

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session – Tenth Legislature
37th Day

Friday, March 21, 1947

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

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Corman that Bill No. 65 – An Act to protect Certain Civil Rights be now read a second time.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, this Bill before the House, an Act to protect Certain Civil rights, should be regarded by everyone in the Province of Saskatchewan as a Bill of great importance in that it restates many of the principles by which we have been guided here in our province in the past and also emphasizes some points which during recent years have been shown to be very important.

I was very interested in the debate on this Bill so far. If we look at the Bill, we will notice that Sections 2,3,4, 5 and 6 of the Bill deal with those privileges and those freedoms which we have accepted as a matter of course: the right to freedom of concepts; the right to free expression or free speech; the right to free association; the right of people to organize as they see fit as long as they organize for lawful purposes; the right to freedom from arbitrary imprisonment – and we have not had any difficulty with that question here in the Province of Saskatchewan; and the right to have elections. These freedoms have without any question, Mr. Speaker, been accepted as the basic freedoms to which we are entitled and they are probably the most important of all because they are basic and they should be jealously safeguarded at all times.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned, when he was speaking on this Bill the other day that there was no danger of any loss of any of these privileges, that they were accepted. That may be to a considerable extent true, Mr. Speaker, but I think it is a good idea to restate our position in regard to these freedoms and to keep these things before the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

But it is not altogether true, Mr. Speaker, that some of these freedoms have not at times been interfered with in this Province of Saskatchewan and I do not know for sure that the mere restating of these freedoms will make it more possible to enforce these freedoms and to guarantee these freedoms to everyone. That remains to be seen. I agree that the greatest support for freedom is the determined will of the people to determine that they are going to maintain these freedoms. There have been infractions in the past and I did not altogether agree with the Leader of the Opposition when he intimated that this was merely a restatement. It is still a little more than that. I believe the Leader of the Opposition in his speech said that

this Bill should include safeguards against Government encroachment on the rights and liberties of the citizens of Saskatchewan and Section 6 of the Bill deals with the right to elections.

Mr. Speaker, I did some work a good many years ago under the liberties and freedoms that are set forth in this Act in organizing a new political party. In one district I ran into this situation that none of the people in that district dared to talk to me or to be seen with me. Why? Because, Mr. Speaker, this was a district that was almost 100 per cent dependent upon relief allowances for their living and they were, all of them, afraid to speak to anyone who was organizing a political party to oppose the political party that was then in power. That was in 1938. In 1940, there was a polling subdivision in the Melfort Federal constituency and I want to remind the Members of this House that in that constituency the majority in the election for the CCF was over 3,000. But in this one poll where the people were entirely dependent upon relief for existence, the vote was 80 Liberal and 3 CCF. This was Camp K if the Hon. Member for Moosomin would like the name of the poll. Some time after that, the Member elect and myself were in that area and we met many of the people in that area. One after another these people that we met on the road, or in their homes, stated to us that they regretted that they had felt they did not dare to do anything else but vote Liberal. They were afraid to vote CCF. Mr. Speaker, people didn't get that way in the Province of Saskatchewan without some very strong influence being used on them. I say, Mr. Speaker, it is not only a good idea to restate these rights in these five sections of the Bill because they have been generally accepted in the past but to restate them for the purpose of emphasizing that we really mean that those freedoms, those liberties, those rights and privileges should belong to the people of this province. It is no harm either to mention in this Bill that the term of a legislature shall not exceed five years. We do not mind putting that in this Bill because we expect to live up to it.

Now Sections 7 to 9 in the Bill deal with economic rights: the right to employment, the right to engage in occupations, the right to own and occupy property. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that without these economic rights the other rights and freedoms cannot endure very long so that these other three sections are just as important. They may not be termed the basic rights but they are things that people are entitled to: employment, the ownership of property and the right to engage in occupations no matter what may be their color, creed or race. Sections 10 to 12, Mr. Speaker, then refer to certain other rights to services and certain privileges. The right of access to public places, the right to membership in professional and trade associations and the right to our educational institutions and on those, again, I think I may say that very little comment need be made.

Then we come to Section 13 in the Bill which is the section which prohibits any publications of any material that is, -- how does the Act say it -- "tending or likely to tend to deprive, abridge or otherwise restrict because of the race, creed, religion, color or ethnic or national origin of any person or class of person," and that too, I think, we can have no quarrel with at all. All the Members in this House, I believe, would agree that those things in the Bill are quite right and that they should be stated and that they should be emphasized.

March 21, 1947

The Leader of the Opposition criticized this Bill chiefly because of certain things which were not included in the Bill. One of the most outstanding statements which he made was when he said, (I think I have his words correct), "sometimes I think that the people will have to fight to control the power of governments as they did to control the power of kings" and again he said: "This Bill should contain a safeguard against the eradication of capitalism." Mr. Speaker, I could just imagine the Leader of the Opposition if he were living two or three hundred years ago trying to pass laws to prevent the people from doing away with the rule of absolute monarchies. I could imagine him trying to have laws passed to prevent the people from doing away with feudalism, or as my hon. friend behind me says, to pass laws to prevent the people from doing away with slavery because it would be an infringement on the liberty and freedom of the slave owner. When he states, "that sometimes I think that the people will have to fight to control the power of governments as they did to control the power of kings", he shows his hand quite clearly. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, he shows that he does not believe in democracy, that he does not believe that the people should have the right to either leave capitalism here in Saskatchewan or to eradicate it as they see fit.

I believe in democracy and I believe that the people are going to eradicate capitalism and I believe that they should have the right to eradicate capitalism. That is their privilege. This world is an old world but the people who do this world's work have not yet come into their full place of power and position which they deserve to have. They are coming and they are getting that power and they are learning how to use that power. And so, Mr. Speaker, I am rather disappointed that anyone in this House should suggest that we should put into the Statute Books of this province a law which would say to the people of this province – you cannot change, you cannot make progress, you must go no farther ahead on the road towards complete emancipation and complete freedom of the human race.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition said that there should be some provision in this Act to prevent the Government from fixing up elections in the province by means of gerrymandering constituencies. That is a subject which he would have been well advised to have left alone. All one needs to do is to look back over the history of this province, to look at the map of the constituencies of this province and if those constituencies were not laid out with two avowed purposes; first, to make it as difficult as possible for the people in those constituencies to organize a people's organization. And second, to wiggle the boundaries so as to make as many constituencies as possible safe for the government in power of the day, if that was not done I'd like to have somebody really prove to me that it was not done.

Then the Leader of the Opposition suggests that we might provide for ten Members in the city of Regina. Mr. Speaker, I never thought of it before, but in looking back over some of the facts and figures, I find this (and we didn't do this), I find that there is a city in the Province of Saskatchewan with a population of about 20,000 which has two members and that there are some single member constituencies in the province with a population of 24,000. The Leader of the Opposition would have been much better off to have left alone that question of

gerrymandering of seats in this province.

I am entirely in support of this Bill, Mr. Speaker. I think that we will be able, in the future, probably to go farther to make a broader and greater statement of the freedoms and liberties which we regard as our heritage. But I want the people of this province to remember this, that if they are going to retain their freedom then they must be forever on their guard. Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom. People will come along and suggest to the people themselves that in the name of freedom they should be restricted from making progress and put it in such smooth terms that some of them might even believe it. The people must be vigilant, the people must be willing to think about these questions and they must not allow themselves to be fooled. I shall support the motion.

Mr. D.S. Valleau (ASVR): — Mr. Speaker, I am going to repeat the freedoms which we hear the most about today, they are called the four freedoms: freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom of expression and freedom of religion. I do not remember exactly the order in which these were first enunciated, but I do know that in the minds of the people we have come to put ‘freedom from want’ as the first and best known of these.

Today, ‘freedom from want’ is our greatest problem. I think that I can speak on this with a slight amount of authority, that it was stated over and over again that the boys who were serving overseas were fighting to secure the four freedoms. I think that it is important that we not lose sight of the fact that that was possibly the one factor in which we had a unanimity of opinion. I have heard the question asked of myself, sir, after I returned to these shores. I believe it was an uncle of mine who asked me: “If you were so anxious to be struggling for freedom, why is it that the first thing you did upon returned home was to get married?” That proves again the significance of freedom as such. It is not a thing which exists by itself, it is a concept that only comes into play when we visualize human beings in society together and freedom is interpreted as a lack of restriction from ones fellows, or it has been interpreted as a lack of restriction from ones fellows, or it has been interpreted that way in the past. I am not entirely certain that that is the best interpretation.

In the past the peoples have looked upon freedom as absence of tyranny, and freedom could not exist, therefore, unless tyranny existed, or unless there was a struggle against tyranny. Rather than becoming a positive thing as it should have been, freedom was a negative thing, something opposed to something else. For example, we could see an ancient tribe living on a desert, instead of cultivating the desert soil and making it bloom like a rose as modern man would do. This native tribe would march a few miles and fight another tribe for the privilege of camping on an oasis, and they would be struggling for freedom from the oppression of the other tribe. Instead of taking the positive approach of trying to create something in the desert, they were taking the negative approach of trying to prevent another tribe oppressing them, and as man gradually got away from that idea and developed instead the idea of people co-operating together for the common good, and realized that man in association with other men can achieve higher freedoms, then he can, in opposition to his fellow men, see the concept of freedom greatly increased.

March 21, 1947

I think it is highly significant that our outlook has changed and Roosevelt, the late President of the United States, was conscious of that change when he enunciated the four freedoms and placed among those four freedoms, the phrase "freedom from want". It is also significant that he was not able to state that positively, that he had been our greatest exponent of more abundant life of a society of ample production and large amounts of material goods, but the language had not grown as fast as our ideas had grown and when he tried to express his idea of creative abundance in terms of the old ideas of freedom he had to use a double negative, he had to say "freedom from want". Instead of implying that we would have plenty, he had to say "freedom from want".

