

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fourth Session – Tenth Legislature**  
**40<sup>th</sup> Day**

Wednesday, March 26, 1947

The Assembly met at 11:00 o'clock a.m.  
On the Orders of the Day.

**SECOND READINGS**

Hon. O.W. Valleau (Minister of Social Welfare) moved second reading of **Bill No. 95 – An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act, 1946.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, in the number of clarifications that can be considered, there are two that might be regarded as new principles involved in the Act.

The first one is that under the Bill it is proposed that parents shall be made responsible for the welfare of their children. While there is an inference to that effect under the Deserted Wives' and Childrens' Maintenance Act, nevertheless that Act is formulated primarily for the purpose of providing protection to the wife. To a certain extent it is considered that the children are only incidental so far as the wording of the Act is concerned. I would like the House to note also, that we, in the amendments of the Child Welfare Act, used the word "parents" not the word "father." Also, in the same section it is provided that in the future in Saskatchewan a stepfather or a stepmother shall be responsible for the welfare of their stepchildren providing that they are aware of the existence of the children upon the time that they married the mother or the father of the said children.

The second principle involved in the Bill, last year when we were putting the new Child Welfare Act through the House, we were endeavouring to frame it in such a way that it would not be regarded as a criminal charge where we place the putative father in affiliation proceedings upon the witness stand. In the actual working of the Act during the past year, it has been found that we probably went a little too far and that we have had difficulty, in fact in many cases we have been completely unable to enforce our orders, although the Act has given us the power to secure convictions, yet we have been unable to enforce our orders. In cases where affiliation orders have been placed against a man, who proceeded to divest himself of his property by giving it to a near relative and in some cases to the mother or something like that, and then we are unable to enforce the Act against him. The amendments proposed in this Bill will put a good deal more teeth in the Act. I believe that the particulars can be better discussed in Committee.

I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, move that the Act be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Valleau (Minister of Social Welfare) moved second reading of **Bill No. 96 – An Act to amend The Partnership Act.**

He said: This Act provides that a

portion of the fees collected at the time the partnership is registered may be forwarded to the Provincial Secretary. Well, I think that was intended in the previous Act yet the way the previous Act read, or the Act which is at present on the Statute Books, that the fees are retained by the Registrar in the Court House and the Provincial Secretary is under the necessity of doing the work and keeping the files without having any claim upon even a portion of the fees collected from the registration of the partnership.

I think that that is the principle part of the Bill and I move second reading.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of **Bill No. 97 – An Act to amend An Act respecting the City of Regina’s Street Railway System and other Public Works.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 97 is a Bill to give more power to a municipality. Bill No. 97 also, has another distinction in that it is probably a Bill amending an Act which is probably the oldest Act being amended this Session, and that is an Act passed in 1910, regarding Regina street railways. Now, because of conflict between Regina street railways and the Saskatchewan Railway Act, or pardon me, the Regina Street Railway Act and the Saskatchewan Railway Act, the City of Regina in order to do certain things regarding our street railway had to come to the Government for a written Order-in-Council and this Bill will insofar as the Regina street railway is concerned, will make the provisions of the City Act under which it operates supersede the Saskatchewan Railway Act.

I move second reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Minister of Education) moved second reading of **Bill No. 101 – An Act to amend The School Grants Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill will affect school grants in four different ways. First of all, it will double the present equalization grants paid to those districts not included in larger units.

Secondly, it extends the principle of equalization to town schools which were previously omitted with this exception that the maximum insofar as the town schools are concerned in the equalization grants is \$1 per day, I believe the figure is. Thirdly, it makes it possible for the payment of \$1 per day on behalf of those rooms which are used for purposes of vocational education.

