is unfair to agriculture and that it is to the Liberals that farmers should look for redress and a square deal. I have always admired your mental powers, but just how to convince farmers that their interests are safer in the hands of a bunch of Liberal lawyers than in the hands of the CCF will put even your verbal agility to the supreme test.

Your recent speeches, Walter, would indicate that you intend to make a great hue and cry about the lost liberties of the people under the CCF. In all kindness, I would warn you to watch your step there. No other government that ever held office at Ottawa has shown as much disregard for personal and civil liberties as has the Liberal Government to which you have given your support and devotion. From your Government's claim that it is independent of parliament enunciated by acting Premier Ilsley, down through the defiance of parliament in the removal of the milk subsidy, arbitrary deportation orders, the overriding of habeas corpus, the Magna Carta, and the Bill of Rights and secret orders-in-council denied by responsible Ministers, was a people-be-damned philosophy which is as foreign to real liberalism as it is to real Canadianism.

February 14, 1947

Any attempt to revise the tactics of Mr. Kerr during the provincial election of 1944 will fail as it did then. Charges of regimentation, confiscation, dictatorship and centralization come with very poor grace from one as close as you to a government whose record on the count of civil liberties has been condemned by organizations across Canada representing all points of view, from the churches to the recent convention of your profession in Winnipeg.

Just here, Mr. Speaker, that advice given to Mr. Tucker is now extended to the Liberal Opposition in this House. I suggest that before they talk any more about the lost liberties under the CCF that they had better put their own house in order.

An Hon. Member: – I would like to know what the CCF lawyer is charging the Liberal lawyer for the advice. What's the bill for the advice?

Mr. Corman: – The bill hasn't been rendered yet. It depends on how well they behave during the rest of the term. But, Mr. Speaker, you can't any longer, in Canada, preach freedom and practice dictatorship as the Liberal Party is doing and get away with it. Now, Mr. Speaker. I continue:

Don't be too much afraid of Tommy Douglas, Walter, he won't bite. I can assure you of fair treatment in the Legislature if you will enter it without any air of bumptiousness or superiority bred of being for many years a member of a party with an overriding majority in the House of Commons, able to shout down or break down all opposition and with the speaker not unfriendly to you. Pile-driver methods do not go in the Saskatchewan Legislature and even ex-parliamentary assistants will have to obey the rules.

Generally speaking, you will find us pretty decent fellows with perhaps as much sense of fair play and as much concern for the welfare of the province as is possessed by your good self. Don't talk so much about your independence and freedom of party domination. Hansard belies your words. The people have not forgotten that you voted against dollar wheat after representation from a delegation of 400 went to Ottawa, sent to Ottawa and paid for by the nickels, dimes and quarters of the hard-pressed people of this then distressed province. I went with that delegation and know something of its intense feeling and the Liberal Government's motion for 90 cent wheat. You said that \$1.20 was a fair price for Saskatchewan farmers. But when Tommy Douglas put you on the political spot by moving an Opposition amendment, which in effect called for \$1 wheat, you voted for 90 cent wheat against your own people and against your expressed convictions. You might rather have lived that one act down if you had shown any improvement with the years, but only recently you gave another exhibition in the House of what your enemies will call political expediency, perhaps never equalled in the annals of Canadian politics. You know, of course, I refer to the motion to tax co-operatives, the iniquitous three percent profit clause. Your speech on that occasion and your vote will rise up many times to haunt you in the days to come.

February 14, 1947

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what I said on September 26th over the air to Mr. Tucker. I believe if the Members of the Opposition could speak their minds they would agree with most of it, especially the references made to long distance leadership. I don't naturally expect them to agree with the references made to lawyers, because 30 per cent of the Liberal Opposition in this House is made up of lawyers.

On October 3rd, Mr. Speaker, I said some other things. I have before me the Leader-Post of September 20th, on the front page of which appears a three-column headline as follows: "Political Link Charged Between CCF and UFC," or to extend it, between the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation and the United Farmers of Canada, Saskatchewan section. I remember reading a similar headline some time ago charging a tie-up between the CCF and the Co-operatives and another linking the Labour Unions with the CCF. Early in our career we were told that the CCF and the School Teachers' Federation were working together and not long ago, when the churches protested the action of the Dominion Government in deporting Japanese Canadians without trial or proof of individual wrong-doing, the CCF alone among the political parties of Canada supported the churches and backed up that protest. To be consistent, the Leader-Post should have come out with a headline: "Political Tie-up between Churches and CCF."

Well, I for one, find it hard to break down and weep because of such goings on. If there is meaning to the saying 'that you are known by the company you keep' no CCFer is going to complain because he is associated with farm organizations, labor unions, co-operatives, school teachers and the churches. Just what purpose the Liberals have in emphasizing the community of interest between the CCF and such representative groups, for the life of me I don't know. But they have, at least, made me prouder than ever that I belong to a movement which has common objectives with those who work on farms, those who work in factories, shops and offices, those who strive for the common good in co-operatives, those who serve in our schools and those who labor to advance the kingdom of God in our churches.

I notice that at the end of that talk, Mr. Speaker, there is this note: the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party is writing articles on the editorial page of the Leader-Post. I wonder if this is the forerunner to a union of the two old parties. I still don't believe you will get good upright Conservatives like M.M. MacPherson and Fred Kent sleeping in the same bed with Jimmie Gardiner. Both Murdo and Fred know that Jimmie would have all the covers over him and all the pillows under his head and that they would be sleeping in their underwear.

Mr. Speaker, in the following talk I said this:

The new leader,

And I repeat it in this House for the benefit of the Opposition and again ask them what they are going to do about it.

The new leader of the Provincial Liberal Party has treated the public to a lengthy dissertation on the removal by the Provincial Government of the education tax. This is, of course, the privilege of any citizen of Saskatchewan but one wonders why Mr. Tucker confines his attention to provincial taxes. He is in no position to do anything about them, not being a Member of the Legislature and with

February 14, 1947

no intention of seeking a seat in the Provincial House. His words would carry more conviction if directed at federal taxes under the jurisdiction of his Government at Ottawa. Always remember that the only place that Mr. Tucker can speak with authority is in the House of Commons and in the Federal Liberal caucus at Ottawa. If his zeal for tax reduction is sincere and not window-dressing and he really has become tax conscious, he might tell us what he is doing in his own sphere of influence to see that the people get a square deal.

I concluded:

He tells you of the Liberal opposition to the education tax and how they would remove it pronto if given the chance. Why didn't they do something about it when they were in office? We are being told constantly how much money the Liberals left in the public Treasury, I believe \$8 million they claim, and about how sound provincial finances were when turned over to the CCF. If they had so much money and were so sound financially, why didn't they do something about the education tax in 1942, 1943 or 1944?

On October 31st, Mr. Speaker, I had something to say about the suggested union of the two parties:

Human nature being what it is, CCFers may be excused if they note with satisfaction, if not glee, the doubt and the perplexity now existing in the ranks of the old parties. As Mr. Tucker said, when he voted to tax co-operatives, they really don't know what to do; to unite or not to unite, that is the question. Leaders of the Progressive Conservative Party have let it be known that Marcus is willing. On October 5th Mr. Rupert Ramsay came out with the statement that implied that there would be no union or working agreement between Liberals and the Conservatives in Saskatchewan. Then Mr. John Diefenbaker arrives from Ottawa and makes the first official declaration that the two old parties should get together. Following that, Mr. Ramsay, who is supposed to be the leader of the Provincial party, tags along and advocates local constituency unions admittedly for the sole purpose of beating the CCF. I believe the last word for Mr. Tucker is that there will be no collaboration, but don't pay too much attention to him. He will do what Mr. Gardiner tells him and the power behind the throne has not yet spoken.

On November 7th I said, Mr. Speaker, as follows, in part:

Hypocrisy is defined as pretending to be better than one is. Political parties as well as persons can be hypocrites. I charge the Liberal Party with brazen hypocrisy in its criticism of the Saskatchewan News and the money spent on it. No other Government in Canada ever spent as much money and employed as many people in propaganda as has the Liberal Government at Ottawa. I am not going to waste much time on it. I can prove my point by quoting press reports and editorials mostly from Liberal papers. A staff correspondent for the Leader-Post reported in July last as follows: 'More than half a million dollars is required annually to pay the salaries alone of 262 public relations and publicity men and their staffs

February 14, 1947

employed by the various departments of the Dominion Government to grind out releases and information and Government activities and announcements.’ And the Winnipeg Tribune about the same time reported a Member in the House of Commons as saying, and I quote, ‘The Canadian Information Service sent out so much material that they did more during the last years to create a paper shortage than all the newspapers and publications across Canada. Forty-five publications sent out at regular intervals carrying nothing but Government propaganda were listed.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I said in that talk as to the true character of the Saskatchewan News gotten out by the Provincial Bureau of Publications:

The Leader-Post said in an editorial on July 12th last, quote: ‘This is not to criticize the material in the Saskatchewan News as it presents the work of the Government mainly in factual form.’ I have been quoting from the Regina Leader. Now the Regina Leader and I agree,

and I am still reading from the radio talk:

that the Saskatchewan News, under Mr. Galen Craik is not propaganda in spite of Mr. Tucker and his hypocritical charges. And the Leader-Post representative at Ottawa and I agree that the real culprit is the Dominion Government with the propaganda staff of 262, its salary payroll of over half a million dollars annually and its 45 weekly or monthly publications, all grinding out releases extolling or excusing the Liberal Government.

I would suggest here, Mr. Speaker, that it is time the Leader of the House, the House Leader of the Liberal Party and the Leader-Post got together on this Saskatchewan News.

Now, I have read, Mr. Speaker, some excerpts from talks over the air, from scripts prepared for those talks. I have repeated them in the House to take the House fully into my confidence. As I close, I think I should perhaps read what I am going to say next Thursday, or part of it. I want to be absolutely fair with the House and I will then wait to see what the Opposition does about it. Now on Thursday . . .

An Hon. Member: – Are you reading . . .

Mr. Corman: – I am not reading my speech. Mr. Speaker, I am not reading my speech. I have only read what I said over the air as the challenge was made to me – “say in the House what you’re saying over the air.” Well, I have done it in an apparently different way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will quote by telling you what has been recorded and will go over the air next Thursday:

I know that the Liberal schools to be started in the province are to be under the supervision of the former Minister of Education, Mr. Ruben Stain. He should be well qualified and equipped to instruct Liberals in high class methods and tactics. It was he, you will remember, who called the CCF, and that means its membership including you, me and all the servicemen who supported us, as

February 14, 1947

political cesspools and proper sewers. Those are the words he used in the prophetic confines of the Legislative Assembly and he was frantically applauded by all Liberals in the House and given headlines in the Liberal press. May I observe that a party that will go along with and applaud the ex-Minister of Education in his abusive references to the supporters of another political party is in a weak and vulnerable position in charging me in these broadcasts with being personal or overstepping the bowers of their criticism. I'm a namely pope compared with most Liberal speakers of the past or present.

I suppose Mr. Stain's curriculum for his Liberal schools will follow the high standard of those remarks in the House. I also presume Mr. Stains will be our next Minister of Education when Mr. Tucker forms a Liberal Government in the province, if he lives that long. Nothing would please me better than to have, as an election alternative next June, or a year from June, or whenever it is, Woodrow Lloyd versus Ruben Stain as Minister of Education. Most parents, regardless of politics, feel safer with their children in the care of Mr. Lloyd than they would with them at the mercy of Mr. Stains and his bathos teachers. I can assure young Liberals attending these schools being set up in the province that they are more likely to graduate as fascists than as real Liberals.

I conclude that part by saying:

Have you noted how Mr. Tucker's charge against our Minister of Education of using a political text book in the schools, has petered out as do most of the Liberal Leader's charges. Progressive Conservative speakers, over the air, have called the criticism nonsense. The Star-Phoenix, a Liberal paper, ran a special article showing such criticism of it as being so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have repeated in the House some of the things I am going to say next Thursday. Now I had intended to meet Mr. Tucker pretty much alone in this House but the Opposition has willed it otherwise. I don't know whether as individuals they want to hear Mr. Tucker lambaste it or not. It looks like it, Mr. Speaker, but in any event, the challenge to say these things in the House has been accepted and if the Opposition want any more of it they can have it. Now I want to say here, in closing, Mr. Speaker, and I want to make it abundantly clear, that until Mr. Tucker enters the House my colleagues and I will feel free to criticize him and his policies and his records whenever and wherever we can and nothing that the disturbed Opposition can do will swerve us from that course.

I will vote for the motion and I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and this is particularly addressed to the Opposition, I would remind you that you are born into the old parties; you have to think your way into the CCF.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Municipal Affairs): – Mr. Speaker, I first of all want to follow in the very proper path of previous speakers in the debate and to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne. The new Member for Morse showed to the

February 14, 1947

Legislature his understanding of Saskatchewan problems and his ability to express them. The Member for Meadow Lake showed to us that he had not lost any of that ability which he had displayed to us in previous Sessions. I want also to congratulate the Member for Morse on being elected to this Legislature. I am sure that the people of Morse constituency will not regret having made that decision and that they will return him again when the next election takes place.

I sincerely regret that the Leader of the Opposition has found it necessary to resign from his former position as Leader of the Liberal Party in the province. I have had the honor and privilege of being in this House for quite a number of years and I think, with the kind of straw they had to thresh, that no one could have done a much better job than he has done. It was not his fault, as we often inferred from even the columns of the Leader-Post, that the Liberal Party was rapidly slipping into oblivion. He did as good a job as anyone could be expected to do and I have, for him, a good deal of respect. I had the privilege of sitting opposite him in this House as Leader of the Opposition and incidentally, having been in that position, Mr. Speaker, the somewhat same position he is in today, I can sympathize with him. I was Leader of the Opposition in this House when our Leader, the Leader of the CCF in the province, was a Member of the Federal House at Ottawa, as the Leader of the Liberal Party at the present time is a Member of the Federal House; but I must make this difference, Mr. Speaker: my leader at that time, who is now Premier, never turned down any opportunity to get into this House. He had no opportunity to get here. Apparently the Government of that day was afraid to call by-elections. There were vacant seats in this House and then, on top of that, using the excuse of a war in Europe, comparing conditions here in Saskatchewan to those that existed, for example, in Great Britain, they postponed the holding of an election for one year past the statutory five-year term. And so I sympathize, very much, with the Leader of the Opposition having to substitute in this House for the Leader of the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan, who apparently does not want to get into this House.