In a positive society such a negative definition would no longer be necessary. For example, nobody demands freedom from lack of air, air is a very essential thing to us, we all breathe air. We need lots of it and yet no one ever considers that we should have freedom from the state of not being able to breathe air. Similarly the Hon. Member says we should have a little freedom from hot air and I think probably lots of people would agree with that. Similarly, the water situation. Nowadays, water is so plentiful that no one says we should have freedom from lack of water or freedom from thirstiness, but we still have not arrived at the time in history when food is so plentiful that the people give up worrying about lack of food. If food were as plentiful as water and as plentiful as air, we would no longer have to say that we need "freedom from want", we would stop thinking about it. It would be a positive thing instead of a negative thing, and that is one of the things which we are working for in present day society. In a world of abundance, freedom from want is something which ceases to be needed. In a world of education and wisdom, freedom of expression and religion do not have to be stated. In a world of peace, freedom from fear is unnecessary.

Unfortunately, we are still living in a negative and not a positive world. We still have to struggle against things to a certain extent instead of struggling for them and in that struggle, the native struggle for freedom, we find, as has been stated already, that at various periods in history, important charters have been made, important statements have been made, books have been written, laws have been passed codifying the concept that the world has reached at that date of what freedom is. Some of the most progressive concepts for freedom have come from the Anglo-Saxon world, but, Mr. Speaker, all our concepts of freedom have not come from the Anglo-Saxon world. Those of us who read Scripture can note that the ancient Israelites had developed a very high concept of freedom. In some respects, it has hardly been equalled since, particularly in the concept of the equality of sexes. Their concept of freedom was till more greatly enhanced when Jesus of Nazareth delivered the sermon on the Mount, bringing a concept of freedom which has never since been equalled in any codification of law or statement of principle.

The Greeks, also, in the time of their early struggles for democracy, achieved quite a high plane. It is true that their democracy did not include the slaves that dealt with the aristocratic class and it is true that ostracism was their idea of election, but nevertheless they achieved a plane of thought and of democracy which it would be well if the world would look back to it occasionally to get new hope. Roman law was finally codified and strengthened by Justinian who performed a monumental

task and thereby set the principle of codifying law so that people would not be charged without knowing under what Statute or what principle they were being charged. In other sections of the world, Confucius in China was a great law giver and brought many principles of freedom. The French revolution in Europe brought to a head the growing European concept of liberty, equality and fraternity. Liberty being the struggle for freedom, fraternity and equality being the principles of a positive struggle for a better life.

Thus do we see that freedom itself is not something that is limited to one race or to one creed. It is not something that is limited to the Anglo-Saxons, but it is something that is grown in all parts of the world, at all times and has been stated and codified at various times. Freedom from want has remained possibly one of the most important freedoms, and it is, in my opinion, that freedom from want will not be completely achieved until we have achieved the other freedoms. Freedom of religion was something that has been achieved at early periods in history. For example, under the old Roman Empire a very large measure of freedom of religion was achieved and in the growth of the American system of government in North America, freedom of religion is something which is necessary to an imperial form of government such as Rome had. It is also necessary to a federal type of government such as that which they had in America, in the United States. Today that concept has grown to many other countries not necessarily of a federal type. But in a nation such as ours, where we have large groups of various religions and ethnic groups, racial groups, it is very important that we observe the principles which proved so necessary to the growth of Imperial Rome insofar as freedom of religion is concerned. Freedom of expression was the next to grow and it grew during the latter part of the liberal revolution and the industrial revolution.

The Bill which we have before us, Mr. Speaker, is significant because it attempts to bring all these streams of thought together and express them in a slightly modernized form. Today, the restriction upon freedom which is the most depressive throughout the world is the restriction caused because of racial intolerance, or national, or religious prejudice, and in many parts of the world before the last war at the present time, sinister groups of people who were trying to keep the world as it is, or force it backwards in history had used racism deliberately as a method of creating class divisions. The Nazis used that method with very bitter results, the Fascist used that method and I regret to say that in some parts of the world such things are still going on. At the same time, it is something we can not with optimism that in many parts of the world racial tolerance is growing and that the so-called down-trodden races of the world are showing a growing awareness of their rights and the necessity of freedom and self-government and are undertaking the assumption of their responsibilities. I think it is something that we can note with pride that Great Britain has agreed to give freedom and independence to India and although we are not yet certain whether the Indians will accept that responsibility with all of the authority and responsibility that they should, it is significant that racial tolerance is growing in sections of the world at the same time that racial intolerance is growing. So that we find that today that issue is the issue above all others that we have to settle in our minds.

There is more than one stream of human freedom, all of these

March 21, 1947

streams today are flowing together. Every race, every creed, every color, every nation has made a contribution. The purpose of the Bill before us is to give these groups the creative rights of our community that all may contribute to the growth of a positive future in this province. Today, when the ugly warfare which is a parallel to biological warfare, the ugly warfare of racism, is being used in many parts of the world, it is significant that the racial national tolerance is growing in this province. The future of the world depends upon the outcome of this struggle and this Legislature today has a chance to strike a blow in that battle for freedom.

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to endorse the reasons of the Attorney General as to why a Bill of this nature is both justifiable and desirable at this time. I think, Sir, that we should not forget that we have very recently completed a war, a war to safeguard many of those rights which are mentioned in the Bill, but a war which liberal minded people everywhere meant to be more than merely something to safeguard. It was something which was going to extend.

I think, too, Sir, that it is not unfitting that we mention at this time, the passing and bringing into force the Canadian Citizenship Act. Some of the Members present will recall the ceremony in this Chamber, some probably were present at ceremonies in various other parts of the province. It seems fitting that the Legislature should, in a Bill such as this, reaffirm and remind, not only ourselves, but the people whom we represent of the privileges and the responsibilities of that Canadian citizenship. I do not share the opinion of the Leader of the Opposition because we have many of the rights mentioned in the Bill, that we should not take the opportunity from time to time of restating and reaffirming these rights and these responsibilities. There is a danger, I think, which all of us recognize in completion. There is always a danger of thinking that once we have said something, we have done. I believe that the Attorney General, in his excellent presentation, pointed out and emphasized that we enjoyed many of these privileges, we do repeat, Mr. Speaker, the same prayer each day in this House; frequently throughout the year, and the years, we sing 'O' Canada'. In the same way it is fitting that this Legislature make a statement of principle, and reindorse and reaffirm old principles which remain new.

It was not intended, of course, that this bill would reform the world. I do think we need to remember, however, that the world does not make communities; that on the other hand communities make the world. But we are concerned here with our Saskatchewan community and our share in realistic world making. In the same way ideals are not superimposed. Ideals grown. We can provide the soil and fertility whereby these ideals may grow better and that is a part of our responsibility. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the contents of this bill, the explanation given by the Attorney General, and remarks by other Members possibly would be a subject of discussion in hundreds of communities throughout Saskatchewan, that organizations might study the Bill and consider its implications, that we as individuals and other individuals throughout Saskatchewan will ponder it in the light of its philosophy of tolerance and its philosophy of non-discrimination and examine, in that light, our own attitude towards our fellow-man.

I do agree entirely with the Leader of the Opposition when he emphasizes that public opinion is the only permanent guard as to our liberties. The Attorney General emphasized the same thing, but it must be a public opinion which is enlightened, the public opinion which, if necessary, can become vocal. I think that the Legislature can rightly be expected to assume leadership in this way, that this Bill does provide an opportunity and an expression for such leadership. I agree too with the Leader of the Opposition that all of our rights are not written in this Bill. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has been writing a new chapter of the Bill of Rights in every session, that our Security Legislation, Labour Legislation, Health Legislation, Social Welfare and Educational enactments, all of them, being chapters in a Bill of Rights for the people of Saskatchewan. Most of them, Mr. Speaker, incidentally opposed by the Opposition.

In his discourse, the Leader of the Opposition took us back into the history of the struggle and of the realization of many of our present liberties. I think most of us here enjoyed and appreciated his exposition. Like the Leader of the Opposition, Sir, I have read some history, I have read some before the Bill was presented and I have read some since. I cannot agree with all of his decisions, I do regret that he did not finish the story. It is true, of course, that the Magna Carta was a great achievement. It was a necessary step. But it represented in reality a victory for a group of barons, the large landlords over the kinds and it bore but little fruit at the time for the ordinary person. It did promise some fruits but for hundreds of years the great majority of the barons continued to exploit, and in many cases, to maltreat their tenants and serfs. It matters very little, after all, if when one is going to be starved, whether one is starved by a King or by a baron. Nevertheless it was a valuable step in removing control from the reigning monarch. It is a step which in itself, Mr. Speaker, as we are re-enacting here today, has been reindorsed at many times, and in many places, by many governments.

In the same way the Bill of Rights to which he had reference was essential and was good. It was largely a guarantee to the parliament of the day, a parliament which did not represent the people and which, for centuries, did little to protect the people, but it was a step up the ladder to eventual government of the people, by, and for the people. But there, and I think, unfortunately, the Leader of the Opposition stopped. The great and significant story of the Industrial Revolution, the struggle of the working people against factory owners, and large landowners in order to obtain economic justice and parliamentary representation, the story was not told. I do submit, sir, that that phase of our development of our now accepted freedom, liberty, must not be omitted. The story of the Reform Bills of the nineteenth century widening parliamentary representation, the story of the Factory Act and similar legislation of the same period, which provided for economic freedom and more decent working conditions. The struggle of the commons to less power from the lords, the agitations of the Chartists which were howled down as revolutionary in 1847 and 1848, but which today with only one exception have been accepted. The whole story, Mr. Speaker, the abolishing of the Divine Right of Capital is quite as important a chapter in our human liberties as in the story of the abolishment of the Divine Right of Kings. The story of these events are significant. The reaction of the manufacturers, of the land owners, of the privileged groups to these reforms is also quite significant. One might consider, for

March 21, 1947

example, the Factory Act in 1847 (I think it was) which prohibited the employment of children under the age of nine years; which limited the employment of children under thirteen years of age to 48 hours a week; and which limited for those under 18 years of age to 69 hours a week. Interesting to note that this rather mild enactment considered by present day standards, of course, was opposed by the Liberals of the day who represented the industrials, and these reforms were opposed on three main grounds. They said first: that it would oblige manufacturers to reduce wages and to raise prices; that it took from the workmen the freedom of contract and that it would ruin industry and drive capital to other countries. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, where we have heard those arguments before, more recently. If my memory serves me rightly they are almost the self-same arguments used by the Members of the Opposition in this House against labor legislation proposed by this Government.