The House probably knows, Mr. Speaker, vocational education is more expensive than the academic because of the fact that it requires more expensive equipment and because also, of the fact that the number of students per teacher is somewhat less. And fourthly, it proposes a change in the grants which are paid to schools with more than six rooms. At the present time the situation is that if there is a school with rooms between one

**March 26, 1947**

and five, the grant is \$1.50 per day; if there are from six to ten inclusive rooms the rate is \$1.30 a day; if there are from 11 to 25 the rate is \$1.10 a day. If there are more than 25 the rate is 90 cents a day. I think it must be admitted that perhaps there is no justification for that large a differential. So the Act proposes that if there are from one to ten rooms inclusive, the rate would be \$1.50 a day; if there are from 11 to 25, the rate would be \$1.40 a day; and if there are over 25 the rate will be \$1.30 a day.

I move second reading of the Bill.

**An Hon. Member:** — Can you estimate what the cost will be?

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can give a rough estimate. For the first done, it would be from \$80,000 to \$85,000. That is the increase, doubling of equalization grants to rural village schools. The town equalization grant it is estimated will cost approximately the same, \$80,000 to \$85,000. The grants on behalf of technical education will be from \$50,000 to \$60,000, we think and the change in the rate of flat grant for elementary schools from \$65,000 to \$70,000.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. Mr. T.C. Douglas (Premier) moved second reading of **Bill No. 102 – An Act to amend The Health Services Act, 1946.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is an Act to amend The Health Services Act. There is no general principle. I can enumerate some of the changes.

One is to allow the Minister of Municipal Affairs either to pay the amount required for any L.I.D. for the public health services from the Trust Account or from collections made by levying a tax for this purpose rather than by only being able to levy tax for this purpose and pay the amounts collected.

Secondly, to improve the financial position of the Regional Board by requiring municipalities to pay over the total amount of uncollected taxes on or before the end of December of each year.

And thirdly, to make it necessary rather than discretionary for the municipalities to pay the personal tax on behalf of their indigent.

And fourthly, to provide for a joint board, administering its scheme, where several municipalities have joined together in order to provide medical services for their residents. And, five, to empower municipalities to pass bylaws prescribing a minimum general tax for its residents which must not exceed \$10, and to empower the Minister of Municipal Affairs to pay the participating physician where the Health Services Planning Commission enters into a contract with the physician to provide medical services for the residents of an L.I.D. And to change the maximum personal tax from \$60 down to \$40 because of the fact that hospitalization is no longer included in these schemes within the region. I move second reading of this bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. Mr. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer) moved second reading of **Bill No. 104 – An Act to authorize the Government of Saskatchewan to enter into a Certain Agreement with the Government of Canada.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this very important Bill probably should have some discussion. It has been discussed in the House in the Speech from the Throne and later in the Budget Address reference was made to it. I did on that occasion give an outline of the events leading up to the present arrangement.

This Agreement, Saskatchewan is for a five-year period and is not an Agreement to implement the original proposals to the Dominion Government which were submitted at the Dominion-Provincial Conference in August of 1945. This is merely a taxation agreement under which the province for a five-year period gives up corporation tax, income tax and succession duties and in return receives from the Dominion Government a fixed subsidy.

This Bill makes no provision for the Dominion Government assuming the responsibilities which they were prepared to assume in August of 1945. We are still hopeful that the day will soon arrive when the various provinces of Canada will all enter into the Taxation Agreement so that the Dominion Government can proceed to call a conference. Indeed, we are not content to wait until all provinces have entered into that Agreement. It is the intention of the Government of Saskatchewan to urge the Prime Minister to call a Conference at a very early date. Indeed, we have already asked that a Conference be called to discuss this whole matter. We don't know what the postwar period will bring and we want to be prepared for it. The Dominion Government was prepared to enter into an arrangement under which they would assume the responsibility for the employable unemployed. Surely it is the responsibility of the Dominion Government, they and they alone have the power to frame economic policies which can result in full employment in this country and so we are very desirous that a conference be called at an early date so that the Dominion will assume this responsibility.

Then, too, Mr. Speaker, we are anxious that the Dominion will assume the responsibility in connection with the old age pensioners. They undertook in the original proposals to be fully responsible for pensions for all persons over the age of 70, millionaires and paupers alike would receive this pension. They were also prepared to grant 50 per cent of the cost of pensions for those 65 to 69, inclusive and who could prove the need.