I was very much interested in what the Member for Rosthern had to say about this question. The Member for Rosthern suggested that someone else might resign his seat in this House because there were so few Liberals. I suppose that would be very generous; but I would suggest to the Member for Rosthern that he might suggest that the Leader of the Opposition should resign in the hope that we might get a more decisive victory for one party or the other in his constituency in a by-election. That would be a very interesting contest for the new Leader of the Liberal Party in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, one other thing: I wish to congratulate the Hon. Member for the Mediterranean Area on his speech of yesterday and I sincerely congratulate him because I believe that he has sincerely and honestly come out in this House in his true colors.

Mr. Embury: – That is more than some Communists do.

Mr. Brockelbank: – Mr. Speaker, I shall deal to a certain extent with people who continually shout names at other people, but I will not take time off to do it now; but I do want to point out that the Hon.

February 14, 1947

Member has in actual fact joined forces, if not in name in fact, with the political party in Canada which is a greatest and most powerful protector of the vested interests in Canada, the Liberal Party, and it is strange to note when we look back through . . .

Mr. Embury: – On a point of Order. What I said was that I had had no part of Liberal politics in all my days. I do not like to be misquoted.

Mr. Speaker: – The Hon. Minister is merely stating his opinion. I would point out that you in your remarks used the same tactics. The Point of Order is not well taken.

Mr. Brockelbank: – Mr. Speaker, I do not want to make this personal in my way but I do hope that the Hon. Member can give to others in this House the same kind of free speech that he was accorded . . .

Mr. Embury: – Accorded! Do not forget they heard you over the air!

Mr. Brockelbank: – And I am sure that that will be a great deal more than I want, a great deal more than I want. I stated, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member had, in fact, if not in name, joined with the only great party in Canada that can do anything to protect the vested interests in Canada and that is the Liberal Party. It is quite evident that the Conservative Party failed in its task of protecting the special privileges and interests in Canada and as a result it was thrown overboard and the Liberal Party has usurped that place.

Now it is strange to note, through history, that some political parties have been prone to change their name from time to time in the hope of gathering some more popular support because of a change in name. If we look down in the Province of Manitoba we see a funny history there, where we have had Liberals and Progressives, the words Liberal and Progressives all mixed up, sometimes ‘Progressive’ was first and sometimes ‘Liberal’ was first. We look at the history of the Conservative Party, we find that it used to call itself the Liberal-Conservative Party and then it ditched that name and took on, recently, the name of Progressive – the Progressive Conservative Party. Well, I suppose now, Mr. Speaker, we have in fact what we might call a Conservative Progressive Liberal Party in some parts of this province and probably in many parts in Canada. If not actually there now, I think there are people who are making an effort to bring that creature into being.

It is interesting to note, too, that other political parties have done the same thing exactly, have changed their name from time to time. The Social Credit Party has had two or three names and I cannot remember all of them. The Communist Party has had two or three names which are very well known and I would like to point out to this House that since the CCF was first organized it is the only political party in Canada which has been willing to stand on its own platform and to keep its own name and not try to steal somebody else’s.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one fortunate thing about the claims of the Liberal-Conservative Progressives, that is, they have a record and that we can go back and look at that record

February 14, 1947

any time we like. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, it is a pretty fruity record. I want to read a short quotation in this House from a man who is a real free enterpriser and this is it:

We stand for the maintenance of private property. We shall protect free enterprise as the most expedient, or rather, the sole possible economic order.

I wonder, do my six friends in the Liberal-Conservative Progressive Opposition agree to that statement? I wonder, do they agree that free enterprise is the most expedient or even the sole possible economic order? I suppose they do. They appear to have no objections. The man who made that statement was Adolph Hitler, to the capitalists of Germany in the period between the two Wars.

Mr. Phelps: – Very appropriate!

Mr. Brockelbank: – People who get into a difficult spot often resort to calling names and in this House, Mr. Speaker, I have been called a lot of things. During the War years, when I sat over there where the Leader of the Opposition is sitting now, people on this side of the House used to call us, in the CCF, National Socialists, Fascists, in spite of the kind of quotations that we could produce from Hitler himself, the leading Fascist in the world. Fascism was the result of uncontrolled free enterprise and it is nothing new to us to have names hurled at us. I am not particularly interested in those except to the extent that I think if we are going to be at all honest with ourselves and if we believe in our democracy at all we should be a bit honest, we should be sure that when we use words that we understand them. There is probably no word that has been more abused and more purposely misunderstood than has the word ‘Socialism’. People who want to think that it believes something terrible, something different, put that meaning on it. And when my friends might ask some of us if we are Socialists and we say, yes, they may class us as this kind or that kind or another kind of a socialist. As I might ask the Hon. Member for Arm River if he is a Christian and if he says, yes, on the same logic it would be correct for me to assume that he was either a Presbyterian, a Lutheran, a Bible Student, or what have you.

Mr. Speaker, two or three things more I would like to bring out in regard to this system of free enterprise. In 1943, on April 21st, there was held the annual meeting of the Falkenbridge Nickle Mines in Toronto. Mr. J. Gordon Hardie, the President of the company, brought good news to the shareholders. To quote from the President’s remarks as reprinted by the company, this is what he said:

Incidentally, you will be glad to learn, as I was, that through indirect channels it is reported that your Norwegian refinery is safe and is being maintained. It is in operation by your Norwegian staff under German control and on the same Norwegian nickle, copper, ore protection that we formerly handled on toll basis.

We have often contended in this House, Mr. Speaker, that the people who own and control the power of our country to produce, the means of production in the world, are more interested in their own welfare than they are in the welfare of the world; but it is seldom you run on such a case as this, where the

February 14, 1947

president of a company is reporting to his shareholders in Canada, when Canadian boys were at war with the enemy, that he was glad that their property was busy in enemy territory producing munitions of war for the enemy. That is private enterprise and I want my hon. friends to remember it.

Private enterprise does other things too. During the depression years in the Province of Saskatchewan, we had a Liberal-Conservative Government in tandem; one was in first and then the other was in second and they were both the same as far as dealing with the problems of that time were concerned. Both of them sent settlers into northern Saskatchewan onto some land; some of that land was not fit for agriculture at all. They gave them small advances. They hoped that when they got a few acres under cultivation they would be able to support themselves. They were living there on the most meagre relief allowance and I have here on my desk a few receipts from the Saskatchewan Relief Commission. It is a cordwood delivery receipt. I don't know whether any of my hon. friends in this six Member Opposition have ever cut cordwood for a living or not. If they have not it would be a grand experience. This man . . .

Mr. Proctor: – I have cut as much as you have.

Mr. Brockelbank: – No, you have not. This man cut green poplar cordwood, hauled it to the railroad siding and his load was a cord and a quarter. Here is the receipt for this load, one cord and a quarter, at \$1.25 per cord and a quarter of green poplar cordwood delivered at the railroad siding. There is a whole bunch of them here; some of them are for one cord for \$1. Anybody who has had any experience along that line would really know what \$1 meant under those circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, these people who talk about freedom and about liberty – and I want to give them the credit of being honest and sincere in what they say because it would hurt me very much to think that anyone would get up in this House and make speeches about liberty and freedom, such as the Member for Moosomin has made and others in that group and not believe what they are saying. I would like to deal with this whole question with regard to liberty, free enterprise and socialism very briefly for a few minutes.

Often in this House we have had people quote from this little book, “The Case for Socialism.” Today, it is with pleasure that I am going to use a few quotations from this to show what is meant by socialism. I will use any copy of this book, Mr. Speaker. If the Hon. Member for Moosomin has some spare ones stored away, I would be glad to quote from them too. First, we have here:

This is Socialism, community ownership of the means of producing and distributing wealth, the organization of industry under that common ownership as a public service for the benefit for all, directed to social ends and to the equipment of the life of the whole people instead of as now to the private enrichment of a privileged class of owners.

And, again, let me read this quotation:

The enslavement of men by their fellowmen has taken many

February 14, 1947

forms in human history. Whatever its form may be the substance and reality of enslavement is that it gives one man the power to say to other men, 'I shall live pleasantly on the good things of the world by making you provide them for me.' Whatever the device may be which enables men to do that it is slavery. The fight against private ownership of capital, the fight for socialism, for the nation's control of its own resources, is the last fight in the age-long struggle of humanity for freedom, a struggle which can have but one end and that end is the final disappearance for human society of the right of the owning class to live upon the labor of a subject class.'

Mr. Proctor: – Do you agree with what you have just read?

Mr. Brockelbank: – Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member wants me to say, yes or no, and then for him to put the interpretation that he wants on what I have just read. I just do not do things like that. What I am interested in knowing and what this House, I am sure, is interested in knowing, is whether or not the Member from Moosomin subscribes to what I have just read.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal of talk about freedom. We have heard a great deal of talk about the four freedoms, during the War and some since the War, but not so much since the War. Particularly in regard to some of those four freedoms there are people who would be very happy if these certain freedoms could slip back into oblivion again. Very many of them would like to see them slip away. The people, the human race, in a great part of the world have fought hard and long to win the freedom of speech and the political freedom which they have and the religious freedom which they have and a certain amount of protection and security. They are still fighting, Mr. Speaker, to secure freedom from want. That is the one freedom which we must yet secure and just how in the world my hon. friends can by any method of logic, decide that when we achieve that freedom from want we are going to lose the other freedoms, is more than I can understand. As a matter of fact the truth is exactly the contrary. Unless we can achieve freedom from want, we cannot expect to forever hold those other freedoms which have been won.

I have stated in this House before that democracy and capitalism or free enterprise, or whatever they would like to call it, are not compatible and cannot continue to live together. Unless we can have socialism with democracy, democracy is going to pass out of the picture and it is quite evident that that has already happened in some parts of the world, today. Now I cannot hear the Hon. Member, Mr. Speaker. Here is another extract from this book, from the chapter entitled, "Socialism and Liberty." He says:

What is this man to do then, in a world in which the means of his work are owned and controlled by other men while he has nothing but his labor power? That is the system which the anti-socialist defends, the system of private ownership of the means of the nation's work. What is the man to do? He must live. He cannot live without work. He cannot work without access to the means of work. The means of work are private property. What I ask is he to do? Is it not clear to you that he can only secure his life by losing his liberty? He must put his

February 14, 1947

neck under the yoke and accept a master. He must beg his brother to give him leave to toil.

It may be a form of slavery which might even be benevolent, which might even at some time be generous. But not yet, Mr. Speaker, in this world have we got to the point where it is recognized as a fundamental right that every person should have the right to toil, the right to apply their labor to our resources and to have a return for their work. That is the battle that we are fighting today, to win that right. Again, from this book:

To own slaves it is not necessary to own men. It is quite sufficient if you own the means of their work. Private ownership of capital, the necessary means of the nation's work, sets up this great slave organization of industry under which men have no right to work (and consequently no right to live, which is involved in the right to work) except by permission of an owner. Only by such permission and on such terms can the mass of the people live so long as the industry of the nation is under private ownership and it is upon these terms that every wage earner does actually live, today.

Mr. Proctor: – May I again ask the Minister if he agrees with the statements of that writer?

Mr. Brockelbank: – Mr. Speaker, I am just a little inclined to resent the inference of the Hon. Member for Moosomin, when he questions my belief in what I am saying.

Mr. Proctor: – Do you believe it? Yes or no?

Mr. Brockelbank: – From this book:

The only liberty which socialism threatens is the liberty of a small privileged class to live by preying upon the nation's resources.

And, of course, Mr. Speaker, that is the liberty which the six-Member Opposition in this House is fighting to protect: the liberty of a small privileged class to live upon the resources.

Mr. Speaker, if 999 men have their means of work owned by the thousandth man, and are at his mercy for the right to live, according to the free enterprisers that is liberty, power of initiative, the free play of intelligence and will and so forth. But if the thousand men jointly own their own means of work and co-operate together as an organized community in carrying on their pursuits and activities, then the free enterpriser says that is the most sterilizing despotism the world has ever seen.

Mr. Speaker, I think we can get a slightly different view-point. You know in one of the states in the Union to the south of us, a judge in court has decided that it is libel to call anybody Communist. I hope we do not ever get to that stage here because I sure want to be able to call my friends over there Liberals and Conservatives and anti-Socialists as long as they are that. I do not think it should be any offence to call them that when that is what they want to be. But they are anti-Socialists. They stand against an economy and the political

system, in which the people themselves will own and control the means whereby they live. They are opposed to the people controlling their own lives. They believe that a few people who happen to be born into these places – like the Attorney General says: ‘you have to be born into the Liberal Party’ – are the people who should have the divine right to decide whether or not other people should work and how they should work and under what conditions they should work.

What has been the result of it? And, again, let me refer to those depression years when we had throughout Canada idle plants, all kinds of factories shut down; idle workmen, nothing for them to do; workmen with hungry families, without clothing, without footwear, some of them without decent places to live. That is what we had from free enterprise. The people of Saskatchewan and the people of Canada are not going to easily forget those things either. We had a group of men who started from the West Coast heading for Ottawa – the famous trek to Ottawa. Why were they going to Ottawa? They were going to Ottawa because this free enterprise system had said to those men, you have no right to live. You shall not eat. They were stopped here in Regina and what did my hon. friends and their friends have for them? Police batons! That was all they had for them. Well, Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend from Moosomin ever thinks that he and his other free enterprisers are going to win the battle for free enterprise without an all-out fight, they are going some. Men will fight before they starve and if those fellows threw some stones and some bottles those who were refused the right to work and the right to eat, the right to live, who will blame them? There were many of them in the last War. Many of these men that I know that went up into northern Saskatchewan and lived under dire conditions of poverty when the Liberal and Conservative Government in Canada said, “We cannot afford to do this. We cannot afford to do that,” when the free enterprisers sat with their factories closed. War came, they enlisted . . .

Mr. Nollet: – And made good soldiers.