It is of interest to note that these factory laws, this particular one I am referring to, was passed by the Tories of the day. They passed it because they wanted to get revenge on the previous Liberal Government, who had repealed the so-called Corn Laws, thereby reducing tariffs which the Tories claimed would ruin them and the lords and the large landowners. One historical writer, or one textbook and I am now referring to a textbook by West and Eastman which is being used in the Grade eleven and twelve classes in our Saskatchewan school rooms for sometime, says this:

The story shows that neither division of the Capitalist class could see any needs of the working class that conflicted with their own unjust profits.

Or we might have carried the discussion to a slightly later date, when there was a difficulty in the farming class, due to the fact that large landowners had gobbled up all the land. There was a little rhyme I think, current of that day, which said:

The law locks up the man or woman who steals the goose from off the common, but leaves the greater villain loose to steal the common from the goose.

Since indirect reference was made to larger units, I think the Leader of the Opposition might have read some English Educational History and have shown us how, in the early 1900s, in England and in Scotland the principle of larger units was excepted without a direct vote of the people. Or, he might have carried, up to date this story of British liberties, carried it to a logical conclusion, told us how these selfsame people who have contributed so much to the story and struggle of democracy, elected in 1945 a Socialist Government, a Government that believes in planning, a Government that has socialized the Bank of England and the coal mines, and which plans more extensive socialization.

Mr. Speaker, the evolution of the political, economic and social instruments of democracy did not stop with the "Bill of rights", and it has not stopped yet. It is still moving and it is moving in the British Isles at least in the direction of the eradication of monopolistic capitalism to which objection has been taken. And it is moving that way because ordinary people, Trade Unions, Co-operatives and so on, realize that they cannot control their own destiny until the power of capital is

subjugated to the importance of people.

Reference was made to the denial in this province of access to the courts. Now, I presume that the reference was to the Labour Relations Board, and I think that it can very properly be argued that in respect of access to the courts, the setting up of boards such as these which function semi-judicially is really giving the public more access to the courts, not less. I think it would be found, Mr. Speaker, if one were to examine the origin of Boards such as this, that the reason was that in a large number of cases in which there had to be minute consideration of facts, the courts such as this expedite decisions. They reduce costs, but they save the time of the major courts for more difficult case. I think too it might have been proper to have mentioned that after all there is hardly a new principle in the Labour Relations Board, and it is an accident with regard to courts or it is lack of an accident in regard to courts. That Board set up in this province by the previous Government – I have reference, for example, to the Workmen's Compensation Board – function on the same basis, and with the same restrictions as regards to people. Or to take an even more parallel force, we have had for a number of years in the province what is know as 'Boards of Reference' in the field of education. If a teacher loses a position, feels that that position has been taken away unjustly, she or he may appeal to a Board of Reference. The Board of Reference is established, representative of the employer, of the employee, and a chairman appointed by the Government and from this Board there is no appeal. The situation is the same, it may be a matter of taking away a teacher's livelihood and there is, as I have said no appeal, which is in a very parallel field to which the Labour Relations Board operates.

I could disagree, Mr. Speaker, with the Leader of the Opposition in another way. As I remember, he stated that fireworks usually came when things were being taken away from people. I do not want to disagree entirely with that. It is true in part. But if my memory of history serves me correctly, the greatest fireworks came when the people were trying to get things for themselves and were being denied those things by those who would maintain the Status Quo. Armed revolutions and labor risings have been caused largely by the denial of right to the ordinary people, by those privileged classes, or those controlled by privileged classes.

Because certain semi-accusations at least were made against the present Government I think it is worthwhile that we review the history of the present Government. The Hon. Members will remember that we had, in this pr, farmers organizations, organized an educational groups, organized as a group which would present the point of view of farmers to organized government. The Hon. Members will remember, too that there came a time when the farmers realized that that type of ac tin was not enough, realized that if they were going to get a fair deal, then political action was necessary. The same situation was true with regard to labor. We had labor groups organized for the purpose of negotiating with employers and of arguing, or discussing with government. Gradually those labor groups realized that that type of action was not enough, that if they were going to get a square deal, political action was necessary. Then we have realization on the part of farmer and of labor that alone neither of them was strong enough to see that either of them got a square deal and we have the amalgamation of those

March 21, 1947

groups in the formation, in this province, of the Farmer Labour Party, which later on became the present Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. I think it would be well if we were to think carefully about that title 'Co-operative Commonwealth Federation' because we do mean what it says. It is no accidental name. It has purpose and it has meaning. This rather small group grew rather considerably and they grew for several reasons. They grew, first of all, because of the logic and the validity of the platform which they were able to place before the people. They grew because of the leadership, because of men like Woodsworth, and Coldwell and the late George Williams, the present Premier and many Members of this House and many people outside of this House. And they grew too, Mr. Speaker, because of the denials of governments of the day, because of the inability, of the unwillingness of governments of the day to give them what they thought was a square deal. They grew because of their disgust of machine politics of the governments of the day and they grew because people were not afraid of losing their homes and their liberties but because people were losing their homes and their liberties. I think it well too that we review just briefly the record of this government insofar as providing improved liberties and freedom where the people of this province are concerned.

In our Farm Security Legislation we have given there a liberty which farmers did not possess before, and in giving them that liberty have also improved the position of the other citizens of Canada, of Saskatchewan, who depend on the farmer. That in labour legislation, in improving the standard of wages, in improving the rates of compensation; in making it possible and encouraging them to organize and to bargain collectively, we have given them greater freedom than they possessed before; and thereby enhanced the freedom of the other people of Saskatchewan too.

In our program of health, in our enactments with regard to old age pensioners and those in receipt of Mothers' Allowances, we have given them the right and the freedom to receive medical treatment which previously was a freedom held by those who could afford to pay for it, but which is now recognized as a freedom of theirs, because, Mr. Speaker, they happen to be people.

Then there was the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition that we write into the Act a clause, as has been referred to by the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, to prevent the eradication of Capitalism. In other words, I take it, that he wants to return to the days of unrestrained and unrestricted so-called free enterprise. I think we should look at the fruits which this so-called free enterprise system has produced, and admittedly there are many good fruits, a great many of them Sir. We have achieved a comparatively high standard of living, if we make our comparison with the standard of living in many other countries. But if we make our comparison with the potential which this great country of ours could provide, then perhaps the comparison is not so favourable. But, in looking back, the broad picture of one generation, the generation to which most of us here belong, we see the highlights of what this so-called system of free enterprise, in nearly every country in the world, has produced and those highlights are two world-wide wars and one major world-wide depression.

This party, Mr. Speaker, does believe in real free

enterprise. We contend that enterprise never has been free and never can be free under monopolistic capitalism. There are examples in Saskatchewan today of how certain dealers in goods are not willing to sell those goods to certain types of organizations. We have not had free enterprise insofar as it meant freedom of the individual to expand. Opportunities have been too unequal. Capital has weighted the scales. There are other fruits of this so-called free enterprise system. I should like to read to the House an editorial appearing in the Co-operative Consumer under date of March 1st. It has this to say:

In a highly competitive society such as our own, everyone competes with everyone else and there are bound to be a few winners and many losers. This leads us to the second main conflict in our accepted way of doing things, the conflict between the supposed freedom of the individual to attain success and all the actual limitations which prevent him from doing so. We are told that we are free to make our mark in the world, but we find that we are hedged in by obstacles and circumstances beyond our control. While it is believed that any man can get what he wants if he is efficient and energetic, we also know that in fact the chances are limited for most people. When the expected goals are not attained, the result is a feeling of bitter disappointment and frustration. Our economic order also produces insecurity and anxiety resulting from low wages, fear of depression and unemployment and although our economic plight is no fault of our own, we nevertheless have feelings of personal guilt and loss of self esteem.

Now this is the part which I want to emphasize:

One of the leading psychiatrists, F. Alexander, has gone so far as to say: This insecurity and the frustration of having no opportunity to make use of one's productive capacities are the main source of emotional maladjustment in our times, moreover a depression depends all the conflicts mentioned above. Competition during depression becomes keener and more ruthless although need for co-operation and solidarity becomes greater. The prospects of attaining success become almost impossible, but the ambitions are still there. What can be done to eliminate or at least reduce the effects of mental illness? Many psychiatrists and social scientists doubt that mental illness can be eliminated while we retain our present economic system.

May I repeat that sentence.

Many psychiatrists and social scientists doubt that mental disease can be eliminated while we retain our present economic system.

They maintain that social conflicts must first be eliminated before any real solution of the problem of mental illness can be reached. That again, -ms is one of the additional proofs of a so-called free enterprise system. I should like to read from another page to indicate further possibilities of the so-called free enterprise system and I admit, Mr. Speaker, in reading, that the material which I have, has reference to the United States of America, but what is applicable in the

March 21, 1947

United States is in some measure not entirely impart, in all occasions, but in some measure relatively applicable here. This is an article which appeared in the Glace Bay Gazette during the week of March 9th or March 16th (I am sorry I haven't the date), but it is an exclusive interview with Mr. O. John Roving, a former Special Assistant to the United States Attorney General and I want to read some of the things which this former Special Assistant to the United States Attorney General had to say, and he is speaking about now, Mr. Speaker, not ten years ago.

The blueprint for American Fascism has been drawn along tested patterns. It parallels in sickening detail the course of Fascism in Germany and other lands. Under a smokescreen of anti-communism it promotes discrimination and disunity until a nation is hopelessly divided against self and existing government disintegrates. Again a principle target of a fascist state is the labor movement. Deprived of unions, working people can be driven to work harder and longer for less funds. In every Fascist country the labor unions were among the first victims ...

and so on. I must not take time to read it all. I do want to read one or two other parts. Particularly this:

Hitler, you will recall, was engaged in rabble rousing and trouble making for many years before Fritz Thiessen and the other big businessmen decided they could retain and extend their power only through a Fascist State. We are not quite ready for it here. Big business is not now seriously threatened. It still controls virtually every phase of our economic and political life. It is representatives in Legislatures comply with the wishes of the men with money. If a threat to their control should ever rise, I am convinced large sections of top business in America will follow the Thiessen pattern. At that time the Fascists will receive whatever sums they need.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that a statement like that coming from a Special Assistant to the United States Attorney General can hardly be overlooked in this argument of turning back free enterprise. This Bill, Mr. Speaker, and consequent discussion and self-examination can help us, not only in maintaining, but in extending those liberties which we cherish and which we wish to preserve.