Mr. Speaker, the Dominion Government undertook to provide some of the costs of a health program. We have not waited for the Dominion, we have proceeded with ours and are now proceeding with hospitalization, but we are not satisfied that that is sufficient. We feel that the people of this country and the whole of the Dominion are anxious for a complete system of health insurance such as was proposed by the Dominion. Under that they undertook to provide 60 per cent of the cost, up to a total of \$21.60 per year. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are many clauses such as how the subsidy is arrived at and the matter of protection for a province in case the Dominion enters into a better agreement with some other province, these are all matters which are set out in the Bill and which we shall have an

**March 26, 1947**

opportunity to discuss as we discuss the Bill in committee. I would, therefore, at this time move second reading of this very important measure.

**Hon. O.W. Valleau** (Minister of Social Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, I have just a word or two to add to what has been said by the Provincial Treasurer in regard to this Act and particularly to my own disappointment and I am sure the disappointment of the Government and of all Members of the House that we are unable to conclude the agreement which was contained in the Dominion proposals to the Conference, a year ago last August. In the responsibility I have as Minister of Social Welfare, I possibly become aware of the needs of the people of this province, possibly to a greater degree than any other Member of the House and I have certainly become aware of the financial implication, of the need and necessity of more funds, of the further assuming of responsibility by the Dominion for the provision of funds through which we can do a reasonably good job of welfare work in the Province of Saskatchewan. I am sure I am voicing the opinion, -Mr. Speaker, of every Member of the House when I say that we hope that a reconvening of the Conference or other measures which may be found desirable, may be taken to bring about as speedily as possibly in the Dominion of Canada the assumption of the financial responsibility which was outlined in those proposals of August of 1945.

**Mr. J. Benson** (Last Mountain): —Mr. Speaker, seeing it is getting so late in the Session and the Members are anxious to get through, I am just going to say that I am going to support the motion.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **SECOND READINGS**

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

**Hon. O.W. Valleau** (Minister of Social Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member should take the credit for having made the shortest and possibly the best address that has been made in the House this winter, the most popular and since I do not propose to try and compete with him in that respect I'd like to go into the Bill just a little bit further. It is a Bill that I feel merits the support of every Member of the House as I am sure it merits and receives the support of the great folk, the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. I must confess, the other day listening to the debate, I was just a little disappointed. It seemed to me that the Bill was receiving a certain qualified measure of support, a measure of support that seemed to say, well now, this is not very important, but we will vote for it anyway, and I frankly feel that I would rather see the Bill defeated than to see it passed by the votes of those who do not regard it as important. To me it is tremendously important. I feel that for this once at least, in the Province of Saskatchewan, that we are playing a major part in the affairs of this world.

I do not think that the Hon. Attorney General was exaggerating at all when he described it as possibly the most important Bill that had ever come before this House. I feel – even though we are only a small province in comparison with the world – that it should be placed pretty much on the same type of important legislation as the Magna Carta, Bill of Rights, Declaration of Independence, etc. Neither do I feel that it is amiss to enunciate the principles behind the things in which we believe. I am quite in agreement with the Leader of the Opposition when he suggests that a Bill of this kind is of no value unless the people do support it. It is quite true that at no time can we progress very far ahead of public opinion. I am speaking of this Legislative Assembly. Nevertheless, we have a function and a duty to lead public opinion and I believe that the enunciation of the things in which we believe to actually put them down on paper is of value in creating or formulating public opinion. It is something to which we can come back, to which the people of this province will come back repeatedly, to say, well now, these are the things in which we believe.

The question arises: Is Saskatchewan fitted to lead with the type of Bill or the principles behind this Bill, and I think that we are, in a peculiar measure, qualified to lead. When we go back and examine the situation that existed, and I am doing this for comparison sake, which existed in what is now Great Britain or England at the time of the Magna Carta, we find that the barons at that time were dealing with a particular situation, with their own problem, a problem in which the question of racial equality or religious freedom scarcely entered.