Mr. Brockelbank: – . . . many served and lots of them never came back. If the Hon. Member from the Mediterranean Area is under any illusions as to what the men were fighting for, I think I can tell him. The men in this War were fighting against the kind of a system which would give them the things which they had experienced in the past. Now I want to assure the Member for the Mediterranean Area – and I wish he were at his seat – with all due respect to his rank, that Colonels and Generals cannot always speak for the private soldier. I know his feelings a bit and I know the feelings of these men who left from this poverty to go into the army and I know their feelings now when they have come back. So do not ever think it that our men were fighting to maintain this system of free enterprise which has brought fruits as we know them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one other thing I want to say about democracy and freedom; that is, democracy and freedom are living things. They are things that must grow and expand or they will die. And democracy cannot continue to live unless it continues to expand. Again, that is just another way of saying that socialism must be side by side with democracy, or democracy will die, because socialism is only the application of democratic principles to the very bread and butter of our existence. That is all it is. It is democratic fundamentally, whereas free

February 14, 1947

enterprise is dictatorship and in the final stages of free enterprise it has always led to the totalitarian stage.

Statements have been made in this House, coming back now to the Province of Saskatchewan in particular that this Government has taken power away from local governing bodies. I challenge any Member of this House to name the powers that were taken away from the municipal councils in this province; any powers that they ever had. As a matter of fact, I will be very pleased when we are at this Session, introducing amendments to The Municipal Act to give to those municipalities more powers; powers to do things. Probably, my hon. friends over there will not like them but giving to them more powers. Can anybody state that there is not democratic control in the education system in this Province: The school trustees, the trustees of each of the school units are elected just as truly as ever they were and yet my hon. friends, because they are without any real argument, they are without any ground on which to stand, get up and say, "you have taken their power away and are destroying local government in this province." We are not, Mr. Speaker, we are making it strong and we are giving the local government a chance to do things that it could never do before.

The same thing applies in regard to health services. The health regions in this province are a self-governing body with a board elected by the people and that board is to decide what kind of services they want to give to themselves. It is passing strange – perhaps I should not say it as strange, because it has always been the case in history when people, who are fighting a lost cause against the great mass of people, themselves are in the last ditch, their last defence is to call names, to tilt at windmills, to build up straw men and knock them down with great gusto. And that is what we see taking place today. As a matter of fact, they do better than that. Our friends in the Opposition get up and they make promises for the CCF and then they make them the way they want them and then they go after us because we have not fulfilled them. I would remind my hon. friends too, that they are just a little illogical on that point. In my adult life I think the Liberal Party in Canada and Saskatchewan has had two or four conventions to build a policy and that is not very many. But they do not need very many, Mr. Speaker, because they never use them. They are as good as new and they can always have a platform.

I am very proud, Mr. Speaker, of the few things that we have been able to accomplish in this province in the way of improved conditions for the people. We will never in one province be able to build a complete picture of the kind of society that should exist. But we can go some of the way. As far as I am concerned, we shall continue to proceed along that path towards their own lives and over their own well-being. That, Mr. Speaker, is democracy.

I shall support the motion.

Mr. D.M. Lazorko (Redberry): – Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I first want to congratulate the Hon. Member for Morse and also the Hon. Member for Meadow Lake for the excellent addresses they gave here. Following those who spoke before, I can only add this, that the people of Morse, having had two years of the so-called CCF tyranny, answered our Liberal and Conservative opponents in this province by electing again the CCF Member with

February 14, 1947

a substantial majority. I also wish to extend congratulations to the other Members who have spoken before me, which incidentally leaves me a very limited field to deal with now.

There have been a few statements made in this Legislature very recently and it is because of these statements that I decided to take part in this debate at this time. I want to take you back to our constituency and through its life and development and answer a few of the accusations that have been made in this House recently.

Our constituency of Redberry has had a rather turbulent political history back from the time this province was formed. In 1905 we elected and sent to this Legislature, the late Hon. George Langley, who represented us up to 1921 and who has been looked upon as one of the outstanding men in the early political and agricultural life of this province. In 1921 we elected a Progressive, who represented us until 1934 and who, incidentally, the last few years or in the last couple of Sessions, crossed the floor and went back into the Liberal fold. In 1934 our constituency was taken off the map of the province and I want to state that to a certain extent the people of Redberry were disfranchised. In 1938 we, again, became a constituency and again elected a Liberal representative until 1943 when he passed away. No by-election was called although our seat was vacant for close to two years. In 1944 the people of Redberry constituency subscribed by a clear overall majority and elected a CCF representative, subscribing to the idea of a better education, hospitalization and better roads, in general a better life for the people of our constituency and also at the same time the people of the whole of the province. You may wonder sometimes though we have had Liberal members in our constituency for a good many years, why the big change in 1944? One of the reasons, I believe, as I mentioned, was that the people wanted a change. Further, I will try to point out other reasons by using other illustrations about our constituency.

Redberry is a rural constituency in the northern part of our province, to which I always like to refer in a rather picturesque way, or paint a picturesque picture of the constituency of Redberry. We find it cradled in the arm of the big bend of the North Saskatchewan River, rising over sand dunes and rock-strewn pastures from the waters of the river, onto a level and fertile plain. Then further north, dipping down again to the edges of a fairly large island-dotted lake, known as Redberry Lake – and incidentally, this winter the fishermen of the district took out and handled through the Fish Marketing Board somewhere in the neighborhood of 70,000 pounds of the finest whitefish that you can find in this province. Leaving the lake, the constituency rises again in a series of rock and bluff covered hills to a background of fairly heavy bush and beyond that some wasteland.

Picturesque as this setting may be, when we look a little closer, what is it that we find? In 1944 we found the people living in a community where large hospitals have been closed for a good many years. We find a community where a number of schools have been closed for a good many years. We find districts in this same community where children have been growing up without a chance of education, where no schools were provided for these children. We find a community which has very poor roads and worse highways.

February 14, 1947

It was mentioned by the Hon. Member for Moosomin that the Liberal administration, in the past, initiated the idea and practice of seeding down slopes along the highway to keep the weeds away and so on. I would think that in some of the places where the roads and highways were marked on the map in the constituency of Redberry, they had sown grass or hay across the whole road allowance, because when our administration came in we could not even find a better road than just a very poor trail. And, above all else, we found a community or a district in which people were living in hovels instead of homes. But what do we find after three years of CCF administration? We find highways have been completed, graded and gravelled; we find bus service across the two highways in our constituency now, service which the people of our constituency appreciate a great deal. We find, also, that many municipalities have received substantial grants for the building of bridges and market roads and we find, also, this following summer we will have an extension of power through a large part of our constituency joining us with the power line from Saskatoon to North Battleford.

Going back to the roads, I would like to read a quotation from a letter written by a Mr. Peters, from Indianapolis, dated January 5th, 1947, and addressed to the National Parks Bureau, Ottawa, Canada. I quote part of the letter:

The road from Winnipeg to Edmonton is rough in most places to say the least, however, here is a tip to guide you to smooth roads and I do mean gravel. Between Radisson and Battleford the gravel road was in such good shape that we made as good time, with equal comfort, on that stretch as on most American pavements. This was not due to local showers. The reason must be that the man who drags that section of the road knows his business and attends to it.

This comment is somewhat similar to what I have heard from a good many people who have seen some of the new roads and used a lot of our roads in this province over the past number of years.

There have been other developments, during the last three years, and especially the one I am going to mention now, which to the people of our constituency is very important and that is the opening of the Hafford Hospital, with the aid of the Provincial Government, which came in, giving the people of that community extensive financial aid to help them in opening up and running this hospital. Also, the Government has given financial aid to a hospital that is being built at the present time in the town of Borden. These two hospitals will serve a big portion or the majority of the people of our constituency. We have, also, under the Act passed, I believe at the last Session or the one before that, started a Veterinary Services Area in the western part of our constituency. One municipality in our constituency has also voted, last year, carried with a very big majority, a by-law under which they have a municipal doctor at the present time and adding to all the provincial hospitalization scheme. Here is the thing which all our people in the constituency of Redberry have been wanting for a long time.

All of our constituency is in the larger school unit set up at the present time. We have been able to see some benefits from the operation of this new set up. We have schools built where there were no schools before. In one unit they built

February 14, 1947

in the rural area a three-room school, where today, we have almost 90 children attending.

There are a few suggestions I can make as far as the larger school unit is concerned at the present time. One is that we will have to find a formula under which the rate, as between urban on the one side and rural on the other, will be the same ratio in every unit so as not to result in confusion because we can see when we take the statistics of the different units in the province and follow them closely, we see a considerable difference in the ratio of the rates between the rural and urban areas. The other suggestion I want to make is that we have to do one of two things, either give larger equalization grants to some northern areas where land is poor and the region is financially weak, or put the whole province on a uniform tax basis. These are two things that are being discussed by people in our constituency all the time. Good arguments are being advanced in support of each one. I believe we will have to deal with this matter at some time in the near future.

During this particular debate, Members of this Legislature have heard many comments on the proposed Bill of Rights. While speaking of this, Members of the Opposition have tried to point out the different rights and freedoms that the people of this province have lost. We have heard a lot of lip service in favor of democracy and freedom. We have heard, very recently, mention of machinations within this Government; also, we have heard the reference to demagogues and many other things. We have, also heard mention of Russia and of Communism. We were told that in Russia we have seen murder with slavery and starvation. I agree that this has been the case in Russia. I also want to point out further, if we turn back the pages of history and look it over a little bit, we will find that the same has been true in the history of the different people in Europe almost as a whole. Rome has had its share. They did not get as far as the people living Russia at the present time, but there were others that did. By the way, Rome as other Empires who have had a part in this torture, have long since crumbled into dust; but these perpetrations have been carried out in Russia and in other countries, by Russia also, as well as by other people. They have been carried out by Mongolian invasions over half the European continent. They have been carried out by Napoleon's legions, possibly over more than half the European continent, and the last, but the greatest, orgy has been perpetrated on almost all the people of Europe by the Nazi and Fascist legions whom we have just so recently defeated.

We, of the democratic world, entered this struggle in the defence of Poland, France and the other countries that were attacked by Fascist armies. During the course of this struggle, just as well as Poland and France and many of the other smaller countries, the Soviet Union, though not by its own will, also became one of our allies in this struggle which has been one of the greatest struggles the human race ever fought to preserve what freedom and democracy we have. Then, after this struggle is all over, we find people possibly unknowingly, are letting themselves be led and fitted with shoes similar to those worn by the overlords of Nazi concentration camps and gas chambers, all in the name of freedom and democracy. We can hear this in the Legislature. We can hear this at different public meetings. We find a lot of it in the press. We find a concerted effort on the part of powers-that-be to divert the desire of the common man and woman, across the face of the earth, in their attempt to

February 14, 1947

join hands and in this way to better their own conditions. Having heard these references about demagogues, I am wondering where that term applies.

It has also been mentioned by the Hon. Member for Rosthern of people who came to this country, who did not live under a democratic regime before coming to Canada; who were not in a position or have not been able to adapt themselves as fully to the democratic way of life, as they should have. I want to say that in this country we have a good many people who have not had the chance to live in a democratic country. My forebears lived in a country which had been dominated politically and economically by other nations for centuries, who knew nothing but the background of centuries of struggle against slavery and everything else that goes with it. There are other people who come from similar conditions but I have seen these people, after coming into this country, adapting themselves to our ways of life very quickly, realizing the necessity of education and self-government and learning to use self-government in our municipal bodies and in our school bodies and in our province. They have in a short time begun to practice and live political democracy in a short time begun to practice and live political democracy and in the last number of years we have also seen that the younger generation, born and raised in this country, has gone the full length by joining with other boys and girls all across this Dominion and from other countries in defence of our way of life.

It has been mentioned lately in this House that half of us on this side are either Socialists or advanced Liberals. In conclusion, I want to say this: as far as I know I was not born a Socialist or an advanced Liberal but my bringing up has been one in which I should help my fellowman and I, as well as all the rest of the people in the constituency of Redberry, where there are several thousands – we are today working together with the rest of the people in this province in striving to better our own conditions, to bring in more security and a better way of life for all of us, that all of us may eventually benefit by it.

Mr. Speaker, that is my reason why I support the motion.

Mr. M.J. Dobie (Active Services Voters' Representative): – Mr. Speaker, I found that the trend of the debate had taken this peculiar turn where it was a matter of siding between two principles, socialism or private enterprise or whatever you wish to call it and I felt that being an independent Member of the House it was up to me to express my opinion on the matter. Now, I wish to state perfectly and clearly, without any question of being misunderstood, that when I speak on the matter of policy as far as the Government is concerned, whether I criticize or commend them, that I do it because of my own personal convictions. I am not speaking for those whom I represent in this House. I was elected to this Legislature as a soldiers' Member to do what I could do in conjunction with others who were interested in those things which would assist the men and women who have served in their coming rehabilitation. But I do not pretend for one moment to speak for them on any other matter.

Now, Sir, much has been said in this House and much has been done by this Government regarding the policies which have been good for the people of the Province of Saskatchewan, of which I can hardly approve. I am not like the Opposition that cannot

February 14, 1947

see anything good in the Government at all. An official Opposition, of course, must object, oppose everything the Government brings in, but there are many things that I can see that this Government has done of which I fully approve and I am going to say so. Might I divert for one moment.

I would like to congratulate the Hon. Member for Maple Creek for having been the recipient of that beautiful vase of flowers she has on her desk. It adds a little touch to us on this side of the House, I can assure you. May your good man long live, Madame, and send you flowers on every occasion. While the Hon. Member for Morse has had, I think, probably sufficient congratulations on his election, yet I would join in welcoming him to this House, not only as a Member of this Assembly, but as a fellow farmer. I still consider myself a farmer although for the last 30 years I have spent not quite half of that time in his Majesty's Forces, but I still think of myself as a farmer.

I would like, also, to join with the Hon. Member for Moosomin and the Hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Reconstruction in welcoming back to the House, in his old business as Sergeant-at-Arms, Major G.H. Mullin, V.C. MM. I say, Sir, that my association with Harry Mullin has been of long standing. We enlisted together in the same unit in the First Great War, but Harry was smart – at least he thought he was at that time – he passed himself off as an old soldier and he got on to that first draft of the Princess Patricia's and was in France about four or five months before we were. Probably he wasn't so smart but he got there anyhow. Then I ran in to him again in this present War at Dundurn when we found ourselves lieutenants in the same unit of the Veteran Guard of Canada, so that I got to know him quite well. I hope that he may enjoy for many years wearing that proud distinction, the Victoria Cross, which is the highest award that is given for gallantry on the field of battle, and that he may also enjoy his present position for some time.