I would again emphasize, as has the Leader of the Opposition, that an enlightenment of public opinion is the only guarantee that we have. Enlightened public opinion which will result in continuing progressive government. Increased education, not only in extension quantitatively, but in improvement qualitatively. Education which emphasizes training in how to think and I would urge the Member, Mr. Speaker, to take every opportunity to encourage the organization of study and of discussion groups. We have excellent opportunity under such organizations or such programs as the Farm Radio Forum and the Citizens Forum to cultivate our Saskatchewan habit of getting our feet under the table and talking together, thinking together, planning together. The extension of library facilities is of considerable importance, and of course the continuation of government that will continue to extend security and economic stability to the people is important. It is much more, Mr. Speaker, than a matter of

protection of minority rights. It is the matter of building up the recognition of the importance of people, just because they are people, whether they are in a minority or not. People who are important, because they are people, whether they are black or white, American or Canadian, or whether they are old, or whether they are young. We need to cultivate more and more the importance of people just because they are people.

I want to close by reading the closing paragraph of a book by the writer Pierre Van Paasen because I think it states clearly and well the ideals of progressive people, ideals which I think every Member in this House would subscribe to and which suggest the type of thinking and the type of pattern which we must have if civilization is not alone going to continue but is going to continue to exist. His quotation is this:

Slowly the hopes and aspirations of mankind turn into concrete achievements. There is something utterly pathetic in all of man's individual endeavors, but not in the collective march of humanity to its ideals. A day will surely come when men having grown tired of walking together, will turn to his buddy and on the day when we shall have learned to feel the sorrows and the joys, the suffering and the hope of others as our very own, that world order of love and justice for which the universe yearns and which the planets in the stillest nights are the splendid but imperfect symbol, shall have come nearer and on that day alone the brotherhood of man will become a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the Bill.

Mr. A.W. Embury (Representative for Mediterranean Area): — It is as well I think, that the other point of view is presented at times. The debate upon this Bill of Rights introduced as it is by a Socialist Government, must of necessity be a matter of particular interest to the House and to all of the public. A great many people have not yet realized as is my submission that fact that Socialism is merely the political philosophy of soviet Russia, that is what I've said before in the House and that's what I say now. Hon. Members smile at this, permit me to read the Article 12 of the Constitution of Soviet Russia. It says this: "The principle applied in the USSR is that of Socialism. From each according to his ability, to each according to his work." A great many people, with matters pertaining to freedom are not taken for granted in a totalitarian state, that has been my theory, that has been my submission to the House. A great many people forget about it, but I believe it is worth considering, those rights have to be defined in a Totalitarian state, as the socialist plan for seed in Saskatchewan. I think it will be interesting to compare our progress with the history of soviet Russia. Mr. Woodsworth himself, a great forerunner in the CCF movement in Canada, has said there is no reason why we should not be able to carry out the soviet system in this country successfully, he was referring to Canada.

Mr. Corman: — Could the Hon. Member tell us what he's quoting from?

Mr. Embury: — Well I'll help the Hon. Member, I can get that reference

March 21, 1947

for him. That system to have our freedoms guarded by impartial courts of justice, they have to be declined. The Hon. Attorney General says in introducing this Bill to the House that our freedoms are retained only by the thin walls of the court or words to that effect. Now, I like to think that our courts and the integrity of our courts are solid and not a thin wall at all, I would have honestly expected the Attorney General to have a better appreciation of the functions and strength of our courts than he seems to have.

Mr. Corman: — I was quoting from Conservative newspapers from Toronto.

Mr. Embury: — Two wrongs do not make a right, Mr. Speaker, that does not sound like an appointed privilege to me, it sounds like an interruption. His comments along those lines, Mr. Speaker, are these: In line with the general trend of the Government to criticize the officers of the courts and in some cases to deny access to the courts altogether, as they did in the Labour Relation matters and in some insurance matters. His comments will have the effect of making those walls just so much thinner. In this Act the very offence is defined in the Act itself, or to be tried by the very courts that the Attorney General speaks of so slightly.

Mr. Corman: — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a Point of Privilege, I correct the Hon. Member. He's repeating that I made those statements, which is untrue. I was quoting from a newspaper.

Mr. Embury: — The House has agreed, the rights referred to and the privileges referred to, the freedoms referred to in this bill of rights, have been acknowledged on all sides of the House, has been sacred to us. The piloting of this Act through the House dealing with this precious subject has been left to the Attorney General. If he's as good and useful an Attorney General as he is a radio comedian, we can consider ourselves well served. I leave it to the fair minded Members of this House to say whether that is the case. The Attorney General has stated that he considers this Act to be the most important Act that ever came into this Legislature. Now, Mr. Speaker, when the long term plan of this Government for the eradication of Capitalism from Saskatchewan has been accomplished, I wouldn't be surprised if any Statute giving us any rights at all will be most important indeed to us all. How long, Mr. Speaker, do you think the Socialist Government will leave this Statute on the Statute Books? The Attorney General of Saskatchewan says in all humility that he's introducing this Act in a spirit of tolerance, forbearance and moderation. He proceeds then to follow it up with some typical Communist jargon calculated to stir up class hatreds and internal strife. In the one and same speech, Mr. Speaker, this remarkable gentleman introduces a Bill to safeguard the rights, freedoms, of every person and every class of person, and at the same time talks disparagingly about the members of the Assiniboia Club. Lots of farmers, both successful and unsuccessful are members of that club. Many a man in that club, who started in life without a dollar, who had nothing but his brains and hands to work with, poor men, rich men, all kinds of men in that Club. The Attorney General went on and spent some time referring to the class of person which he says that

I come from. Well I do not know what that class is supposed to be, he talked about my background, he talked and generally sought to discredit that as well as he could. I don't know that I had any reason to be ashamed of my background, certainly not as much reason as he has to be ashamed of his background.

Mr. Corman: — Mr. Speaker, I dislike having to rise so often, I think the hon. gentleman knows that I made no reference whatever to his background.

Mr. Embury: — In connection with the background of the Attorney General. It has been a very opportunist political background. First Liberal, then Social Credit and then CCF. The Member of this House, who do so much talking to stir up dissension and class hatreds would be well advised to put something in their Bill of Rights to protect those who may be affected by all this slanderous, Communistic nonsense. The Hon. Premier said of me that other day, that I came from a class.

Mr. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the debate the other day was a totally different subject, the debate on that was concluded. The Hon. Member is not allowed, on the rules of this House, to quote from a previous debate.

Mr. Embury: — Mr. Speaker, to that portion of the remarks and other remarks made by various gentlemen, in a similar sense to a class of persons, now in this Bill before us they are talking about the freedoms of every person and every class of person. I am referring to the general attitude of the Government as it is relative to this particular Bill on second reading of it and I would like very much, although I'm sure that the Hon. Premier is afraid of what I am going to say.

Mr. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I ask to be withdrawn the suggestion that I am afraid of what he is going to say, any person who has watched either the hon. gentleman or myself in this House will know that I am not afraid of him in here or any place else.

Mr. Embury: — He said of me that I could not take it, that I came from a class of persons who couldn't take it. Well I think from judging by the consternation and few remarks that I may have caused and by the inadequacy of the Premier's remarks about me the other day, that I can't pay him the same compliment on either score, he can neither hand it out nor take it.

Mr. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the Point of Order hasn't been answered. I'm pointing out that my hon. friend is continuing the debate in this House which was closed. I have no objection to that if I'm allowed to continue it. The hon. gentleman is now replying to a speech which I made the other day under a previous debate. Now if that debate is to be continued I should be very happy, but it must work both ways.

Mr. Embury: — Mr. Speaker, these are the gentlemen who bring this bill in. These are their notions of tolerance, forbearance and

March 21, 1947

moderation.

How long do you suppose this Bill will remain on the books after the Socialists have eradicated capitalism in Saskatchewan? I am particularly moved by the brave pretensions of the Government to champion the right of freedom. The tolerance forbearance and moderation shown by the Hon. Members opposite indeed to any effective critics of the Government must have been apparent to other fair minded Members of the House. To see the Hon. Premier and the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and all the other Hon. Ministers exercising their wonderful tolerance and forbearance in moderation while I have been speaking on the two occasions in this House has been a wonderful example and an inspiration. What great admiration they must have excited among other people for those characteristics to which they lay claim.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am giving credit for getting four of them on their feet all at the same time. They all showed their moderation in tolerance and forbearance, altogether right in the middle of my speech. You can see the kindly light of tolerance and forbearance shining in their eyes when their fists weren't in the way. Oh yes, the Socialists notion of the right to free speech are that all men shall have it provided they don't use it to criticize the socialists. How long do you suppose this Bill will remain on the Statute Books, Mr. Speaker, when the Socialists have been successful in usurping a totalitarian control by this Government?

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition pointed out so very ably the other day that all of the rights in this Bill have long been cherished by our people. There is a legal rule which says through interpretation, in which it is stated in Latin: "Expressio unius est exclusio alterius", in English that means; the mention of one is the exclusion of the other. In other words, where in a Statute you purport to define certain rights or conditions you do by necessary implication of law exclude others which have been omitted. The courts will assume that the Legislature has purposely omitted those so that generally under this Bill it could be argued that any fundamental right which the Hon. Attorney General may have omitted from the Bill, may have been construed to have been expressly omitted and purposely excluded from it and that is the legal rule of statutory interpretation. The courts will not take into consideration that the Hon. Attorney General, I don't know, he seems to have taken time off between radio broadcasts to throw this Bill together, they'll have to take it that he knew what he was doing.