The same thing is true of the Declaration of Independence, the American people or the colonists of New England at that time stated that in their belief all men were free and equal to a doctrine or a policy or a belief that they had not possibly followed any too closely and, again, we come to the point that no government or no statement of principles can very far exceed the opinions of the people of the nation. When the Americans made their Declaration of Independence they were a white colony and in their statement, that all men were free and equal, they were thinking of the claims made by the aristocracy, the aristocracy of blood and the aristocracy of wealth, they were not at the time thinking of the inequalities of race or creed. But I am of the opinion that the point that cannot be either proved or disproved, that the very fact that they did set down that principle, has resulted in at least some modification of the treatment of the colored races within their boundaries. Even although that treatment may have not been all that could have been desired.

Saskatchewan, however, is in a position today which is almost unique in the world of today. Those of my generation came to Saskatchewan from other parts of the world. I came here from Ontario and as nearly as I can recall the only non-English speaking people that I had ever know before I can to Saskatchewan were the Chinese in the laundry. I cannot, at the moment, recall ever having met another person whose native tongue was not the English language. And I can well remember, I came West at the age of, I think, 19, but I was rather curious about people of other nationalities. I can remember quite well the first American with whom I had ever worked, wondering just how different he was because I had been raised down in Ontario where we were rather insular and where the only people who were of my value, were the people of Anglo-Saxon origin. I might just

**March 26, 1947**

mention here, Mr. Speaker, that while I myself am not of Anglo-Saxon origin, yet my people have lived among the Anglo-Saxons to the point where probably I could be regarded as being at least Anglo-Saxon. But we came to Saskatchewan with our prejudices, with our beliefs that the people, who were created to rule the world, and to lead the world in all respects was the Anglo-Saxon race. We found other people who came here, other people who had in themselves just as great a pride and just as great an intolerance in many cases as we of the Anglo-Saxon race, people who came from central Europe, from northern Europe, from western Europe, who came here thinking that they carried all of the wealth of experience and virtue which might exist among human beings.

The Attorney General the other evening gave us a summary of the various nationalities, who go to make up the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. We met those people, we found as our ignorance of other people wore off, we found a great deal to admire in people, not only of one or two other races, but of every race with whom we came in contact and I think that is true of all other racial groups. I am not suggesting for one moment that I believe that I or the people who have been raised as I have been should surrender the things, the culture of our race to take that of another. Neither do I believe that it is necessary that those of other races should surrender theirs in order to do simply as the Anglo-Saxon does. But we came to appreciate the virtues, the qualities of other races both as a race and as individuals and we came to judge people of other groups as we judge those of our own group by the individual himself and not by the race to which he happened to belong. We have all had the experience of having lived alongside of people of other groups. The experience of watching them, of finding them excellent neighbors, of finding them living up to their standards just as well as we live up to ours, we came to appreciate them.

Today in the Province of Saskatchewan, I believe that there is less racial intolerance than probably anywhere else in the world because we have come to know the problem. You see intolerance, intolerance is based on ignorance and jealousy and envy and fear. The people who are snobbish, are snobbish because they are afraid that someone lower down than they are are going to pass them in what they imagine to be the race for the top positions in human society. You don't become intolerant of the animals, you are not afraid of them, you are not afraid they are going to exceed you. You do become snobbish and intolerant of your fellow human beings. If I might mention, which I had not intended to, just one particular race, you don't find people condemning the Jews until the Jews start to make money then they start to condemn them because they are afraid that the Jews will raise themselves beyond, to a point at which they excel in the accumulation of wealth and so we fear them and we envy them. And the person who is snobbish who has that as a part of his makeup is really suffering from an inferiority complex.