When I was elected to this House as a soldiers' representative, I had visions of a larger field of endeavor being opened up to me to give assistance to those of my comrades who were worthy of assistance and I have not been disappointed. While it is found that there is not such a great deal to do in so far as work in the Session is concerned, that is where there is any publicity attached to it at any rate, I find that it has opened the way in great measure to giving assistance to those who need a little help over the rough places. I have been very fortunate in being able to work with the Department of Rehabilitation and Reconstruction, Local Rehabilitation Committees, Canadian Legion, DVA and Veterans' Land Act and we have been able to accomplish a great deal. In my small way, without any publicity, these matters are taken up and we do what we can for our comrades and I am very pleased to have the opportunity of doing so.

Now, Sir, might I commend the Hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Reconstruction and his staff and also the Minister of Natural Resources in the placing of lands at the disposal of veterans and the Minister and staff of the Department of Rehabilitation and Reconstruction for the allocation of those lands, for the setting up of housing accommodation, establishment of schools and all those things that they have done to give assistance to veterans. I can assure you that that work has been very much worthwhile and it is appreciated by veterans which I know very well. Not all has been done that, I am sure, the

February 14, 1947

Ministers hoped could be done, but a great deal has been accomplished. One thing has pleased me very much and that is to have found out within the last few months that the relationship between the Department of Rehabilitation and Reconstruction and the Government Departments of VLA and DVA and especially VLA has been most cordial and a very healthy working arrangement has been arrived at. Some little time ago, there was a bit of difficulty with regard to the inspectors of the Provincial Government and the inspectors of the Dominion Department VLA seeing eye to eye insofar as the inspections of land was concerned. Some little difficulty was experienced in that a veteran was delayed. After signing his contract the Provincial Government for the lease of that land, he was delayed because VLA would not grant the non-repayable grant of \$2,320 or whatever was decided to give him. Now I am sure that the Minister will agree with me that that matter has been cleared up and the two departments are working together very nicely indeed. It was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne that 764 parcels of Crown land had been allocated and the Hon. Minister mentioned it as well and that 450 further parcels will be allocated soon. I have the report from the Veterans' Land Act of the operations for 1946 and I find that we have a grand total of 3,449 veterans who have been established, whose contracts have been established, whose contracts have been completed and they are established. That includes those who have been allotted Crown lands. It also includes not only full-time farming, but small holdings of which there are four doing commercial fishing. I think it is a very creditable showing and I am sure that what has been done by the Provincial Department is something which has been very much worthwhile.

Now, Sir, let me move along to veterans affairs. I might mention, and I think there is plenty of time. I might mention some of the peculiar problems that we still have with regard to veterans. It was mentioned the other day by the Hon. Member for area number one that possibly the enthusiasm was beginning to die down a bit, insofar as assistance to veterans and their establishment is concerned. Well, I am not just sure about that. You don't hear so much talk about it but I think that the sincerity still remains. I think the sincerity in giving assistance to those who have served still remains. Now, insofar as our rehabilitation committees are concerned, I find no difference whatever in the Department of Rehabilitation and Reconstruction in their energy and determination to carry on this work, so I must accept that this enthusiasm, this interest still remains; but we have problems, the housing problem is one. You have it in the cities, of course, to a greater extent than any place else.

The problem of land, Sir, is very difficult, very difficult indeed. Even though this year we had over 3,000 veterans settled, that does not mean that that average will be kept up. It does not mean that that average will be kept up and a much darker view of the picture can be taken when we consider that we have 9,525 veterans who have qualified as full-time farmers. Now the land must be obtained for these chaps some place and I am afraid it is going to be a bit difficult. The trend that farming has taken with larger holdings and the reluctance that farmers have of settling is rather a surprise to me. I understood when I came out of the army two years ago that a lot of these older farmers would be willing to sell. They said they were tired and they wanted to retire and I thought they would be willing to sell, but I find such is not the case. Now, though some have turned the land over to their sons and the like

February 14, 1947

of that, the majority of them want to hang on to their farms. They can get help to carry on their farm operations; and a farm is a pretty good thing to have at the present time, Sir. It is a pretty good thing to have. If the Lord sends rain and sunshine, they are pretty well assured of a good living, so the problem of getting land for veterans is one that is rather difficult right now.

We have another more serious problem and one which I have spoken of before in this House and that is the older veterans. That is a problem we will have for many, many years to come. I think probably that matter will be taken up with this committee that is being set up on veterans affairs and mayhap something can be done about it.

Now, I wish to get along to provincial affairs for a few minutes. I have been rather impressed in listening to the debates in this House with the unanimity that there has been between those who support the Government – the absolute and definite agreement that everything is fine and dandy and that there should be no criticisms or complaints of any kind. We have heard, of course, that there should be a road fixed here and there and the like of that, but there has been from Government Members fairly complete agreement that everything is all right. I had a Commanding Officer one time who was a tough old nut and in those quiet spells when fellows were not being absent without leave and getting tight and coming in with black eyes and all that kind of thing, he was a little concerned and he used to call us in – I was an N.C.O. at that time – and he would give us ‘what for’ because he was thinking that this was not just a normal state of affairs and he was correct. There is always that calm before a storm and I am wondering if there isn’t something wrong with regard to the agreement of the Members of this Government. I am wondering, Sir, it doesn’t seem reasonable to me that we should hear no criticism from the Government side of the House. Their majority is such that if two and three or four or half a dozen of them were to kick over the traces it wouldn’t make any difference. It might look bad for the time being but I think the people of the province would be pleased to hear it.

Now, I can quite agree with the Leader of the Opposition when he speaks about this amazing amount of propaganda that is going on, because this is all along the same line. I was saving the stuff up at home, which was published and sent out by the Publications Branch and I had a nice lot of it, just one copy of each. I intended to list it and bring it along with me but this literature, I don’t like to call it propaganda, I don’t like that word, but all this literature, pamphlets, folders, what have you, saying that everything the Government has done and everything they intend to do is perfectly right. Well now, probably that is correct, but I do know, Sir, that there are people in the country receiving this stuff (stuff is not a nice word either, some of it is very good; there are some fine pictures of the Cabinet Ministers in it) but there are people who do not appreciate receiving this literature. They do not appreciate it; they know they are paying taxes to publish this; they know they are paying taxes for the fellow that composes it and compiles it and all that kind of thing. There are zealous people that I think we all know who distribute literature and they stick it under your front door, attach it to the key hole, on the seat of your car or under the windshield wiper, but our Government puts it right in our mail boxes and we are paying for it. I can assure you that there are people who do not

February 14, 1947

appreciate so much of it. I remember a quotation, I believe it was one of the tales of the Wayside Inn, which says that men put no faith in fine veiled sentiments, who put their trust in birds and bees. I know that the people are not putting their trust or their faith in what is contained in these circulars, pamphlets and documents; they are putting their trust in their farms, in their businesses and in their own ability to make their own way in the world.

Now, Sir, much has been said with regard to our state-controlled enterprise. The Hon. Premier gave a very interesting talk the other afternoon in which he gave a good deal of detail regarding these state-owned enterprises. I think you will have gathered from me now that I am not socialistically-minded. In spite of all the glowing reports that we have heard with regard to these state-controlled and state-owned enterprises, I have yet to see where they have made any appreciable difference to the economy in the life of this province. I believe, Sir, that the times, the prosperous times that we are enjoying at the present, are not due to the policy of this Government but they are due to the demand of war and the aftermath of the War for the goods that we have. Prosperity is due to the ability of our people to produce and the productivity of our lands, our mines, our lakes and our forests; and it is due to the adaptability of our people and their ability to overcome the difficulties that they have to contend with. So that when we have all this talk about the wonderful things our state-controlled enterprises are going to do, how they are going to reduce the cost of our social services, I can contend that the people of this province must be shown.

There is also legislation that we have on the statute books that I do not like at all. We have compulsory legislation, legislation such as contained in the Fire Insurance Act, legislation and regulations with regard to sale of fish, timber, fur and what not. These are things I cannot agree with.

I received a letter from a man a few months ago bearing on the Fire Insurance Act. His son, who had returned from overseas, had been in the insurance business previously and intended to re-enter the same business. The father was very much perturbed. In fact, he was quite hostile when he found that a Government Insurance Agent had been appointed at this place, who had not been in the business before and that the son would lose all the insurance on the schools and hospitals and that kind of thing. Now, this man had been a supporter of the CCF candidate in that area, but the letter I received from him led me to believe that he did not think very much of this legislation. Now that is the trend; those are indications and, of course, one swallow doesn't make a swan, but those are the indications.

Might I refer now, Sir to something the Hon. Member for Maple Creek referred to yesterday in her very pleasant talk and that is the liquor traffic in this province. I have no idea what could be done. I have no suggestions to make as to any changes, but when we consider that we have a profit of six, seven or eight million dollars and sales of over \$20 million, and when we consider that day by day our boys and our girls are picking up beer bottles all over the place, thus being taught and trained in the wrong direction; and when we consider that our police are having difficulty with the violators of the liquor law as was reported just the other night and that infractions are increasing, surely the liquor traffic should be given serious thought.

February 14, 1947

A few days ago I had on my desk – and I presume we all have had it on our desks – a letter from the Temperance Association. They advocate, for one thing, the reduction in the quota of beers and wines, spirits and so on. Instead of a quota of 12 bottles of beer, two bottles of wine and one of spirits per day, it should be that much per week. I am not prepared to say whether that would be good or otherwise, but I don't think we should be at all proud of the profits we are receiving from that source. I don't think we should be at all proud. I would personally like to see it a little more open. I would like to be able to sit down in a public dining room and have a bottle of beer, or a glass of light wine. I think it would be very much better. I am just mentioning that in passing; it is the first reference I had heard to the liquor laws of this province.

Now, I have a little matter to mention which affects the constituency in which I live, represented by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. We have, in that constituency, a very promising oil field of which I have just spoken, in the Lloydminster area. I am given to understand that we have a good quality of gas which is trapped in the wells and no use whatever is being made of it. We had Board of Trade meetings last year along that line and we found out, of course, that pipes were not available to pipe that gas anywhere. But I would like to see, just as soon as pipe is available, a franchise given so that gas can be utilized in the surrounding area. I would like to see it.

Then we have another matter which affects both the constituency of Cut Knife and Battleford and that is the gap in the power line between North Battleford and Lloydminster. There is a gap there of nearly 100 miles and I trust that the Hon. Member for Cut Knife and the Hon. Member for The Battlefords will bear this in mind and see what can be done about it. We hear a lot of talk about the extension of power lines, and while this area is not heavily populated, I feel that we should be given consideration.

Now I am more concerned, of course, with regard to our ex-service men, my colleagues, those whom I represent. I have always been pleased to be associated with them in any way. I am sure that we recognize the contribution they made in time of war. If they are given a chance to rehabilitate themselves, the contribution that they will make in peace to the social, economic and cultural life of this country will fully equal that made in war. I am quite convinced of that. They return to civil life with the same sense of loyalty and responsibility that prompted their participation in actual battle.

I would just like to say, Sir, in closing, that I am much in favor of what this Government has done in certain respects. I am most decidedly in favor of the Hospitalization Plan. I think that is a grand scheme and while I realize, in talking to hospital authorities and doctors, that there is going to be difficulty not only in the crowding of the hospitals, but in the reports the secretaries of hospitals must send in and the reports that the doctors have to send in, because they are not the best people in the world – as I know the Minister will agree – to fill out and send in reports. The Plan itself, in my opinion, is good. And once the road is cleared away and the Plan is well in operation, I think the majority of the people of the province will be very proud of it.

Then there is, too, the extension of social service,

February 14, 1947

hospitalization and medical treatment for our old age pensioners, free cancer treatment and all that sort of thing which is very, very good indeed.

Insofar as the liability insurance regarding the automobile is concerned, we do hear some complaint about that. I may tell you quite frankly that the only complaint that I heard, last spring, from anyone paying his \$5 on his car, was from a real good CCFer, a real good party man and he was the only one who complained about it. Well, probably they will take his into camp and talk to him, but the fact remains that these things are all to the good and I am quite convinced that they are. The people of the province recognize that they are good.

But there are other things, as I say, that I personally do not agree with. I cannot agree with regimentation. I put in nearly 10 years in the army where we were told to do this and told to do that and told to get up in the morning and told to go to bed at night. I was a Commanding Officer in Canada for over four years in this War and it didn't matter what I had to do, I was told by the Department of National Defence or by the Military District. If you could slip something over and do it without them knowing anything about it, well fine and dandy. I cannot believe in regimentation, I cannot believe in it. So, therefore, what I object to insofar as this Government is concerned, is this trend that is taking place to a socialized state. Now that may not take place in our time, it may be many, many years or never, but the trend is there and I personally cannot agree with it and, therefore, Sir, I cannot support the motion.

Mr. L.F. McIntosh (Prince Albert): – Mr. Speaker, what I am about to say may be considered by you to be out of order, but I would like to pay my compliments to the manner in which you conducted the opening of this Session of the Legislature on January 30th. Very simple, very graceful and giving one the impression of a Speaker of many year's standing was the manner in which you opened this Session of the Legislature. If I am out of order in making those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will deal with it in terms fitting the high office which you hold.

I think it is customary, judging from the remarks that have been made up to the present time, to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne. I am not congratulating the mover so much for what he said, but for the very sincere manner in which it was said. It indicated to me that the convention that chose the representative for the Morse constituency used very sound and very sincere judgment and the electors of that constituency, I am sure, will have no cause to regret the decision they made in the by-election that sent the Member from Morse to this House. I would also, Mr. Speaker, like to associate myself with the remarks made by my colleague, the Minister of Education in connection with the great work done by the late Ellen Wilkinson, former Minister of Education, in the Labour Government of Great Britain, whom I had the privilege to meet in the United Kingdom last spring. I am sure we all feel, here in our province with the people of the Mother Land, the great loss and the untimely passing of one who gave promise to making an outstanding contribution to education in the United Kingdom.