A few of the omissions have already been mentioned by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. For example; freedom of enterprise. Now I am aware that in Section 8 there has been some reference made to that but I do not think it goes far enough. We'll have to talk about the latter in Committee. The freedom of enterprise has been mentioned by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and by others. It's rather startling to think that by this Bill we may be excluded or that it might be interpreted in such a way that we did not have the right of freedom of enterprise. The little shop keepers, the little merchants, the independent farmers and all the other free and enterprising people of Saskatchewan had better keep a pretty close eye, I think on this so-called Bill of Rights. Freedom from discrimination upon political grounds, Mr. Speaker, has been omitted from this Bill. If one looks to see what happens to people in Russia, if they don't subscribe to socialism you'll see how important it is

that that provision should be omitted from this Bill, especially when you are dealing with a socialist Government. There may be other important freedoms which the Attorney General may have overlooked and no doubt we will all have an opportunity to help him when the Bill goes into Committee.

In the meantime, let me associate myself with the remarks of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, this Bill is a callous, cynical piece of socialist whimsy or political preference. It's a sort of a general anaesthetic administered to the body politic while the painful operation of socialism is preformed on them. I hope the Hon. Premier will try and say something in reply to what I have just said, he is very interesting and I hope we can keep him talking.

Mr. D.Z. Daniels (Pelly): — A great deal has been said in the years gone by, from the pulpit, from the front of the classroom, from the stage and from the public platform about our unlimited opportunities in this land of ours. To those who went through the depression years with nothing but an occasional slice of bread under their belts, that freedom did not mean very much. When they did not have the freedom to earn a living, when they were turned away from the door of this free enterprise that is so much wanted today, that freedom did not mean a snap of the fingers to them and it was really a hollow thing. When you find in this fair land of ours and in other countries, signs over the store – some such person not wanted here, Jews not allowed, or a particular race not permitted to go in there – when you find that certain hotels will refuse to give accommodation to people because they have a certain type of color of skin and this might offend some of their other guests. Then I say that it is time that somebody said something about it and passed some laws to restrict this type of free enterprise.

I can never forget the bitterness in the voice of a young girl when she was relating to me a little story of what happened during this last war. She had been a school teacher and we all know what school teaching meant in those days of depression. Many a school teacher left their jobs, not because they did not love that work, but because they saw no opportunity at all in it, went down East, not only because there was a little more money, but because they felt that they wanted to contribute a little of their efforts towards the greater war effort, towards the winning of a real victory. When she applied for one of these jobs they asked her certain questions and when they found out she was of central European origin, they told her she could not have a job. Mr. Speaker, four of her brothers – she had four brothers – were at that time in the Services. All had volunteered for the Services, two of them at that moment were overseas. Yet while her brothers were good enough to go and die for this country, she was not good enough to go and work in a war effort. That type of free enterprise is not a very free one. This prejudice is still with us in many places. It is a terribly divisive force and continues to be so in many communities throughout the land, deeply rooted in so many places and that smug feeling of so many people saying: “Oh, our gang is okay, but that other gang has B.O.”, is quite a prevalent thing. There are many types of prejudice that contribute to this divisive force. First of all there is the racial prejudice involving the color of skin, national origin, historical background and tradition. It deprives a great many groups social right that give political and economic right a meaning. One of the hangovers of the lack of

March 21, 1947

planning in the early settlement of the West is the segregation of different groups of people who came out here to make Canada their home into solid blocks, has prevented them from being understood and from understanding other national and ethnic groups here in the West and has slowed down a great deal the process of Canadianizing these people and making them truly worthy of this great West.

One other type of prejudice is class prejudice. It involves the type of work that you do, the clothes that you wear, the size of your bank account, or which side of the tracks you happen to live on. You see that sometimes in the larger cities, sometimes you see it out in the country too. The smugness and the up-turned nose at someone who just happens to be a menial worker – a person who happened to be wearing clothes bought somewhere, or at least they claimed they were bought on Fifth Avenue in New York, look down a great deal on those people who happen to be wearing overalls or ordinary work clothes, forgetting all the time that their luxury and all the fine conveniences in their homes, are made possible through the efforts of those people who go down into the bowels of the earth to dig up the coal to keep these people warm. Those people who will go out and do the dirty work on the farm, to raise the chickens and the pigs and to milk the cows so that they have something for their tables. If I had my way I would like to take some of these smoothies and have them go out and try to milk a cow and churn the butter before they have any of that butter to spread on their bread. Then they might have a little more respect for the farmer's wife and daughter who have to go and do this work today. They would know and appreciate what it is to bring these things to their tables instead of having it brought before them as it is very often done. The simple folk that do the hard work should have the right to hold their heads just as high as anyone else.

I recall, when I went to public school, we once took up the poem of Gray's 'Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard'. I remember certain verses that stick out of that poem that come back to me time and again. They run something like this:

Let not ambition mock their useful toil,
Their homely joys and destiny obscure;
Nor grandeur hear with a disdainful smile,
The short and simple annals of the poor.

Perhaps in that neglected spot is laid,
Some heart once pregnant with celestial fire;
Hands that the rod of empire might have swayed,
Or waked to ecstasy a living lyre.

But knowledge to their eyes, her ample page,
Rich with the spoils of time did not unroll;
Chill penury repressed their noble rage,
And froze the genial current of their soul.

This describes, very ably, what often is the desire and the hope of many a young lad out on the farm, or in the factories, or the mines, or anywhere where they happen to be. They would too, if given the opportunity, aspire to some of those heights that other people have aspired to and gained, because of special opportunities that they have had.

One other great means of segregation, often bringing about

a certain amount of prejudice, is the segregation of different religious groups, the divisive force there because of lack of true Christianity and that segregation to religious faction is a mockery of the common tenant of all religions, the brotherhood of man. Then there are professional prejudices, Mr. Speaker, and they are far from eradicated from our province or from our land here. I recall how the papers just reeked with antagonism and criticism of the proposed Professional Act Revision, how they feared that some of the special privileges that they may have, or may not have under those Acts, might be tampered with and the papers played up this, in protection of those who are the friends of free enterprise.

Not so long ago, I think that many Members of this House along with myself, saw a picture in the Capital Theatre here, a picture depicting the story of a great woman – Nurse Kenny – a lifetime of struggle; of trying to bring about a new cure that she had discovered. And what happened to her? Every time that she tried to get someone to recognize that importance of saving lives and the saving of health and bringing back people to normal health, she was turned down -because she was in a lower strata of society. She was only a nurse and how could the medical profession, according to what the picture portrayed, believe that someone below their strata, without the knowledge and the training that they had, bring about something different that could be better than what they had before. Not only that but therein (I am sorry that the Member for Maple Creek is not here when I say this), I could detect all through the picture the fact that she was looked down upon because she was a member of the female sex, and all the more reason why her discovery of a new kind of treatment for polio took well over 30 years before it was recognized. She went over three continents before it finally made certain headway and it is still held in prejudice in certain quarters of the world.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! In the debate on this Motion for second reading of Bill No. 65 – An Act respecting Certain Civil Rights – Members have been straying far away from the subject matter. I must ask Members speaking to the Motion to stay closer to it.

Mr. Daniels: — Mr. Speaker, I feel that that has a bearing. This all deals with what we are trying to prevent and that is prejudice and certain intolerance that has been evidenced in the past, and that is why I said what I did. This thing that we call prejudice is very ably described here by Dr. Franklin Thery of the University of California, Los Angeles, and I will quote from the Social Service Digest, Volume No. 11, of January, 1947. Here is what he says about democracy and the freedom of which this Bill speaks:

Democracy in our nation is doomed if in the coming decades racialism which degrades and debases the basic concepts of Americanism is not reduced to the vanishing points. At least four-fifths of the American population harbor race prejudices and group hostilities in their mental framework. Over a long range period prejudices can be eradicated by: first, making available educational opportunities to all individuals and communities on an equalized bias. Second, greeting situations in which prejudice is not the profitable or desired mode of behavior.

March 21, 1947

If necessary, prejudice must be made illegal and I think this Bill definitely tends to do that, Mr. Speaker, making job discrimination impossible, ending discrimination in public places, that definitely is contained in that Bill. Putting a stop to segregation and restrictive convenance in residential neighborhoods. I do not know whether that applies here, but the last one combating racialism among educators themselves. There are a great many organizations that fight for liberation and advancement, too often we will find that this liberation is for a special group, and that special group thinks of no one else in that battle but of themselves. I think that they would be far better off in these groups, wanting something for themselves, would say: I want this for the rest of society – if it is good for me, it should be good for others too, and when those people who oppose inequality, or fight those who foster prejudice may continue in their present complaisancy, that is if they do the fighting the way they are doing it today, those who enjoy special privileges will continue in a complaisancy so long as the Negroes are only fighting for the Negroes, and the Jews only for the Jews, and the Ukrainians fight for things that the Ukrainians want, and labor for the labor people, women only for women and so on down the line, off the long list of those who are discriminated against today, in many places in the world. But when all these groups can unitedly attack the source of inequality, when they fight for human equality instead of just for their own, then we will see complaisancy disturbed and ease become uneasiness.

Now, in closing, I would just like to give you a little article that describes so ably what I have been trying to point out as what I feel will be the benefits of this Bill, Mr. Speaker. It is an article called “Martyrs and Heroes Fight Against Mans’ Inhumanity to Man’, by Robret McIver, Professor of Columbia University, who is a French philosopher and socialist who said:

All I owe to you, I owe to myself; what I do for you, I do for myself; what I do against you, I do against myself.

These words contain the core of the lesson we must seek to learn. The greatest peril of modern society is the exclusiveness of group against group in which the stronger group shuts out the weaker from sharing the benefits and opportunities of the common wheel and which the stronger grow proud and hard and intolerant and prejudiced, denying their common humanity in which the weaker groups grow bitter and frustrated so that on all sides anger increases and energies of men are turned from creativeness to destructiveness, from co-operative gain to universal loss and the consummation of this evil thing is here before our eyes the final inhumanity of man to man.