The principles lying behind this Bill are as much for the protection of those who being intolerant as it is for the protection of those whom we do not care to tolerate. Today, we have the opportunity in Saskatchewan, today we have lived as different racial groups for 20, 30, 40, 50 years in this province together, come to appreciate one another, today we can make the statements, enunciate the principles of tolerance. We might not be able to do it, Mr. Speaker, in another generation because

there is again growing up an intolerance, sometimes disguised, sometimes of which individuals are not even conscious, and I would class in that group, Mr. Speaker, the remarks or portion of the remarks made by the Hon. Member for the Mediterranean the other evening. I don't know how it crept into the debate, but something was said about the Assiniboia Club. The Hon. Member was naive enough to suggest the Assiniboia Club was very democratic because even a farmer could become a member of the Club. One can well imagine the interest of the farmers up and down the Province of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Embury:** — The references made to the Assiniboia Club were made very generally in introducing a speech and my remarks were purely saying that all classes of persons could belong to that Club.

**Mr. Valleau:** — Mr. Speaker, I am not interested particularly in the Assiniboia Club, but what I am interested in is the attitude exemplified by the remarks of the Hon. Member. As I was saying, I think that all up and down the Province of Saskatchewan you can imagine farmers getting together and telling each other, well at last we have reached the promised land, we have arrived at a point where, well, we really have arrived because today farmers can belong to that most exclusive organization, the Assiniboia Club. You can imagine, Mr. Speaker, the party lines — Mrs. Jones calls Mrs. Smith up and she says, "You know for 40 years since John and I were married, we have been on the farm and I always felt that I'd let my family down because my uncle was a lawyer, but now that I know that farmers are being accepted, it's a tremendous weight off my mind." You can see the scene in the little country school where the teachers says to Johnny, "Johnny what are you going to be when you grow up?" Johnny says, "I am going to be a lawyer." The teacher says, "Well, Johnny, I thought that you intended to be a farmer like your father?" "No," says Johnny, "I want to be a lawyer. I want to be able to join the Assiniboia Club." The teacher says, "Oh, well now, Johnny, it isn't necessary. It stated in the Legislature just the other day that you don't have to be a lawyer to belong to the Assiniboia Club." And Johnny says, "Are you kidding?" The teacher says, "No, and more than that, Johnny, you don't even have to be a rich farmer; why even a poor farmer can belong to that." And Johnny says, "Well, gee whiz!" Now, that is an attitude of mind which confuses condescension with tolerance or with equality. It does exist in the Province of Saskatchewan and I think it is well for us to enunciate, very clearly and definitely, that that is not the kind of equality or tolerance toward which we should strive.

There were some, I believe, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned, some further things which he thought might be included in such a Bill as is being presented here. I think the Minister of Education dealt with some of those, but I believe there was one he missed. As I remember, the Leader of the Opposition suggested that there should be something in the Bill which would deal with expropriation. Private property should be free from expropriation and he qualified that a little, qualified it by saying, of course, in the public interest to build a road or something that one might expropriate private property. And I think I know what the Hon. Member had in mind. I think we all know. But I am going to say this, that if we expropriate private property for the sake of building a road which is simply a convenience or if we expropriate for the



**March 26, 1947**

purpose of putting up a building or a railroad or establishing a stockyard, that surely we should be expected or should be free or should consider ourselves bound to expropriate private property where it means the livelihood of men and women. But if there is anything in this Province of Saskatchewan which is required it is the opportunity to make a decent living and there is no man in this House who is any more aware than I am today – unless possibly it be the Hon. Member for Moosomin – who is aware of the part that poverty plays in many of the troubles of which the Department of Welfare is faced; the old people, arriving at old age who have never had the –op of making a decent living or a decent wage; the family troubles that arise; the families that are separated; the neglected children. I might refer to just one more, there are a number of unmarried mothers who come to us, why? Because they and their friends feel themselves financially unable or secure enough to enter into marriage. Every phase of our work affects human beings and after all human beings are the most important thing in this world. Poverty does everything. And if the Government has any sense of responsibility at all or if this Legislature has any sense of responsibility at all, its duty is to protect human beings and to use every power that it has to see that they have the opportunity to organize themselves and to secure a decent living wage for themselves. To me it is much, much more important than building a road, then building a railroad.