I think I am expressing the sentiments of the Members on this side of the House when I say that we are very happy to see

February 14, 1947

with us after a serious operation and after caring for some 30 years wounds sustained in World War I, the Hon. Member for the constituency of Moosomin. I note in his speech in reply to the Speech from the Throne that he took occasion, again, as he did a year ago, to bring to the attention of this Legislature the legislation passed by the Liberal Government in connection with security to the basic industry of this province. Undoubtedly, he left the impression, or attempted to do so, that it was the 36 years of Liberal regime in the Province of Saskatchewan, that according to the statement in the Leader-Post, formed the backbone to the farm security of this province. I believe the Hon. Member for Moosomin stated that the Liberal legislation relative to agriculture supplied the backbone to security for agriculture. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that the citizens of the Province of Saskatchewan will be very happy to note that the CCF Government added the head and shoulders to that backbone and made the legislation that was on the statute books and that that has been placed upon the books of this province during the past two years, workable. The Hon. Member for Moosomin made some reference to the agricultural legislation that has been passed, or proposed to be passed, by the Labour Government in Great Britain, and likened the trend there to what we might expect here in our own province. I had the pleasure of making a tour, sponsored by the National Farm Organization of the United Kingdom, in honor of the International Food Conference that was held in Britain during the month of May.

This tour, lasting some three days, took the delegation over a very wide section of the United Kingdom and for the information of this House I quote the size of some of the farms visited. One out in Reading County was a thousand acres, the one down in Warrington County a little over 2,000 acres. One up in Oxford County was some 1,400 acres; another one here 1,000 acres, another farm visited 1,500 acres; another visited 820 acres and one visited up in Stafford County was some 9,000 acres. These, or some of these, were considered to be estates and those of you who know of the food situation in Great Britain will appreciate the need of the people of Great Britain for getting food from every arable acre of that little island which goes to make up their home.

Might I say to the Hon. Members opposite that I would find no difficulty in supporting two of the planks in the platform as drafted at the Saskatoon Convention. One asks the Dominion Government for a Co-operative Act. I would suggest here a Co-operative Act in which interprovincial and Dominion registration of Co-operative Associations might be set out. I would find no difficulty in supporting Members of the Opposition in their request for a Dominion Natural Products Marketing Act, but in doing so I recall some of the remarks made by some of the Members opposite and their supporters when this Legislature passed the Saskatchewan Natural Products Marketing Act.

Mr. Tucker, I believe, is credited with having stated that while he can see merit in the Hospitalization Plan, the cost of hospitalization is too high. I believe he referred to the fact that hospitalization could or should be supplied to the people of this province for around \$3 per capita. I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Liberal Party in the Province of Saskatchewan took a look at the cost of hospitalization per capita in his own family and figured it out at the maximum of \$30 and came to the conclusion thereby that the hospitalization should only cost \$3 per capita?

February 14, 1947

I attended a meeting of the Civic League of Women Voters at City Hall here in Regina in which Mrs. Strum and Mr. Tucker were the speakers. During the question period someone asked Mr. Tucker why he voted in favor of the taxation of the Co-operatives. His answer ran something like this: there was a Royal Commission appointed (on that Commission was the Deputy Minister of Co-operatives in the Provincial Government of Saskatchewan) and Mr. Tucker was of the opinion that the Bill brought down in the House of Commons was so far in advance of the recommendations of the Royal Commission that he had no choice other than to support the Bill. This Royal Commission, as we are all aware, was appointed by the Government which Mr. Tucker supports and yet . . .

Mr. Danielson: – Do you . . .

Mr. McIntosh: – I am sure my hon. friend from Arm River has lived in a co-operative environment and atmosphere long enough to appreciate that it is not sound co-operative practices to suggest to the co-operative organizations that they pay a tax on their capital. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Tucker, in supporting the Bill brought down in the House, supported in effect a measure of taxation of co-operative associations. I believe it is quite true, today, that in an attempt to administrate the acts that were placed upon the statute books, there is going to be a considerable amount of difficulty. But what I would like to say here to this House is that the Deputy Minister of Co-operatives, Mr. Arnoldson, for the Province of Saskatchewan, is recognized nationally and internationally as an outstanding authority on co-operative law and practice and his advice is sought after by co-operative associations in every province in the Dominion of Canada.

During the past summer, Dr. H.F. Infield, an executive director of rural settlement institutes in the State of New York, was interested in co-operative farming and made an extensive study of co-operative farming here in our own province. In a recent communication from Dr. Infield he states:

The example set by the Sturgis Farm Co-operation by-laws skilfully combines a spirit of co-operation with the spirit of fair business dealings, which will unquestionably prove of great value to all co-operative farming practice.

And notwithstanding Mr. Arnoldson's ability in the co-operative field, notwithstanding his very wide knowledge, Mr. Tucker gave it as his opinion that he himself knows more about co-operative law and practices than the Royal Commission appointed by the Government which he supports. But I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that the Co-operative Union of Canada and all its associated members, fought against the principle of the Bill that was introduced in the House relating to the taxation of Co-operative Associations. Might I also mention that Mr. Tucker, as parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Veteran's Affairs, has an opportunity to use his influence and weight, possibly more weight than influence, to convince that department that the veterans on the Matador Co-operative farm should receive their grant as other soldier settlers do.

The Government of Saskatchewan has been accused of being out of step with farm policies. As a matter of fact they have

February 14, 1947

been accused of having no policy whatsoever. I had the privilege of sitting in as an observer at an International Agricultural Producers Conference held in London, May 10th to May 22nd, in which some 32 countries were represented. I can say without hesitation that the overall agricultural policy of the CCF Government of the Province of Saskatchewan and the CCF Members in the Federal House of Commons is quite in accord with the expressions given at that conference by the representatives of 32 countries of this world. On the 28th and 29th of January, I attended the Conference of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, an organization that represent 450,000 farmers from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The policy of agriculture as expressed by that organization is the policy of agriculture of the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan.

After listening to the discussion and the debate that emanated from across the floor, I am reminded of little Ethel arriving home after her first day at school, when asked by her fond mother: "Well darling what did they teach you?" "Not much," replied the child, "I've got to go back tomorrow."

I was particularly interest in the address given by the seconder of the motion, the representative from Meadow Lake, because he gave us a broad review of general conditions in the northern part of the Province of Saskatchewan. We sometimes lose sight of the fact that 50 per cent of the area that goes to make up this province lies north of the city of Prince Albert. We sometimes overlook the fact that in that particular area there is a considerable amount of wealth now being produced and undoubtedly a considerable amount of potential wealth. For the fiscal year ending April 30, 1945, gold produced amounted to \$4,664,000; silver \$746,000; copper \$8,846,000; zinc \$750,000; other metals some \$217,000 in round figures or a total of \$18,226,000 worth of new wealth taken from the lands of the Province of Saskatchewan, to say nothing about timber, fur and fish.

There was an impression left by the Member for Moosomin that the population was fast leaving the northern part of the province because of the policies of the present Government. I went to a little trouble to check over the census of the population in some of these northern towns and I find that in 1931 there was 1,809 people in Melfort; in 1941 – 2,005 and in 1946 – 2,296; in Nipawin in 1941 – 1,344 and in 1946 – 2,197; in Tisdale in 1941 the figures given are 1,237 and in 1946 - 1,456. These places lie along the northern part of the settled area of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Other figures would indicate that there is a considerable amount of activity in that particular section of the province. Might I be pardoned if I refer to some of the developments in the city that I have the honor to represent. It is rather interesting to note that in 1943 the building permits taken out in that city amounted in total number to 190 or a total of \$134,000; in 1944 – 380 permits for a total of \$490,000; in 1945, 349 permits, a total of \$472,000 and in 1946, two years after this Government was elected there were 684 permits taken out in the city of Prince Albert for a value of \$1,745,000. Among the places that show an increase in the population in the Province of Saskatchewan might I also mention this city In 1941, Prince Albert's population was given as 12,508 and in 1946, 14,290. I don't think we should lose sight of the fact that in the northern part of this province we have summer resorts such as

February 14, 1947

the Prince Albert National Park, a federal undertaking, that had 31,474 visitors in 1946 and the other resorts surrounding the city of Prince Albert had some 11,000 people visiting them during the past summer. Now it is my intention, Mr. Speaker, to deal not with the city which I have the honor to represent, but particularly with the co-operative movement and its relationship to the building of a sound and permanent democracy here and in other lands.

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

Mr. McIntosh: – Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some mention of the place of the co-operative movement in a democratic society. I would like to relate one or two experiences that we have had in the field of co-operative endeavor and in the field of co-operative organizations. I think it would be of considerable interest to this House to get some information on the many sacrifices that were made and are being made daily by the citizens of the Province of Saskatchewan in building for themselves a democratic society, building for themselves, through their co-operative efforts, control over the goods and services that they require from day to day.

I remember being in the little town of Choceland when the school trustees of the Public Schools suggested that they would like to have their pupils organize for themselves a credit union, with drafted by-laws very similar in principle to the by-laws used by all credit unions here in the Province of Saskatchewan. They elected their own board of directors, their own committee. They appointed their own treasurers and they started to contribute their pennies and their nickels to building up the share of capital necessary to operate their little credit union. The teacher of this particular school undertook to supervise the operation of this school credit union.

The following year, the children of that school organized for themselves a school co-operative association. They purchased scribbblers, pencils, erasers and so on and put them in stock in the little school. Periodically, during the week, they opened their co-operative and the manager, which was one of the pupils, stepped behind the counter and supplied the needs of the membership of that little school co-operative. At the end of the first year of operation, they had some \$49 of surplus. When they held the annual meeting of the membership of their co-operative, they decided to use \$33 of the \$49 savings for the purpose of purchasing school supplies, such as those required in the field of sports. The following year, this same group, in the operations of their credit union created a surplus of some \$90 and the larger portion of that money was used for the same purpose as in the first year.

So here in that little school is a practical demonstration of children doing for themselves a service that they had been paying others to render for them and creating a savings which was utilized for the benefit of the pupils in that particular school. I imagine that some might think that that was communism. Co-operatives are the largess of the oldest form of social endeavor that we have in the world today. It is nothing new to the Province of Saskatchewan, the first co-operative having been organized here in 1886 for the purpose of making cheese and butter. From that date on, the agricultural people in particular have been building for themselves the kind of service

in a co-operative way that is essential to the democratic society in which they live. Up to 1943, there were 905 different types of co-operatives organized and operating in this province with a membership of 250,846. In the three years between 1943 and the end of the fiscal year 1946, the co-operative association in this province had increased in number by 197 and the membership had increased by 182,000. So in a three-year period, the years in which the present Government has been in office, we find that the membership in the co-operative associations of this province has increased by 182,000 and the number of co-operative associations that we have in the Province of Saskatchewan had increased, during that same period, by 197. Might I just mention one or two of the co-operative associations that have been organized in recent years.

First, I would like to mention the Co-operative Life Insurance that as of December the 31st had 4,953 policy holders insured for a total of \$7,250,030. It is very interesting to note that 83 per cent of the policies written were taken out by those under 29 years of age. This is an indication of the attitude of the younger generation of this province toward the co-operative movement.

Now, when the Hon. Member for Arm River asked what had been done to supply feed and fodder and to conserve same, might I draw to his attention and to the attention of this House, that early in 1944, during the period in which the former Government was in office, a small group of farmers and ranchmen from the southwest part of this province took out a charter to market live horses. During the summer of 1944, however, they found that the market in the United States, in place of paying one and half cents a pound which they were led to believe that market would pay, offered only some three-quarters of a cent. That group came down here to the present Government and after several conferences secured a contract for the marketing of processed meat and financial guarantees from this Government amounting to around \$250,000. This little group of farmers set up for themselves a processing plant in the city of Swift Current and purchased a small processing plant in the city of Edmonton, Alberta. It is interesting to look over their charter. Written within that charter are these words:

This Association is formed for the purpose of getting rid of surplus horses and for the purpose of conservation of feed and fodder and to raise the general level of the type of horses required in the fields of this and other provinces.

On the 31st day of March, Mr. Speaker, in the words of the president of that association, they had slaughtered over 50,000 head of horses which created or left fodder and feed for 75,000 head of cattle.

Now that is one means of conservation of forage and of fodder. This little co-operative association had paid to its 11,000 members that had delivered horses, again quoting the president of that association, "\$1 million more for the horses than what they could have got." They had assets of over \$600,000 and only \$50,000 of liability; and during the latter part of the present month, the first dividend cheque will be going to its 11,000 members. I am sure that all citizens of the Province of Saskatchewan have a right to be proud of the resourcefulness of that little group of ranching people and farmers in the

February 14, 1947

southwest part of this province. I am quoting this, Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate what this Government is doing to assist people in helping themselves in this democratic society that we are building here for the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, I think, that the charter for the horse marketing co-operative association was taken out early in the year of 1944 prior to this Government coming into office, but the charter was taken out for the purpose of marketing live horses. It was not until this Government came into office that they set up the processing plants for the processing of these horses. And I might say here tonight, Mr. Speaker, that it is the intention of this little co-operative to further expand their plant to take care of some of the by-products that originate as the result of the operation of a packing plant.

I, again, repeat that here in the Province of Saskatchewan today there are 1,102 co-operative associations with a membership of 432,000 in comparison with a membership of 250,000 in the year prior to the present Government taking office. The co-operative movement is not confined exclusively to the Province of Saskatchewan, nor is it confined exclusively to Canada or the North American Continent. Prior to the outbreak of the War, there were over 800,000 co-operative association societies in the world embracing a membership of 150,000,000 people and scattered throughout 102 countries of the world. Here, in the Dominion of Canada, there is a membership of approximately 900,000 of people in the co-operative movement.