Let us ask ourselves – what have the intolerant gained from their intolerance? What have their persecutors reaped after the persecution? When we read the history of what happened to Hitler and his crowd, we say – What have they gained? What did the Czarist Russia Achieve from its programs? What have the Nazis gained from their cry and fury against the Jewish people? They have gained the most terrible of all retributions, such ruin upon ruin that has never been visited on a country since civilization began. What did they gain against the Jews – against all groups but their own? They did against themselves. The same law holds, though it may waste the time, though the persecutors may triumph for a season, hatred breeds hatred, as fear breeds

fear. Men sold the dragons teeth and the dragon could, alas, arise and devour them.

Now, I do not want to bore the House with the full text of this, but I want to say that there is indeed an urgent need for enlightenment for a different outlook and I hope that this Bill will bring about those very things, will help to be a guide to the people, as the Hon. Minister of Education mentioned, I too hope that it will be read in a great many places throughout the country. There is urgent need for it. We have never really tried it in its fullest contents. This same person said in his closing paragraph:

Now is the time. There is another and even harder victory to win, a victory of the mind, not of the sword, for this fight we have never yet formed our ranks, we shall be fighting for the truth, for the brotherhood of man, for the well-being and the unity of our land. If we keep these banners before us, we shall conquer in the end.

This, Mr. Speaker, can be considered as the contribution of this province of ours towards that fight for eradicating the prejudices and things that tend to divide us and keep us apart. If we need these things among individuals, we need understanding and a common goal of this kind and I say that we need it among provinces, among nations, all through the world, seeing that we have just passed through a terrific war, and we still have to settle the things and win the things that really were fought for.

Mr. Speaker, believing that this Bill will do a great deal towards this very thing that we so much need in the world today, I will support it wholeheartedly.

Mr. W. Burgess (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, when a question as fundamental as that dealt with in this Bill No. 65 is before the Legislature, I feel that it is a privilege to express myself on the matters involved. Some people might argue and do argue that it is unnecessary to pass a Bill of rights in a province like Saskatchewan. It is perhaps true that we are less troubled by the evils of intolerance than most people. That, if true, is something for which we ought to be thankful. The fundamental principles involved in this Bill can hardly be restated too often. Freedom is a right of man. It is something that has been upheld by the best minds of all the ages. The contribution of any people to the welfare of the race might very fairly be measured by the contribution that they have made to the freedoms and liberties of mankind.

The Greeks, mentioned before in this debate, with their democratic methods of government, their equality under the law, made the greatest contribution which was made by that great race to the history of mankind. The Hebrew writings, which formed the basis of our so-called Christian civilization, taught nothing if they did not teach the right of man to be free. The ancient story of the Israelites labouring under their taskmasters, and the sin of Pharaoh (his sin, by the way, was that he would not set the people free) is a story of a people seeking freedom of expression, freedom of worship, freedom to develop according to the dictates of their conscience, and to develop the God-given right of man to be free. The history of the race is nothing more

March 21, 1947

nor less than a story of the struggle for freedom against enslavement, a battle between right and wrong. Our human institutions must be recognized as more good than evil if their effect is a wider acceptance of the principles of liberty.

We have come to accept certain fundamentals as necessary for the preservation and extension of liberty: freedom of speech; freedom of assembly; freedom of the press and it seems to be that these basic rights cannot be reiterated too often. Freedom of speech may sometimes be improperly used. Things may be said that would be better left unsaid; but the fact that some people sometimes make improper use of the freedom of speech is not a good enough argument for its being taken away. It is also true that the press may at times, under certain circumstances, forget their responsibility to the people they serve. It may be true that the influence of the press is not always the best possible influence, but nevertheless it is just as necessary that men may be free to write as it is that they be free to speak, or free to think. The exercise of the principle of free discussion will enable us to separate the true from the false, the wheat from the chaff.

Freedom is, first of all, Sir, an individual matter. Our religion teaches us that man is a free agent; that he is able and expected to choose the right and turn down the evil. That is not even peculiar to our religion; it has been a fundamental philosophy in the great philosophies of the human race.

Now, in our development of civilization, it has been found often that true liberty can be best, or can only be found by collective action and so we have seen the development of the tribes, the monarchies and the various forms of government up to our democratic machinery of government. These various systems have contributed to the history of the race, to the cultural inheritance of the ancients, in worthwhile things, very largely in accordance with the contribution that they have made to the cause of freedom.

We people of the British race have just cause for pride in the contribution that has been made by our people in the finding of a workable plan of self-government. No man should be a slave; no man has the right or the wisdom to arrogate to himself the right to be another's master. Lincoln said: "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master." Self-discipline is the highest form of right behavior. Better that the individual act with fairness and justice towards his neighbor because it is the right thing to do, than do it because it is in accordance with a law that might be passed by this or any other Legislature. Democracy is the idea or ideal of self-discipline brought into the sphere of government or of national organization. We have developed in the British countries a parliamentary system of government as a machine to give effect to the people's will. I know that parliaments and legislatures are not perfect. They could scarcely be expected to be perfect. It is nevertheless the best method that has yet been discovered to safeguard the rights of the individual and to make possible the expression of his best thought in the matters of government. And, Mr. Speaker, ordinary members should remember that on us rests, in no small degree, the responsibility for the maintenance of the dignity and the usefulness of parliamentary procedure. The world has been cursed through all the ages by people, both in responsible positions and in their individual capacity, who, without sufficient examination, follow demagogues, or 'blind' leaders, to their

own injury and the injury of the race. Members of Parliament, legislators, in a country such as ours, with its long history and wide experience, with its numerous examples of the seriousness of any cessation of vigilance, should be every-mindful of our responsibility. Government by Order-in-Council, Mr. Speaker, must never be permitted to take the place of Government by legislation. The most serious mistakes that have taken place in Canada have been the result of ill-conceived Order-in-Council, not parliamentary action. For example, our treatment of the Canadian-born Japanese people was done by Order-in-Council, not by parliamentary enactment. This is not to say that the men who passed these executive orders were not men of good will, were not anxious to do what was best and right; but it is merely to say that laws are best when passed in open Parliament with free discussion, with decisions openly arrived at. Mistakes even then can happen. They happen under any system; but experience shows that the Parliamentary method is the best yet devised.

There are possibilities of danger to the rights of minorities even in a democracy. People sometimes become tremendously enthused about some possibly worthwhile thing and the majority may find themselves, or think themselves thwarted, or slowed down by what seems to be an obnoxious minority; but minorities often turn out to be right. It is not unknown even in Canada, for a statue to be erected to a man who was tried for treason in his Legislature and afterwards a statue was erected to his name in the grounds of the same Legislature in which he was tried.

I said before that we cannot too often reiterate the fundamentals referred to in this Bill, because the meaning and application that we give to democracy will decide our survival and decide the survival of liberty. I would like to quote the definition of democracy, which is given in Life Magazine, of February 17th:

Democracy means freedom. All men should participate actively in selecting leaders, in shaping laws, in discharging the responsibilities of government. Every man should be free to think, to act, to speak, to write, to create, to approve and to criticize, to assemble and organize, to choose an occupation, to move from place to place, to improve his conditions, to worship God if he chooses, to pursue in his own way truth and happiness. Freedom is the ancient, eternal and implacable foe of totalitarianism and every form of tyranny over the bodies and minds of men.

It is to safeguard fundamental rights like these, so far as that is possible by legislation, that this Bill is proposed and for this reason I support it.

The Act before us provides that citizens shall have the right to join professional societies, trade associations, occupational groups, without regard to their religious or racial characteristics. We have in Saskatchewan one common grouping of society in which this has always been written into their very articles of association. I refer to the co-operative movement. It is a matter of great pride to me as a firm believer in co-operative development that the co-operative movement has never recognized any difference on racial or religious lines and it has thereby in my opinion, evidenced the true appreciation of real Christian principles. Unfortunately, churches have not nearly so good a record in this respect. Many are the crimes that have been

March 21, 1947

committed in the name of religion. Much of the intolerance of the world has been the result of the fanaticism of sincere but misguided people, who, because of a profound faith in their own doctrines, were not willing to tolerate differences of opinion. Politicians sometimes also have been so convinced of the rightness of the cause they espouse that they have been willing to stifle their consciences with the argument that the end would justify the means.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a proper pride in the achievements of the race to which we happen to belong can be a good thing. Inspiration to be derived from the better traditions of our race may help us to better things. Carried to excess, it can develop a smug superiority which will only lead to friction and unhappiness. The Anglo-Saxons have much to be thankful for, have much to be proud of; but they have too often not given to the world the best that might have been expected from a people so richly blessed.

It is good to realize and express the conviction that there is no real difference in the essentials that can be traced to racial or religious difference entirely. Although many the wars that have been fought and much the suffering that has been caused by intolerance of one man, or another's religion, or the intolerance of one man for the color of another man's skin. Children of different colors could play together as happily as chickens in a brooder house, if they were not conditioned by the prejudices taught to them by their elders.

We, of the English-speaking race, have, in this day, in the words of a great man, "truly a rendezvous with destiny". Our youth have fought and won a terrible war, but their victory will turn to ashes unless people like us rise above ourselves and so legislate that peace and freedom can really be secured. Each and every generation will, of course, have to guard its liberty, because it would see, Mr. Speaker, that anything worth having must be worked for. There is no 'royal road' to liberty, and the danger will always be present because the greatest danger lies in taking things for granted, in failing to appreciate our greatest gifts.

We, Mr. Speaker, in this Legislature, might even look at ourselves. We represent the parliamentary system in this province and we should surely be jealous of the dignity of this House. Surely our debates could be carried on on a somewhat higher plane. Good manners and courtesy, not to mention tolerance, might make us recognize that the other fellow is entitled to his opinion, however wrong that opinion might be; that he might even be sincere in his opinions, and that, when he displays a lack of the finer instincts, we should be sorry rather than answer jibe with jibe, because, Mr. Speaker, when the tone of debate in this Chamber becomes lowered to that of the street brawl, we here are doing more harm to the institution of parliamentary government by democratic processes than the enemies of freedom could themselves do.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to direct a few words to the Members of my own Party – not that I presume to be a preacher capable of preaching sermons to anyone; but because we have a peculiar responsibility. I have said before in this House that I was attracted to the CCF by the democratic nature of its organization more than anything else. It seemed to me that we were in the process of building a really democratic organization

through which ordinary men and women might really take possession of our democratic government and use it to make for a more abundant life. Where, instead of an exasperated sense of frustration with the institution of voting and a sense of personal insignificance, that we felt, we could by intelligent interest make this CCF org an instrument to give effect to the will of the people for a better condition of society. A condition of more real freedom: freedom of work, to plan, freedom from grinding poverty, freedom to think, freedom to worship, freedom to really exercise our initiative and to make our greatest possible contribution to the times in which we live. We were not organizing just another political party. Whether we hold office or not is in itself not important, but that we remain true to the ideals of liberty that sent us here is of first consequence; that we stand for the principles of brotherhood rather than the law of the jungle. If we are to accept the responsibility of leadership we will make mistakes, and a definite program requires to establish the right to live, to produce and to distribute the results of prod.