There are some other matters, possibly which may come up and which as time goes on we will feel that they should be included. I think we have made a very good start with the Bill as it is. But as time goes on, as public opinion follows along, it is possible that some of those other matters may be included. I overheard today, the suggestion made by one of the Hon. Members, of the House, Mr. Speaker, that we should have in this Bill of Rights the provision that no man was to have the second wife until at least every man had the first one. I don't know whether public opinion would follow us as far as that or not. But it may be sometime in the future that public opinion will go to the point where they will say that no man can advertise for help and ask if they be non-union. We have not yet reached that, but I think it would be premature at the moment, but I think it is something that might follow very well.

I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, again at this late hour to attempt to foresee what lies in the future. The Bill, which we have today, is of necessity devoted to certain legal principles. May be that it does not in its language include some of the things which we have been discussing in this House during this debate, but it does at least put it down on paper. I recall a remark made many years ago by my Grandfather, who said first you make a thing legal and then it becomes respectable. He incidentally, happened to be referring to the liquor traffic, which is neither here nor there. But, today, we are making certain things in this province non-legal and because we make them non-legal, public opinion supports us which I am quite certain it will, they become non-respectable. People learn to think and to feel and to believe our culture will include, the culture of the people, growing up in the Province of Saskatchewan, will come to believe that it is not respectable to indulge, openly at least, in expressions of racial and religious intolerance.

**Hon. J.W. Corman** (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, what is it that comes in like a lion and goes

out like a lamb – March. This debate came in like a lion, apparently it is going out like a lamb. That cramped my style, but I will try and go along and have it go out like a lamb. There are some things though that I think that I should say, I'll say them as kindly as I can. If I didn't say them I would feel that the lamb was getting a sheared look, but I realize that no one has the right to reply to anything that I say. I will try and make my remarks brief and I will only touch on matters that have been dealt with.

Now, certain amendments have been suggested. We have been told, generally speaking, the nature of it. I do not intend to deal with them here. I think the proper place is when they are moved in Committee and they know exactly what they are. But I think it should be understood that silence or failure to deal with them doesn't in any manner or means give consent to them, Mr. Speaker. I believe I can say this and have it sound kindly. Human nature, Mr. Speaker, is a funny thing. During the last two years, the people of Canada, the newspapers of Canada, all the political parties of Canada, have been unanimous, or tried to have been unanimous on the desirability for a Bill of Rights and pretty much on what that Bill of rights should include. I am certain of one of them, I believe both the Leader-Post and the Star-Phoenix, wrote editorials supporting the idea of a Bill of rights, reaffirming the fundamental liberties and I know that leading Members, both of the Liberal and Conservative Parties have spoken in favor of just such a Bill as we have before the House. Organizations all over the Dominion have been working at, during the War and since the War, to educate the people, to just such a Bill as we have and I may say they are still at it and the democratic newspapers of this Dominion are still at it. We can be broadminded and without bigotry in this province, but what do we find when this Bill comes out? I have the word politicians here – I can't say that tonight, Mr. Speaker, or I won't get out of here like a lamb – but, and I am going to say very little about this, but why the change in the Province of Saskatchewan? Is it because a socialist government should introduce this Bill? I don't understand.

Now, just what is it that has been said about our Bill, I submit, that in spite of the statement of the Leader of the Opposition that he intended to support the Bill, I believe that it is fair to say that his remarks were in belittlement of the Bill. He said it was merely window-dressing. He said it was just something that Attorney General dreamed up and he also said that it only continued the present rights which we already have. That is a quotation from the Leader-Post, I didn't take that down, of course. That statement is not correct, Mr. Speaker, it does make a positive law for the protection of racial and religious seniority but the statement says that the Bill does not, that it only continues the rights we already have.