While in the United Kingdom recently, it was my pleasure and privilege to visit a number of the co-operative associations of the old land. Rather interesting to note is the fact that their membership has gone beyond the nine million mark. It was rather interesting to note that the men and women of Great Britain, men and women who to quite a large degree are among those who carry their lunch baskets to work with them in the morning, over a period of 100 years have built one of the greatest systems of manufacturing, wholesaling and distribution that is known in the United Kingdom or on the continent. It is rather interesting to note that these people have not only built services for themselves within the country in which they live, but also they have holdings in many other countries throughout the world. Their banking institution in 1944 employed 250 people at the head office and in the year 1945 had loaned the Government of Great Britain over 80 million pounds to assist Great Britain in the conduct of her war effort.

This has been done by what is sometimes termed the little people. The little people of Great Britain, the little people of Canada and the little people of 102 different countries throughout the world are building for themselves a society and a system of distribution whereby they are eliminating the monopolistic control that has existed over the things that they find it necessary to purchase from day to day. The Government of the Province of Saskatchewan is giving service in the building for the people this system of democratic service and control. As a result, Mr. Speaker, note the co-operative effort here in the Province of Saskatchewan. The co-operative producers, commonly known as the Wheat Pool, since their inception in 1923 and 1924, in addition to building for themselves one of the most magnificent grain handling organizations in the world, are lowering the cost in connection with the handling of their grain and have returned to their membership since their

February 14, 1947

inception over \$62 million in savings, either in cash or in assets. It is interesting to note that in the consumer field, the Co-operative Wholesale Society's business last year reached close to \$10 million. Now this is one indication of the willingness of the people to service themselves if given an opportunity to do so.

I was asked by the Government to visit the United Kingdom in the fall of 1944 and again in the spring of 1946. While over there, as I mentioned before, we were in close contact with the Co-operative movement of that country. We were also in close contact with other business interests and government officials. As a result of the information gained we felt that it would be in the interests of the Province of Saskatchewan if there was a representative of the province stationed in the United Kingdom. There has been some question raised in the press as to the advisability of this move. Might I say here this evening, Mr. Speaker, that this move was not made in full consultation with the Dominion Department of Trade and Commerce officials and just recently I received a letter, under the signature of the Minister of that department who states in part:

I am advising our Chief Trade Commissioner in the United Kingdom of Mr. Spry's appointment and I need hardly assure you that not only we here in Ottawa but our whole foreign trade service in the United Kingdom and Europe will be very pleased, indeed, to assist and co-operate with Mr. Spry in every possible way for the advancement of our common interest.

A letter under the signature of the Secretary of State for External Affairs says in part:

The High Commissioner for Canada in the United Kingdom has been informed of Mr. Spry's appointment and requested to give him all the assistance he may require in making the arrangements necessary for the establishment of his office.

We felt here that because of the growing interest of the people of the United Kingdom in the things that the people of the Province of Saskatchewan have to offer to that market and of the growing interest both in the Province of Saskatchewan and in the United Kingdom of the development of two-way trade and because we wanted to make a test, the Port of Churchill, the Government decided to make an appointment of an overseas representative. And might I just say a word or two in connection with the possibilities of the Port of Churchill. I think as the Members of this House realize, that prior to the outbreak of war or thereabouts, the terminal elevator at the Port of Churchill was filled with grain, 2,500,000 bushels. Sometime during the War a quantity of this grain was moved out, leaving just under two million bushels in the terminal elevator.

In conversation with the Minister of Transport in the United Kingdom last spring, we were assured that there would be a sufficient number of boats call at the Port of Churchill to take what wheat there was in the terminal elevator. We raised the question then of additional shipments to that Port and later on we were informed that boats to move another million bushels would be available if the wheat was there. The Canadian Wheat Board moved an additional million bushels to the Port of Churchill. Over on the other side of the Atlantic a shipping company

February 14, 1947

was endeavoring to get inbound cargoes. The last year there was some three million bushels of wheat moved out of the Port of Churchill and seventy-three thousand and sixty-two pounds of inbound cargo was landed at the Port of Churchill. As near as we can determine, the Canadian Wheat Board made a saving in freight of \$22,414 in the movement of the wheat to the Port of Churchill.

The British shipping interests, again, as near as we can determine, found that the freight from the Port of Churchill to the port in the United Kingdom made a saving of four cents a bushel over and above what the freight charges would have been had the grain gone from the head of the lakes to the United Kingdom ports.

Many are aware of the technical committee which has been set up representing the three western provinces, to make further enquiries into the possible, into the future use of that port. For the next few months it will be one of the responsibilities of the overseas representative to develop trade through the Port of Churchill.

We, I believe, are sufficiently informed as to the general food situation in the United Kingdom. I don't think it is necessary, tonight, to take up the time of this House in dealing with that question, but I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to inform the House that within the next 10 to 12 days the Members of the Legislature will have an opportunity to hear firsthand from the Minister of Food of Great Britain as to the general food situation in the United Kingdom. He will be visiting our city at about that time. Mr. Dalglish, of the Dalglish Shipping Company, will be in Regina in about a month's time in connection with the 1947 shipments through the Port of Churchill. We are particularly anxious to develop two-way trade with the United Kingdom and with the continent. We believe that the co-operative movement offers, not only to the people of our own province and our own country, but to the people of the world an opportunity to build for themselves the kind of a democracy essential to society.

I would like to take this opportunity of quoting a message, a New Year's message delivered by Lord Russell, General Secretary of the British Co-operative Union and President of the International Co-operative Alliance. He stated at that time:

We have survived the world conflict in which our whole life was threatened and we have achieved victory through the supreme power of co-operation between the freedom loving people of the world. A power which transcends political differences, a power which welds the allied nations together, a power which must be maintained if out of the ruins of war we are to build a new Britain and a new world. The year 1947 will bring us opportunities which must be used for the good of all and not for the preservation of selfish and sectional interests. Be they individual, racial or national, social, political or economic, in saving the future our movement has a unique contribution to make. The spirit of co-operation must be the planned policy of the nation. And in the sphere of production, distribution and service, we must bend our own energies in bringing the full benefits of co-operation to millions more so that in the very real sense happiness and prosperity may be achieved through the spirit and practice of co-operation.

February 14, 1947

I think the Hon. Members of this Assembly have a full appreciation of what happened to democracy in those countries that once had that system of government. I think they will agree that it was because the people of countries failed to realize their responsibilities as citizens within a democracy and they permitted large corporations, cartels and monopolies to control the destiny of their own lives. The Hon. Member that spoke here yesterday, I think, fully appreciates that it was that type of control over Germany, that type of control over Italy and over Spain, that type of control that reached into the Argentine and into Japan, that type of control that was not absent in this country or in the United States, that was the cause of building up fascism and Nazism in those countries that many of our Canadian soldiers gave their lives in defence against. I am sure that he appreciates that and I am sure that he appreciates, also, that in building co-operative effort and co-operative endeavor in the building of a co-operative society, we are laying the foundation to a true and everlasting democracy.

Might I just finish by quoting a little verse that I think fits in admirably with the philosophy of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation.

Strong that no human soul may pass, its warm encircling unity, wide to include all creed, all class, this shall remain community. Service shall be that all and each aroused to know the common good, shall strive and in the striving reach a broader human brotherhood.

That is the philosophy of the movement and of the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan. That is the philosophy of the CCF Members sitting in the House of Commons at Ottawa and it is because of that philosophy that I have no hesitation in supporting the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): – Mr. Speaker, I will have to make the usual rounds of extending congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne and other congratulations as well. I want especially, for this particular occasion, to make a special remark with reference to the Member for Morse. He did make an exceptionally good and helpful contribution to the debate; particularly so. It is significant that it was his first speech in the House and, no doubt, he had some qualms and some fears; but, nevertheless, he gave a very good account of himself and gave a very practical contribution to the debate.

I should also like to congratulate the Hon. Member for Meadow Lake for the very good and efficient job he did. Sometimes when the Hon. Member for Meadow Lake is speaking – he may not be so tall and so big, but you can always hear his bark – he reminds me of a little fox terrier, and believe me, if there is anyone that can worry these so-called ‘bears’ and these so-called royal mooses, it is these little fox terriers – and apparently he did get some of the Hon. Members opposite on the prod.

I should like to draw to the attention of the House the retirement of Dr. Auld. Most of you, I believe, appreciate the contribution that Dr. Auld has given to the advancement of agriculture in the Province of Saskatchewan. His service record

February 14, 1947

extends over a period of more than 36 years of good public service to this province. The name, Dr. Auld, is practically synonymous with agriculture in Saskatchewan. I have found Dr. Auld to be a very efficient administrator, and a man of cool and level judgment, in the short time that it has been my privilege to be associated with him.

I should like, also, to make note of the fact that, in the successor to Dr. Auld, I believe we have a very capable young man, a young man who has great possibilities and who, I know, will very ably fill the shoes left in the office of the Deputy Minister; a young man who, I am glad to note, has very excellent public relations. Those of you who will come in contact with him will realize that in his very agreeable manner. After all, public relations and a good personality, indicate good character, and steadfastness; and I think that in moral character we are going to have a very good successor to Dr. Auld.

While going about and tendering congratulations here and there, I should like to offer still another congratulation and that is to the Hon. Member for Arm River. The Hon. Member for Arm River has paid the Department of Agriculture, particularly its policy, a real tribute when he suggested to myself that I take to heart the suggestions made by the Hon. Member for Lumsden. For the benefit of the Hon. Member for Arm River I would just like to read a note that the Hon. Member for Lumsden passed to me, in which he says:

In my address, I steadily and purely expressed your agricultural policies as outlined by yourself to me.

Mr. Proctor: – He is the only one you ever told.

Mr. Nollet: – However, I do think that most of the Hon. Members are somewhat concerned, particularly since the very severe and boisterous weather we have had for the past week. It is the kind of weather that we have not experienced in many, many years and I presume that many of you would like to know something about the general feed situation. I want to touch on this and agricultural policies very briefly. I intend to deal with agricultural policies more extensively in the Budget Debate.

First of all, just in brief, permit me to outline our positive agricultural policy with reference to the conservation of feed and fodder. I regret very much that I did not see any evidence of any positive agricultural policy previous to the time that this administration came into power. If there was a positive policy I fail to have seen it. I noted that in those pre-war days, the main duties of the agricultural representatives, as I have known them, were to distribute relief and feed and tell people how little they should have as a relief ration. I want to say that, perhaps, was certainly an injustice to the agricultural representatives' service. We have still, today, to overcome the handicap of the bad relations created under that condition and I hope and trust that never again will agricultural representatives be used to dole out relief in the Province of Saskatchewan.

One would suppose that, after the experiences that the former administration had gone through, in not only providing relief, but as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said, giving

thousands of cars of hay as against the few that we are shipping now – they would have learned the lesson and that an endeavor would have been made to build up reserve feed to take care of these emergency situations; because they know, as well as I know, that if you have not control of the feed, you are not going to get feed in to the needy people, in time. We run up against that right at the moment. So we have endeavored to work out a policy that would work away from that emergency shipping-in of feed and fodder that faced you with the proposition of moving feed from the north of the Provinces of Manitoba and Alberta, constantly shipping it in to the southwest. That is not only poor business, it is not only uneconomical, but it also places a terrific burden on the recipient of that feed having to buy it usually at an enhanced price.

The Hon. Member for Arm River should know our long-term policy which is devised, first of all, to bring home to the individual farmer the necessity of building up reserves of feed in good years on his own place. We are encouraging them to conserve, not only by retaining the straw from the combine, but to put more land into forage crop production. I want to say that, as a result of that campaign, I am more than pleased that, this year, it has been reported to me by my agricultural representatives in the southwest, that never before has there been so much hay put up in the southwest of Saskatchewan, and I want to say, in view of the severity of this winter it is certainly a grand thing that we have some reserves of feed to meet this type of weather.

We have also an intermediate policy. We fully realize that we are not going to induce individuals into food-buying practice over night, that it takes time to build up these reserves. We know, too, that we are going to have to supply, in the interim, emergency feed. So, early this summer, we cast about to see if we could find any feed reserves in the province, growing under natural conditions. I discovered that in some places thousands of tons of hay had gone under snow each year. We found such a place at Kisbey, where we arranged to have hay put up by contract. I know it was a small thing, but it was a start. We put up about 800 tons of hay and that moved into consumption immediately when the first order arrived and it was on the rack and moved and the orders all filled before the storm ever came.

We realize, too, that as a result of the early winter, there are more feed workmen required immediately and we always have more hay on order than we have orders for. At the present time we are following that policy, knowing full well that before spring comes, we are going to require a whole lot more feed. We realize that there is the individual who will not put his order in 'till the last, always waiting as it were, for the weather to break, for the cattle to get out on the hills again, but knowing the province as I do, knowing the snow coverage, we are taking no chances. We are going to have plenty of feed on hand.

I want to say, too, that in addition to the feed bans we propose to build up under natural conditions, we are definitely going to develop irrigation projects to do exactly the same thing; that, and to set aside under dry farm conditions, if possible, in every municipality, lots of land which, if necessary, we will sow down to grass again, dig it out of other cultivation and leave it grow up; and it will be the responsibility of the municipality to put that hay in reserve. Behind that reserve again, you will have the reserve under the

February 14, 1947

irrigation condition, and behind that again we will have another provincial reserve of natural hay; and we do believe that in the course of a few years, we can get away largely from the necessity of being compelled to constantly ship feed into the southwest of Saskatchewan.

I want to make a very brief reference to the development, expansion and growth of the agricultural representative services. The growth initially in the first year was slow due to the fact that the personnel were practically all away in the armed forces; that in the greater proportion of our agricultural representatives we have an agricultural representative in every district of the province. We are not in the process of setting up district boards while we have practically completed the organization of the local committees, some 325 in number. Now this is quite a terrific job when one looks over the whole province and when one realizes the difficulties encountered in selling people a new approach to the solution of the agricultural problems. It is, indeed, a tribute to the office staff and the field staff that we have been able to expand so that, today, we have the 325 local committees set up.

I just want to make a brief reference to the veterinary service. We have set up now a position policy – something that has never been done before – with some 12 veterinary service districts in the province. We have provided scholarships for students in attendance at the Veterinary College at Guelph, Ontario. While I was down East, I had the occasion and the opportunity to visit the boys in attendance at the College, some 32 in number. It is our intention to increase those scholarships and make them more attractive in order that we might retain the services of those boys upon graduation.