As I have said before, it is not to free enterprise but to 'economic cannibalism' that I am opposed. Mr. Speaker, in one of the speeches we listened to, this afternoon, the speaker appeared very much frightened or concerned that this CCF party was ceasing to be democratic, or was not or never had been democratic. Surely a party formed as ours was can claim to be democratic. In its genesis that was correct because it was born in the hearts and minds of the people and it drew and it still draws its sustenance from the freedom-loving farmers of Saskatchewan. Why anyone should be alarmed that an organization of that kind could ever become really a menace to the liberties of man, frankly, to me, Mr. Speaker, is somewhat amusing. We may be, if we are wise enough, be the leaders in the cause of liberty and democracy; but we must constantly remind ourselves that we are the servants, not the masters, of this society, and that he who serves best is best qualified to lead.

Democratic government requires an acceptance or a willingness on the part of the people. A free people may accept leadership, but they cannot be driven and remain a free people. Theories of economics are not nearly as important as the fundamentals of liberty.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I be so bold as to say a few words to our friends of the Opposition. Liberalism should be a fine doctrine and those who genuinely hold to its principles can claim to be champions of democracy and liberty. I hasten to assure them that I do not claim for myself or for my present associates any monopoly of the love of liberty. That Liberalism is desecrated when those who claim to be its spokesmen permit themselves to become the party of special privileges, or when, having been long in office, they get into the frame of mind that they are God's chosen people, the custodians of the right of government; that others who may advance different ideas for the welfare of the State are upstarts or worse, who ought to be stamped upon by ridicule and abuse. They must remember that Liberalism's only claim to greatness lies in the fact that its early leaders were reformers who blazed new trails, and that when it ceases to be a reform party, it ceases to be Liberal.

We are passing this 'Bill of Rights', Mr. Speaker, here in the Saskatchewan Legislature and are as it were using it as a means to rededicate ourselves to the principles of right and

March 21, 1947

brotherhood as against wrong and exploitation. Of love being better than hate, co-operation better than strife, and that we intend as a people in this province, to weld together the people of all races and creeds into a community of free men retaining, if possible, the best in the traditions of all their races. To build from the experience and the wide expansion of liberty bequeathed to us by our fathers, a nobler Canadian citizenship of which we may in very truth be proud. That will make the children of men who are yet unborn say that these men in the Saskatchewan Legislature were builders in their day and generation. If we are doing this, Mr. Speaker, we are doing well; if we are doing something else we are just plain hypocrites.

Let us pass this Bill of Rights and hope that, in its passing, we are helping forward the great cause of liberty to which we are all dedicated and that we, the people of Saskatchewan, shall so govern our hearts and actions that we will bring closer the day envisaged by Robbie Burns, when he said:

Then let us pray, as come it may –
As come it will for a' that –
May bear the grie and a' that,
For a' that and a' that,
It's coming yet for a' that,
That mankind the world o'er,
Shall brothers be for a' that.

Mr. D.M. Lazorko (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take my part in this debate, I realize that the subject has been covered very well by all the speakers who have taken part in it up to the present time, but there are a few points I would like to touch on before this Bill is passed.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition, speaking to this Bill the other day, said that we should look at the history and background of the matter involved under this Bill. I have been fortunate, or unfortunate, to have lived and experienced a lot of things involved in this Bill. From my childhood I have seen people of their own will, or otherwise, coming from different parts of the world, because of one discrimination or another: the Englishman, the Scotsman, the Irishman predominantly because of economic discrimination. People of Central European origin because of economic, religious and national discriminations, all looking for a new land where they could build up a new life and build up something better than what they have known in past history. That is how we have seen all these peoples thrown together on our western prairies from 40 years back and who, during that time, began to build a new country, a new life, and a better life than what their ancestors had known.

I have seen discrimination which possibly had been the worst kind of discrimination possible in this part of the country. I have seen young men and women who had gone through University, who could not obtain employment just because their names ended with a –chk or a –ski, or something else. I have seen school teachers who could not find jobs because of the same reason. I have seen other people who could not find other employment just because of the same reason. I have seen many other types of discrimination in years gone by. During the last number of years, under pressure of the world conflict, a lot of this has been done away with, but at the same time today we again are

beginning to see this same type of discrimination or that same inclination to build up that certain type of discrimination being revived, where people because of national origin or racial origin, or their beliefs, are again being singled out, especially by vested interest and the people who are sponsoring them and who are the willing tools of vested interest are again beginning to revive, or are trying to revive this same discrimination.

It was mentioned by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that the British people have had these rights for a long time. I would say that predominantly the English people had these rights for a long time. We need only to look back into the pages of the Irish and Scottish history to see a lot of discrimination that had gone on in those countries, where Irishmen could not hold their own land because they were Irish in their own country. There are a few black pages in English history but at the same time British history is a history of a people who have been in the forefront of developing democracy, of extending rights to a much wider section of their peoples than in any other country on the face of the earth. From the Magna Carta down to the Atlantic Charter, each one of the rights as they were fought for by the common people of that country and accepted, were finally put on the statute books as part and parcel of their every day lives and not just as window dressing as some p have referred to this Act. I believe that English and all the others who have, during centuries of struggle, for the rights of the people in their countries when they have attained, and putting it on the Statute Books is acknowledgement that this is a right of all the people within that country.

We have heard, a good many times in the past, reference of an idea or an accepted rule which has been carried out by vested interests or by people in control in countries or nations where the idea was to divide the common people among themselves and whereby, through that division, those vested interests or people in control at that time could rule and control that country that much easier. From what was said by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in debating this Bill the other day, it seems to me that he is not interested so much in the rights of the common man as in the rights of the privileged classes of this country. He is not interested to see the different people of different national origin who have been thrown together in this country, of seeing these people fused together into one people, into a Canadian people. That does not seem to be his interest, but his interest seems to be, as stated by himself, rather the protection of the capitalists privileges within this country. I believe myself, that by any Act of this Legislature we can advance the fusion of the people in this country, we can advance the co-operative idea and work of the people, who will work together for the common good that we have advanced democracy that much further. The statement so often repeated by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the other day, that he is not opposed to this Bill, leads me to believe that he is opposed. From past experiences, as far as I have been able to ascertain, anything that has been repeated as often as this statement was repeated the other day, shows in the final analysis that a statement so often repeated is diametrically opposed, or the opposite of the belief or stand that they will take and do take at all times. I may say they will not oppose this Bill when it is voted upon, because they dare not oppose it. The interests of this country and the interests of the people here demand that we all become one and one only, one nation and one people undivided by anything that may be brought up at any time.

March 21, 1947

with the Canadian Citizenship Bill passed in Ottawa, for the first time in Canadian history bringing into being by law a Canadian nation and bringing into being by law a Canadian citizenship. I think that this Act which will be passed by this Legislature is very timely to further develop and help the development of a sound Canadian citizenship. We speak so much nowadays of equality of nations. We are trying to do that through a United Nations organization. I think we can do a lot towards making the United Nations a success by beginning to do some of these things here at home. As I said, before, the cosmopolitan population that has been thrown together here can be and will be fused into one solid nation; a nation that will be awake to its own needs and at the same time to the needs of other peoples of the world. As in the past British peoples have given, through the development of democracy and democratic form of government within their own country. I think we can, and that we will, through the further development of democracy in this country, further extend all the rights which should be held by everyone, and we can do our share in the progress of mankind across the face of this earth.

Mr. P.J. Hodge (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, the matter under discussion is one which is particularly dear to my heart, belonging to what is sometimes described as a minority group and it is for that reason that I just wish to make a few remarks in this connection. I may say at the outset I am fully in accord with the principles enunciated in this Bill and my chief concern is only in connection with the interpretation of this Act and of its application.

I think the summary of this Bill could be stated to be that the right of every person should be to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. I think that probably embraces the whole of this Bill, Now those of us who were born in this country regard this as being an inalienable right, but as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, when he so ably discussed this Bill, this right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness has been gained through a painful struggle of political evolution. It is not a matter of right that we are enjoying these privileges but has been attained by a great deal of struggle and we should be therefore very, very careful not to let any of these liberties go by.

In the constituency of Rosthern, the majority of the citizens are either of Dutch descent or Ukrainian descent, and we also have some French and some other nationalities, but the majority of the residents of that district belong to either of those two groups, frequently referred to as minority groups. Now both of these groups, at least many of them who are now there, and the forefathers of others, came from the same country, namely the Ukraine in Russia. In this country so far as I know they did not have this right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness to nearly the same extent that they are enjoying here. They came to this country principally in order to have those privileges, and I sometimes think they probably, on that account, appreciate this right more so than even a native Canadian, because we have never known any other right, but they know that there are many countries in this world where these rights do not exist and for that reason they appreciate them probably even more so than native born Canadians. Even though my people came from Russia, their forefathers came from the Netherlands. In that country they have dykes to keep out the waters of the ocean and they sometimes have seen a break in these dykes and know the

devastation that follows. For that reason they very carefully watch any little deterioration in the dykes, and, politically speaking, they regard these rights that we have been discussing in this Bill as political dykes and anything which they think is a deterioration of these rights is watched with a great deal of concern.