Everyone realizes the necessity and the terrific demand for veterinarians, not only in Saskatchewan, but throughout the Dominion. It was my understanding that the Dominion services alone are short 95 veterinarians. As a matter of fact the inaugurating of the TB free areas is being held up due to the shortage of personnel in the Veterinary Service Division of the Dominion service. Sometimes it has occurred to me that, perhaps, Mr. Tucker would interest himself in the shortage of veterinary service and it seems to me that the Dominion could use some influence, too, to encourage young people to study veterinary service.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to deal, during the rest of the time at my disposal, with a somewhat different matter – a matter that has given me a good deal of concern in view of the type of criticism and the remarks that have been made from the Hon. Members opposite. It has occurred to me that criticism can be good, can serve a good and useful purpose, provided it is constructive criticism. It seems to me that the kind of criticism, the narrowed, colored, prejudiced criticism that we have been getting from the Hon. Members opposite, does not serve any good or useful purpose at this time of grave world uncertainty. Sometimes one would think, when one sees these hon. gentlemen opposite pulling themselves up to their full height and dignity, and when one gazes upon them to see the preposterous manner in which they deliver their advice, wagging their fingers as though they were God himself; one would think that all the knowledge and wisdom and that all the patriotism in the world is centered over there. You would think that they were the one and only

February 14, 1947

patriot in this land. You would think that we were bereft of patriotism and of all good motives on this side of the House entirely; but I want to assure the Hon. Members that the Hon. Members on this side of the House have a very deep concern for the problems not only facing Saskatchewan but facing the nation as a whole. I should like to remind you that they are not the only guardians of democracy, not the only custodians of freedom. Sometimes, when I hear them talk, one would think that democracy was the prerogative of the free enterprise privileged class. I want to say to them that democracy is the prerogative of the common man and always will be the prerogative of the common man.

They like to talk about loss of freedom and suggest that because we propose an economic system that will give economic security and increase the general social standard of our people, that we are going to take freedom away from people. In the same breath, they uphold at ever turn, enterprise; they lay emphasis on enterprise. Now, I am going to say this: If we are going to be so concerned about enterprise, we are going to build up privilege. Privilege and enterprise, so-called business enterprise, go hand in hand, and certainly it has been our experience of the past that that meant loss of personal freedom, yes, indeed, and also loss of personal achievements. The two are not synonymous; the two are absolute opposites. You cannot protect property; you just cannot protect enterprise and at the same time protect human liberties and human rights.

It seems passing strange to me that, in a democracy such as we boast of, we should bear witness to organized labor organizing itself and farmers organizing themselves, to get their just due. It seems passing strange to me that those who talk so much of democracy cannot see that, if such is the case, and the little people must band themselves together to fight for their rights, it is self-evident that we have not got a democracy working for these small groups. A good deal has been said about organized labor. The Hon. Member for the Mediterranean Forces said that he was all for organized labor – provided it was not led by Communists. I have heard people like the Hon. Member talk that way before. Believe me, the labor unions and the membership thereof have heard people talk like that before! But I have always found – it has been my personal experience of the farm movement too, that every time we fight for the working people, whoever did anything in their own behalf, their leaders were always Communists.

Mr. Embury: – Do you approve of the labor movement when it is led by Communists? When it is, do you?

Mr. Douglas: – Don't frighten us!

Mr. Embury: – Answer the question now. He cannot, he hasn't got the courage.

Mr. Nollet: – First of all from what I have heard the Hon. Member say, the Hon. Member sees a Communist behind ever bush.

Mr. Embury: – Answer the question.

Mr. Nollet: – I do not know of any, unless he can name any labor unions that are.

February 14, 1947

Mr. Embury: – Answer the question.

Mr. Nollet: – I am in favor of a labor union regardless who its duly elected leaders are. If the Hon. Member from the Mediterranean Area wants to make something of it, let him go to it.

Mr. Brockelbank: – Even if it is led by a Liberal?

Mr. Nollet: – Yes.

Mr. Douglas: – Or a Tory Fascist?

Mr. Fines: – Or a Progressive Conservative?

Mr. Nollet: – Just as soon as we start that discrimination and commence to pick on labor leaders for being Liberals, or Tories, or Communists or Socialists or what have you, that is negative as far as organized labor is concerned and it is a disservice to organized labor and denies a right to organized labor which they should have.

Mr. Embury: – Go buy yourself a red flag!

Mr. Nollet: – The same thing occurred, Mr. Speaker, in the farm movement. I have heard all of these same charges and I have hear all these same charges that are made across the floor while we were forming a Wheat Pool and the Hon. Member for Arm River can well remember, we were all a bunch of Communists and troublemakers then. I can remember this Leader-Post down here; I believe it had a lawsuit on its hands because of the statement which it made with reference to the man who assisted to organize that Wheat Pool. Believe me, the people in this province have not forgotten those things.

Mr. Danielson: – We did not have such a thing as a Socialist in the province in those times.

Mr. Nollet: – We had a whole lot of Socialists in the province in those times and the significant thing is there are lots more of them today.

Mr. Valleau: – We found that out in 1944.

Mr. Nollet: – I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the economic condition on the farm gave rise to the Wheat Pool; it gave rise to the great co-operative movements which we have in this province and it also gave rise to the political party on this side of the House. I regret that the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources is not in his chair tonight. The Hon. Minister of Natural Resources and I started out as very young men in the farm movement at that time and I still recall the debates that took place in those conventions. It was to the effect that for years we had sent delegations down to the Liberal and Tory Governments to get redress for our grievances. So finally we gave up in distress and decided that we would have to organize a political party that would fight in our behalf. We carried on that way at

tremendous sacrifice and finally we have won through it.

I want to say that I take exception to some of the statements that were made from that part of the House, insinuations that we are going to bring in a totalitarian system of government in this province. I resent that. The Hon. Member for the Mediterranean Area does not need to think that he was the only man that ever fought for freedom. There were a whole lot more of them that did that and I certainly resent the inference in his remarks during the course of his debate. I feel very sorry for him, Mr. Speaker, because he could have given a real contribution to the debate in this House and I am sure that it will not go down so easily with a good many of our returned men.

I want to again repeat that, in my opinion, the threat to democracy does not lie, or does not stem from the activities of the organized farm worker and organized labor. If we are going to have totalitarianism in this Dominion of Canada, it will not come from the common people. As I said before, democracy is their prerogative and their full prerogative. The thing that is impeding democracy, creating all the uncertainty, is this 'big business free enterprise' that our Opposition friends like to talk about so much. It is the state of uncertainty that we see within our nation, within our province, that we should be concerned about; the uncertainty of every single man in the Assembly here, this evening; the uncertainty facing every returned man in the province here, this evening, too; the uncertainty of the future, not knowing what is ahead; the psychology of fear that is in the minds of all people. I think that by removing the basic causes of fear, we will have removed the psychological causes of Fascism. It is only through that fear that people gradually lose their faith in the democratic approach – the CCF intends to get on with the job of building an economic faith within this province, and finally within the nation itself, that will guarantee to the people economic and social security.

I should like to refer for a moment to a reference made by the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. He made a brief reference to the unemployed who were denied the right to work, in the pre-war years, who, while on their way to Ottawa to lay their case before the Government there, were stopped here in the city of Regina, were forbidden to go any farther. While trying to hold a peaceful meeting in the Market Square, finally trouble broke out which resulted in the death, not only of some of those boys, but of one Mounted Policeman. Now those boy were rapidly losing their faith in democracy. Democracy owed those boys a job, the right to work. I would like to hear one of the Hon. Members opposite talk a little bit more about those fundamental human rights and a little bit less about the freedom of enterprise. We had enterprise then and enterprise could not solve the problems of unemployment as it should have done. I sometimes wonder if that is why Hon. Members opposite are so fanatical in their diatribes against this Government – if it is because of their fears that this economy of theirs is not going to work again. Or is it because they have not a good sound proposal and a good solution to come forward with that they have to resort to the type of criticisms that they do? In either case we must remember that those boys later went overseas, and they were the heroes of the nation. Those boys are back here again and still those boys have no assurance as to what the future will hold within the realms of this free enterprise economy of ours. I hope that we can get together and I hope that

February 14, 1947

Hon. Members opposite will give some constructive criticisms, looking towards a solution of those problems that created those pre-war conditions, that we may never have them again in our country. If we do that, I can assure the Hon. Member from the Mediterranean Area we do not need to go out on any witch hunt for any Communists either with this Party or out of it, and the CCF has addressed itself to the task of making this democracy work and we know in doing that that is the best antidote to any kind of 'ism' the Hon. Member for the Mediterranean Area might allude to.

Reference was also made to the tremendous development which took place in Saskatchewan under free enterprise. We recognize that development took place. We recognize that we have a wonderful university at Saskatoon. We recognize all of this things. But while we recognize that too, we also must look back and recognize that we have some appalling conditions on these prairies of Saskatchewan. We must recognize the fact that in those pre-war years – and the conditions are still with us – our farmers carried a load of debt that absolutely and completely broke their morale. We know. Why talk about all the free enterprises? I have witnessed those farmers coming into relief offices – good men, begging relief, begging for seed. Those were the conditions in our province right alongside of the other wonderful advances made by free enterprise. When one looks over the Prairies and looks at the wind-swept shacks that are so common, only one per cent with flush toilets, then I just begin to wonder: free enterprise for whom? It certainly was not free enterprise for those farm people that live and toil on our prairies.

The Hon. Member for the Mediterranean Area is very much alarmed that we might warp the minds of our young people because of the type of textbooks that we use. I would suggest that his criticism might be better directed to the type of tripe that you see on the news stands; the type of films that our young people look to – and why do we have them? Because there is money in them! Gangster comics, gangster pictures in this so-called civilized age! We have got some cleaning out to do here at home and I suggest that we direct some of our criticism right here. Warping the young people's minds! If there was anything that we could do in this province to ban some of those penny dreadfuls, those shooting, killing, murder comics that we have had, we would be rendering a real service to this province. Do not talk about warping the minds of young people. We are trying to correct the tendencies to warp the minds of young people.

He said that he was very fearful that we might be indoctrinating our young people with socialistic ideas. I happened to look through my bookcase and I found a textbook that I had, years ago, while going to high school, "Medieval and Modern History." I glanced through it and I might say, for the benefit of the hon. gentleman that this textbook was not in a public school, but was used in a private school, a Catholic school, where they are very careful about young people getting indoctrinated with any objectionable ideas. I am going to read a few paragraphs from this book for the benefit of the Hon. Members opposite: "Medieval and Modern History." They trace the whole course of history right through and then they project into the students a statement about the future. First of all, they make reference to the labor problems that have arisen because of industrialization. Here is what they say:

February 14, 1947

Beyond controversy, the great problem of the age, one involving many others is the so-called labor problem. Now this, plainly stated is, how are the products of the world industry to be equitably distributed?

This was written in 1901.

The condition of things has been through the employment of the force of nature and the use of improved machinery. Economic goods, that is products adapted to meet the physical wants of man, can be produced in almost unlimited quantities; but this increase in society's productive power has brought little or no corresponding augmentation of material well-being to the laboring class.

I would like to have the Minister of Education take note, 'indoctrinate.'

Owing to the same defect in our industrial system, a few secure a disproportionate share of the benefits. Great monopolies or trusts are created and fabulous sums are amassed by a few fortunate individuals, while, perhaps the majority who labor for wages had their toil lightened, comparatively little or not at all, receive almost nothing beyond the needs of narrow and bare subsistence. This inequitable distribution of wealth, of material well-being, this practical exclusion of the masses from the greater part of the benefits and enjoyments of modern civilization, is creating everywhere the most dangerous discontent among the laboring classes and is awakening among philanthropists and statesmen, the greatest solicitude and apprehension.

Then further on it gives an explanation of socialism and social democracy:

The proposed solution of the problem which has awakened most thought and created most debates is that offered by the Socialist or Social Democrats. Just as our own Government, state, city or national, now owns school houses, controls education, holds and conducts the Post Office, municipal waterworks and other public utilities, so would the Socialists have the government, by the gradual extension of its functions, come into possession of railways, the telegraph, the mines, the factories, the lands.

And the Saskatchewan Bus.

Mr. Embury: – Don't forget the land!

Mr. Nollet: –

The Socialists say that only under such a system as this, which would do away with the wage system and with private capital, though not with private property, can the present exploitation of labor by capital be made impossible.

And it goes on. I do not see anything wrong with that. As a matter of fact, I want to say, for the benefit of the House, this book was not written by a Socialist. As a matter of fact, I did not know it was in there until I took a look a few days ago to see what they would have to say.

February 14, 1947

Mr. Proctor: – I think you have stopped at the wrong place. You should read a little more.

Mr. Nollet: – I learned to be a socialist the hard way. I took a few good lickings. As a matter of fact, for about 25 years on the farm, I took one licking after another and if that does not make a man think, I do not know what will.

I notice that the Hon. Member for the Mediterranean Area, while he had high praise for some of the Ministers on this side of the House and while he thought they were doing a good job, particularly the Provincial Treasurer and the Minister of Natural Resources, regretted very much that they were diverting their activities towards socialism. He regretted very much that they were socialists. Well, I want to say that I am very proud to be a socialist and I want to reiterate that I am mighty proud to stand up in this House and tell the Hon. Members opposite and the whole House, and the whole world, that I am mighty proud to be a socialist.

It seems to me that it is not only the solution to economic difficulties, it will not only prevent Fascism, but in addition it is in harmony, in my opinion, with all the decent Christian concepts that we have received over the centuries. It seems to me when one closely scrutinizes Christian philosophy, that it was simply a message of brotherliness, of ‘do unto others as you would have them do to you’ – ‘what you do to the least of my brothers you do to me’ – and I think it was because, after all, we are all the creatures of one Divine Being. It appears that way to me; and it seems to me that, if we believe in this brotherhood of man, this fatherhood of God, it should not just be inside the church. I think a practical application of that principle was meant. It seems to me that it meant that we must get away from the competitive, divisive struggle for life. It seems to me that, when that struggle goes on between individuals, you simply cannot call your fellow man brother. He is in reality a competitor with you for his existence. When you get that competitive struggle going on in the international level, you cannot have anything else but war. It is my firm belief that war and all of the despair that we witness about us today, have their roots deep in the competitive struggle for life. I believe, too, that all of those ills of society that we have been talking so much about, and praying the good Lord to have eradicated, are due to the competitive struggle for existence. Now it is the record of this system I have just been speaking about, with its money angle, the prostitution, the crime – practically all of them you can lay at the doorstep of this competitive animal struggle for existence.

Now, I think that we have a fine and noble ideal upon which to build a political movement in this province and I would like to compare that and go back through the course of history and watch the course of the development of the industrial era known as free enterprise. When one looks back and you go back into the feudal days, when this competitive struggle for existence was still in its infancy and one thinks of the abject conditions which the exploiting class placed upon the serfs of that age, one once again, sees man’s inhumanity to man, man’s profanity against the creatures of that one Divine Creator. It was pretty well put in a poem by Edwin Markham, which I would like to read to the House as it pretty well expresses my point of view. No

doubt many of you have read, "The Man with the Hoe." It goes on:

Bowed with the weight of centuries he leans upon his hoe and gazes on the ground; the emptiness is in his face and on his back the burden of the world. Is this the thing that the Lord God made and gave to have dominion over sun and land, to trace the stars and search the heaven for power to feed the passions of eternity? Time's tragedy is in that aching stooper. Through this drab shape humanity betrays, blunders, profanes, disinherits, cries protest to the judges of the world, a protest that is also prophecy. How will it be with kingdoms and with kings, with those who have shaped him in the things he is, when this dumb terror shall reply to God after the silence of centuries?

The medieval times – and then one sees the spread of the imperialist activities of the European countries when they came to the Caribbean Sea. We read in history of the destruction of a complete race, some twenty millions of people, in the West Indies, victims of free enterprise exploitation. We see the importation of the negro slaves into the States – another wickedness and another problem created by free enterprise there. And still, my friends say to us over here, that we are for the regimentation; that we are going to take the people's freedom away. The common people have been fighting for freedom. They were the only ones denied freedom. And we said, and I shall repeat again, that when one talks about placing all the emphasis on enterprise, one is bound to put a premium on privilege as against human freedom and human life. It cannot be any other way. We have got to base our economic system on the principles of "Humanity first."

Mr. Hodge: – Apart from the eminent position which the Hon. Member has, what advantage has he derived through this Government? What advantage as a farmer has he gained through this Government?

Mr. Nollet: – Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Hon. Member's question, I can say this: I did not come into this movement and I did not come into this Government for personal and immediate gain. I do believe that we can lay down an economic system by making the start here and proving our case, that will in the final analysis prove of great and immeasurable benefit to all the people in the Dominion. I am not concerned with my own well-being. We know it will take time; anyone knows it will take time. We are not Social Creditors. We are not 'funny-money' people, or people that are going to pull tricks out of the hat. We know all these things will take time. We know it will take time for our increased industries to properly function. We know, too, that they are not going to solve the whole problem. But it is the beginning.

Mr. Hodge: – Can the Hon. Member then tell us what other farmers, what the farmers in general, have gained through this Government?

Mr. Douglas: – Dignity and security.

Mr. Nollet: – Mr. Speaker, I will answer

February 14, 1947

the Hon. Member's question very, very fully in the course of the Budget Debate, as to what we intend to do for agriculture. We quite well recognize the fact that a whole lot of these economic problems must be solved on the national level; but there are things that we can do in Saskatchewan and there are things that we will do in Saskatchewan. I am going to say this much to the Hon. Member: We are going to guarantee the farmers of this province security of tenure. Whether or not this Act will be declared ultra vires at Ottawa, we do not know. If it is, then we are not afraid. We are not afraid that we have got to use the power of moratorium that we have.

Now, I would suggest too, particularly to the Hon. Member for the Mediterranean Area, that while we re on this witch hunt for subversive elements, for Communists and what have you, we should extend the scope of our enquiry in our hunt to take in some of those people that actually sent the sinews of war to Adolph Hitler to create his war machine. I speak specifically now of the great free enterprise firm, known as Canadian Nickel, when in the pre-war days, the greater proportion, over 90 per cent of our nickel went to Germany – so, I suppose, that we could have the satisfaction of knowing that the bullets that were fired at our boys would be nickel-coated and, therefore, would not make such a large wound. I would like to extend the scope of that hunt to include the people who sent the scrap iron, the copper, the ore, to Japan right up until Pearl Harbor; the people, too, who not only sent the material, but who sent finances, campaign funds, to Adolph Hitler, people like the great industrialist Henry Ford, whom Hitler eulogized at one time; the other free enterprise privileged people in Germany, the Deutcherstadt, and their banking fraternity in Germany. I have heard the Hon. Members of this group accused of being even Fascist-minded, at one time; but Hitler arose and was spewed to the surface from that vicious economic system known as 'special-privilege capitalism.' He came from no other source and the first people that fought Hitler were the Socialists in Germany. Let us never forget that either – and a good many of them paid the supreme sacrifice for that, before we ever realized the robot that we were building overseas. Let us not forget either, that the men and women and the boys who died in this war, the homes that were wrecked, did not die, and were not wrecked because of socialism or communism. That destruction and death took place because of Nazism and Fascism and I, more or less, resent this whole implication that we are part and parcel of a subversive group operating within our country here. I certainly do not like that.

Mr. Embury: – Do you mind my raising this Point of Order, Mr. Speaker? I never suggested, as the hon. gentleman says – if I understand it correctly – that he was a member of the subversive group at all. I suggest that they never denounced Communism. I never went further than that. Now if they will do that they will give me my answer; but they will not.

Mr. Douglas: – What is the Point of Order?

Mr. Embury: – My point is that the gentleman says – as I understand it – that I accused him of being a member of some subversive group. I did no such thing.

An Hon. Member: – I did not hear him say that.

Mr. Embury: – Well, I dare say it is on the record.

Mr. Nollet: – I think pretty well everyone present in this House understood pretty well the imputation at least, that because this group over here were not down on the Communist Party and would not join in the witch hunt, because of that lack we are suspected of being part and parcel of some subversive group.

Mr. Embury: – No, Mr. Speaker, my Point of Order is that they will not denounce them and nothing more.

Mr. Speaker: – I do not think the Point of Order is well taken.

Mr. Nollet: – Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make one or two more references before taking my seat. Sometimes, when I hear the Hon. Members opposite criticizing us, I think of a famous Russian writer who had a pretty good verbal manner with which to deal with a reactionary type of mind, the type of mind that apparently sees no good in anything other than their own particular ideas, and their own particular philosophies. This particular writer happened to be a very kindly gentleman. He was called the children's poet, Maxim Gorky, and I think it is particularly appropriate at this time in view of all that has been said about these terrible Russians. After all, there are some pretty fine people over there, some pretty fine writers and this particular writer was, as I said, considered the children's poet, a great lover of children. But he was a man who had very little use for reactionary-minded people, because he believed they were the greatest detriment to human happiness. He called reactionaries "Philistines," and here is what he had to say – and I might say the dictionary usually defines a Philistine as a person who cannot be reached by either ideas or ideals. But since they are the deadliest enemies of human happiness, Gorky said this:

All that represents the spirit of tradition creates within the brain of the philistine a simple mechanism, similar to that of a clock, whose main spring acts in motion, sets in motion the wheels of philistine ideals.

He wound up his attack thus:

The chief motto of every philistine is 'as things have been so shall they be.' Like a dead fish, the philistine rots from the head down.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that we could well have a little bit more constructive criticism from the opposite benches. I think it would be refreshing in this House, after what we have listened to for the last two days. After all, we are all very honestly determined that we are going to try and give good administration to our nation. I think that the Hon. Members opposite should take us as having every sincerity of purpose and intention. We may make mistakes; but we know that – and I do think that we deserve sincerity of purpose and I do think that it is unbecoming that we hear these charges of totalitarianism and regimentation an all that sort of thing. As a matter of fact one would think that the Members opposite would change their tactics. The people in the country do not fall for this

February 14, 1947

anymore. They are sick and tired of it. They have proved it. And if you are going to resurrect that party of yours, I would suggest that you adopt more constructive attitudes.

I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to still another great danger, which gives me great concern. We are all concerned about world peace. Now, wherein do the dangers to world peace really lie? In my opinion – I have been watching for the past year or so a gradual change in the US foreign policy. At one time the foreign policy of the United States was tempered with humanity, under the leadership of the great President Roosevelt, when he enunciated his ‘freedom from want and freedom from fear’ and his guarantees of security in accordance with the Atlantic Charter. Since that day we hear very little of these freedoms any more. We have gradually witnessed the development of a vicious imperialist foreign policy, instead, in the United States, that gives me great concern. I think that the Hon. Members opposite and particularly the Hon. Member from the Mediterranean Area, should feel some concern over the fact that the secrets of the atomic bomb are in the hands of one nation and in the military hands of one nation; a complete military secret. It is a matter of real misgiving to me, too, as it must be to him, to see German Fascist scientists brought to the United States to further develop the destructive propensities of the destructive weapons they found in Germany – and, indeed, these former Fascists, if they do a good job of creating, through their inventive genius, new and better death-dealing instruments in the United States, are going to have their citizenship papers granted to them. That gives me real concern. Statements coming from Admiral Hull that the American Navy will ‘go any damn place it pleases in the world,’ do not sound very well in a world where we were promised the United Nations, where we were promised the world of security. And to prove to the world how well they can defend themselves they have dropped five of these bombs. I hope that we sit back and ponder the significance of this new atomic age and the fact that one nation has control over that immense destructive weapon and the power that that one nation can wield over the whole world. Sure they do not care about other piddling little islands any more, as long as they have got the atomic bomb.

Now, I think that, if Canada made her voice heard against the development and expansion of that imperialist policy there, we might still avert another war. It is quite significant, too, that they have a new Hirohito in Japan in the person of General MacArthur. Not one of the other nations have any say at all in Japan. That is the sole prerogative of General MacArthur and the people behind him. We might not think that that is a dangerous tendency, but I can see a dangerous tendency. I can see a powerful nation there, that is never going to give up its prerogative to dominate and police the world and I think that is decidedly dangerous, and I can see where we in Canada will probably be the Belgium of the next war.

I understand, too, and know that there are still American troops in Saskatchewan, at North Battleford. I think that they should be told to go home. They have no business up there at all and I should think that the secrets of the atomic bomb should be laid before the United Nations Security Council – all of them – and should not be the sole prerogative of one nation at all.

When we start talking, in this day and age, about patriotism and that sort of thing, we should stop to think that after

February 14, 1947

all we have got greater loyalties, greater loyalties by far, in this modern world than just simple loyalty to nations as we have known them in the past. We have got loyalty to principles. We must have some loyalty to the principles particularly taught by the one at whose feet we gain our knowledge and whom we all worship. I would think so. I believe by adhering to the principles of peace and eliminating the root causes of war that are inherent in the competitive way of life, that we can lay the foundation not only for security within our own nation, but between nations as well. I think that can be done only on the basis of a co-operative economy.

For the benefit of the Hon. Member for Arm River, I want to say that that is the type of economy that we want. We want a co-operative economy, whether you call it socialism or what else. Socialism merely implies that you mean society, that you are going to govern in the interests of society; and some Hon. Member said, 'if you have not got the powers of employment how are you going to employ men?' It implies that you are going to extend the principle of economic democracy to your factories and shops. I would like to know how much democracy exists, today, in these youth machine shops down East, employing 30,000 men, run by a little board of directors at the top, the working man having absolutely no say about labor, management or any other question. There is a totalitarian economic dictatorship in the capitalist economy and it cannot be denied and those same people would like to build up a political dictatorship to be their political counterpart. But, believe me, a movement of this kind is going to prevent that sort of tendency. It is the co-operative movement and the trade union movement that are going to prevent these people from extending their economic dictatorship to the political field. The greatest threat, therefore, to the proper functions of political democracy is the fact that we have got an economic autocracy that takes far more out of the pockets of the people than Mr. Fines does, or Mr. Abbott does, by far – and they get theirs first.

Now, it seems to me that you cannot have those two kinds of interests running side by side, one antisocial and the other political democracy trying to create services in the interests of the people. The first takes no responsibility. They cast the unemployed on the lap of your democratic government with relief and unemployment and the rest of the allied problems. They should take their responsibility for these things, I would think and if they do not, it is high time that those industries are socialized and that they pay their just share of the income that they acquire, into the coffers of the nation, to provide not only social security and health but education and all the other amenities that go with a good life.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is a danger. It is not enough just to take ownership of factories; we must have democracy in the factories. There is such a thing as democracy in the workshop. Those are the fields into which we intend to expand and we intend to expand economic democracy, as we go along, along the same principles as are applied in the co-operative movement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that we should have a little less of this destructive criticism that creates all the divisions that we see, and, as a matter of fact, we can truthfully say that even the political divisions that we have within the nation are created by the competitive economic system under

February 14, 1947

which we exist: divisions between races, creed and political parties. Surely to Heaven we can get our heads together and work out a plan that will remove all of the fears we have experienced in the past and it can only be done by applying that principle of co-operation.

I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that I can live to see the day when we, in this world, will be free of war; that we will be free of the dangers of poverty and be freed from all the evils that are inherent in the competitive struggle that I have endeavored to outline. I should like to live to see that day when we could walk down the road together and look into the future, arm-in-arm as brothers, working to the future of a world of security and peace under God.

The question being put, on the motion, it was agreed to on the following Recorded Division:

YEAS – 40
Messieurs

Douglas (Weyburn)	Sturdy	Houze
Wellbelove	Williams	Burgess
Benson	Boyle	Howell
Valleau (Melfort)	Daniels	Brown
Brockelbank	Darling	Wooff
Fines	Stone	Cuming
Corman	Howe	Swallow
Feeley	Willis	Van Eaton
Buchanan	Aitken	Connon
Hansen	Thair	Dewhurst
Nollet	Murray	Gibson
McIntosh	Lazorko	Valleau (ASVR)
Douglas (Rosetown)	Lee	
Lloyd	Putnam	

NAYS – 6
Messieurs

Patterson	Danielson	Embury
Procter	Hooge	Dobie

Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier): – Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Fines:

That the said Address be engrossed and presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor by such Members of the Assembly as are of the Executive Council.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:40 o'clock p.m.