Now there are one or two matters which they consider to be in this category. For instance in sections two and three of the Act, we are told that we have the right to freedom of conscience and the right to freedom of expression. But, after listening to the radio address of the Attorney General, where he intimated that people who did not have the same political philosophy as himself; and so on, that there should be a court established for them, they should be tried if they doubted the sincerity of those statements. Now then, section four says that every person shall enjoy the right to assembly peacefully with others and form with others association of any character under the law. Now I do not know whether school districts come under that category, but it is an association of a kind and prior to 1944 the people had the right to form districts as they wished and to govern them, but now that right has been taken away. Under section six, we are supposed to have an election every five years, but as I stated many of the people in the Rosthern district come from Russia, and they have a constitution there also, but they also know that the elections are not being held. I have here a book called Political Handbook of the World – 1946, and in it, referring to the Supreme Council of Russia, it mentions this:

The Presidium shall act as an executive and direct the cause between the session of the Supreme Council, elections to the Supreme Soviet that have been held annually in December were postponed since 1941. The powers of the present party have been extended until 1946 by presidential decree.

and then it mentions also:

Another high organ of the Party is the All Union Party Congress, which according to the Party Statute, is supposed to meet at least once every three years, but actually has only met twice in the last fourteen years.

Now I am not saying that the present Government will not hold elections according to this Act but I merely say that many people in the Rosthern constituency have come from a country where they had a constitution guaranteeing elections at certain times, but these elections were not held.

Now then, section seven guarantees the right to employment; but we have The Trade Union Act which provides that unless you join a union within a certain length of time, you cannot get employment.

According to section eight, we have the right to engage in occupations, but this is disappearing as well. We had many insurance agents in this province, we have the Mennonite Mutual Fire Insurance Company and at all times, prior to 1944, they were permitted to engage freely in business. But now, under The Company Insurance Act, many of these agents cannot engage in certain lines of insurance; and this company cannot insure school houses the way they did before. The same thing applies

March 21, 1947

to the Automobile Accident Insurance which can only attend certain types which can only be written now by the Government Insurance office. Crown corporations take away employment from certain individuals and engage in very unfair competition with others.

Then, we are supposed to have the right to own property, but according to the provisions of The Trade Union Act, the property can be effectively confiscated. We also have another instance of confiscation of property and that is under The Mineral Rights Act. Unless you now pay tax on mineral rights they are confiscated by the Crown. We are supposed to have the right to membership for veteran society. Well we still have that, but this enquiry which was held here not so long ago made some of us rather suspicious as to the intensity of the Government in that respect. We have also heard a good deal, by the Attorney General and others, regarding the matter of tolerance and equality and this sort of thing. But I must associate myself with the remarks of the Member for the Mediterranean. I thought the Minister's remarks concerning the members of the Assiniboia Club did not contain just as much tolerance as could have been expected on an occasion of this kind and also his attack on combines, cartels and so on. There has been a great deal said in this House at various times about these vested interests and so on, of combines and so on. I think it is up to a large extent imaginary. When we go to any one of these cities, towns, or villages in Saskatchewan where are these vested interests that we speak about It is true enough that we buy most of our goods from some large concern, or some other place, but so far as Saskatchewan itself is concerned, I fail to see where these vested interests are. We are all for the small businessman and I think we should confine ourself to this province and not talk about vested interests that exist somewhere else.

Then, that tolerance is certainly not shown in The Trade Union Act, where, I think, was pointed out when the Bill was passed that the employers rights have certainly not been very highly regarded, because whenever an employee is dismissed, the employer must show that he is guilty of labor infractions when it should be the other way around.

I think intolerance has also been shown by this Government in disregard of courts in connection with the Insurance Act and with Automobile Insurance Act, Trade unions Act, even in connection with a recent Bill which was passed in regard to assessment where the judge was eliminated and someone else put in place. Also city Acts, the judge used to be on the police commission and now some member of the council takes his place.

A matter of ecology has also been stressed, but this is not apparent in some of the legislation in the past year. For instance, take the matter of seed grain. Those who have already paid cannot get any refund. Surely that is a glaring instance of inequality.

Now I do not wish to bore this House with a repetition of its errors, but I just want to mention a few of these points that show that, although this Statute is being opposed, it will no doubt be enacted. The record of this Government certainly is not in accordance with the spirit and intent of this Act and it is needed in view of the record of this Government in those instances that I have already mentioned, and others which could

be shown. The Bill is actually more or less just a repetition of platitude, and it reminds me more or less of safe insight description for his own purpose. Now, there are actual, in my opinion, although I am quite in accord of what it said in the Bill, objections to the passing of a Bill of this description. I agree with the Member for the Mediterranean when he said that once you codify a law that is supposed to represent the law, and anything not contained in the law is excluded therefrom. Now here you enumerate certain rights, but there are other rights that should be included, as was pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition. I think for that reason it would be much better not to codify the law at all. We have been getting along fairly well without a Statute of this nature and I think it would, in order to effectively protect our rights, probably be better not to codify it for fear we might leave out some rights which we now possess. I think, as it has been stated here, that these rights should be every once in awhile re-affirmed and re-stated, certainly I agree with that; particularly this Government I think should have these rights in very large letters on each desk to remind each one of them of it, but at the same time I do not think it should be necessary to put them in the form of statute just on this account.

Mr. Valleau: — Would he then suggest that such documents as Magna Carta, Bill of Rights, Declaration of Independence, should not have been written because they did not include everything?

Mr. Hooge: — As pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition before, these documents that the Hon. Member refers to were not Statutes. For instance that one, Magna Carta, that was an agreement that was reached between the King and certain of his nobles.

Now, in connection with the matter of discrimination, I am certainly in agreement that these discriminations should be abolished if they exist. My people have very often been referred to as foreigners and for that reason possibly have been subjected to a certain amount of discrimination. Now, being the son of the so-called foreigner, I have on certain occasions possibly been subjected to a certain amount of discrimination, but I cannot complain too much. I must say that I have really been very fairly treated in this province, in the Province of Manitoba and in any province where I have ever been, so that the matter of discrimination mentioned by the Member for Redberry on the count of nationality does not seem to me to apparent. But, I think that the fact that this is in the Statute is going to cause a certain amount of embarrassment and it could be made the instrument of oppression. Supposing you advertise for labor, and half a dozen or so apply, and you probably only want one. Well, you have got to exercise your judgment and select one out of that bunch. Well, someone may be a Hungarian, one may be Ukrainian, one may be Dutch, and another may be Irish, and so forth. Well, he may select the Irishman, then the others would say: "He took the Irishman because we were Dutch, or we were Hungarian, or Ukrainian." Where are you going to draw the line? It seems to me that that is rather dangerous (although I am fully in accord with it, that there should be no discrimination), but once you enact it and then have a fine when you do not comply with it, it seems to me that you are putting your very powerful instrument into the hands of certain people for oppression. After all, the idea of exercising tolerance and so on is a matter more or less of virtue. It should not be a matter of Statute.

March 21, 1947

You cannot legislate virtue into the minds of people and I do not think that (although as I say, I am in favor of the intention of the Act) once you put it in the form of a Statute, then you are confronted with realistic conditions, where you have to exercise judgment and choose between one or another, well, it seems to me on every one of those occasions, some action could be brought against you because you did not happen to choose that person.

Now as to the Bill itself (although I have no objection to it) I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that if the Bill is enacted and no doubt it will be it should be extended. It should contain further power and one thing, in any event, it should contain, is the definition of the word 'freedom' which is mentioned here a number of times. The conception of this Government regarding freedom seems to be quite different to the conception that some of us hold and no doubt in Russia and in other Socialistic countries, they also use the word freedom, but their conception seems to be quite different and I think, therefore, it would be very essential that the definition of freedom should be contained in this Act.

I just want to refer briefly to a few remarks that were made by some of the other speakers. The Minister of Municipal Affairs referred to his experience in talking to certain people in a certain cons who were afraid to talk to him, after the election they said they had been afraid to vote CCF. Now, before the election they apparently were afraid to talk to him, well I think it probably would have been better for the people of this province had more of them been afraid to talk to the CCF canvassers.

The Minister of Education said that we should be reminded of the duties and responsibilities, referring to this Act, I quite agree with that and I think that particularly this Government should be reminded of this daily. He, apparently, referred to the Socialism which has been introduced in Great Britain as a political evolution. Well the progress which that Government has made up to date certainly does not seem to be very impressive and I do not think that that shows any degree of evolution at all, in fact I think it shows retrogression, if anything. He also seemed to refer to the two world wars as being the fruits of free enterprise, but I never knew that the world wars, which started by nations, particularly emphasized free enterprise, and I think, therefore, that argument does not apply at all. The Member for Yorkton, I believe it was, blamed discrimination on free enterprise. I cannot see anything in this argument at all. This is a matter of individual taste or judgment, I expect that a CCF, a Tory, or a Liberal is faced with a choice of employment, choice of vocation and this sort of thing many times, and whether he belongs to one party or the other, he has to exercise this judgment. That is what the Member for Yorkton probably calls discrimination, but probably it should be called choice. Now this Miss Kenny's theory apparently, the non-acceptance of that for a while, was also blamed on free enterprise. The medical profession must necessarily be very jealous of certain innovations, very many new remedies and quack remedies of one thing or another, would otherwise be forced on the public. In fact too many are now and I think a careful and exhaustive examination should be given any new theory, particularly one treating such an important disease as the one that was treated by Miss Kenny. Once it is found that the treatment is effective, no doubt it will be accepted by the medical profession. I have a very high regard for the medical profession here and in other countries.

I think that they are one of the most democratic societies that we have. In industry very often we find that if somebody invents a certain new process of some kind, they immediately patent it and try to make money from it. But in the medical profession I have never known them to try and make money out of a new discovery. They will test it until they find its real efficacious, then they will print it in the Journal and make it available to all the other doctors and to the world. I think the doctors are really and truly endeavouring to protect the public, to protect us, by very carefully scrutinizing any new theory of treatment that is being advocated publicly.

I am fully in accord with the remarks of the Member for Wolseley, and I hope that the Members of this Government will take all that he said fully to heart. With regard to the remarks of the Member for Redberry, I did not think that, although he spoke of tolerance, his remarks pertaining to the Leader of the Opposition, certainly did not show that degree of tolerance which he apparently wanted to advocate.

The debate was adjourned on the motion of Mr. Benson.

The Assembly adjourned at 6:00 o'clock p.m.