We are going to be asked to protect the capitalists in this bill by amendment I understand. The capitalists don't feel as does the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, that the Bill is meaningless. There are already complaints that we are taking away from them their God given rights to hire and fire whom they like and to hire either sex, or to hire only people of certain religious denominations. They are complaining that we are taking away that right so I think without saying anymore that it is evident that the Bill does more than we state the law as far as minorities are concerned. Knowing the Hon. Leader of the Opposition as I do, I mean this, as a man of his conviction, I believe the

**March 26, 1947**

people want the racial minorities of this province to know that the Liberal Party defeated this bill that gives them new rights, the right to employment, the right to engage in business, the right to own and occupy property, the right of access to public places, to membership in professional institutions and to education. A Bill making it an offence not to concede in those rights, I believe that it is only fair that the minorities in this province should know where the Liberal Party stands on that matter. Window-dressing, or something the Attorney General dreamed up, I don't know which is the worst, Mr. Speaker. I didn't dream this up, of course, Mr. Speaker, but I believe the minorities of this province will be glad that somebody did dream it and they were not left to the – I have something here which I am not saying – left to be dealt with in the mood of the remarks of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, we are asked to put something in this Bill protecting the rights of the capitalist and so-called private enterprise. I am not going to go into this at length, but the word private enterprise has been dealt with in a pamphlet put out by the United Farmers of Canada. It is a pamphlet, I believe this pamphlet that came to my desk, I ran across this: The pamphlet first quoted Trade and Commerce Minister McKinnon as having said in a speech at Hamilton, Ontario, and I quote:

Let there be no mistake on this fundamental point everything the Government has done and will do is designed to supplement private enterprise and not replace it.

Now, the editor for this magazine of the United Farmers of Saskatchewan went on to say:

Free private enterprise is the old order under which in a quarter of a century we have had ten years of War, ten years of depression, three years of artificial prosperity and a world financial breakdown. We are still wondering what Prime Minister King meant when he stated on a number of occasions that we must have a new world order. Perhaps Mr. King and Mr. McKinnon ought to get together on this subject.

I think it is well of us to bear in mind that the farmers of Saskatchewan don't hold what is called free enterprise in as high regard as it is held by some in this House.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs, I believe, adequately dealt with the suggestion of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that we have put something in the Bill against – and I believe these are the words, -- the eradication of capitalism in Saskatchewan. The Hon. Minister, if I remember it explained that by doing so we would be prohibiting progress even though the people wanted it. But I am changing the phraseology of what I am saying now, Mr. Speaker, in view of the new atmosphere around here, but I believe if we had interviewed any such suggestions in this House, if we imposed an economic system on the people whether they wanted it or not, that we would have been called totalitarian dictators and all the rest. I suggest in all kindness that the suggestion was not considered before it was made. I do want to say this though, that is one amendment that, I don't like the word "dare," but I hope the Opposition don't recede from that position and, Mr. Speaker, I dare to bring such an amendment in Committee stage. In that we are being asked to

do by legislation, by compulsion – if we had done it it would have been compulsion or if we had suggested it – we are asking to do by legislation what the supporters, the upholders of the capitalists can't do by education and persuasion. I suggest that if capitalism is such a good thing, the democratic method should be followed and the people should be convinced of it.

Mr. Speaker, just while we are on this question of capitalism and having in mind the fact that this Bill has been besmeared or in an attempt made to besmear it, because it was brought in by a socialist Government. I would like to point out that the evils that we are to cure in this Bill are not evils that grew up under socialism. The threat in Canada through arbitrary detention and deportation orders come from a capitalist government. The threat to free elections in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, didn't come from a socialist Government, it came from a capitalist Government. Racial and religious discrimination inasmuch as it does exist and flourish in Canada and in Saskatchewan, had its birth in capitalist practices, not socialist practices. I do suggest that the suggestion that the capitalists are better qualified than the socialist to decide what should be in this Bill of Rights may not go down with the people of this province. Now, this suggestion just at this particular time that we come to the aid of the capitalists in this Bill of rights is of special significance. The suggestion as I intimated before, is a confession that in this age and generation the capitalist cannot justify the system under which they prosper on its merits, but it has a deeper and more dangerous significance just now and I submit that the debate in this House shows where the Liberal Party stands in respect of capitalism in world affairs. Now, Canada and the United States are the sole remaining centres of capitalism in the world. They, of course, are not going down without a struggle, probably without another World War if necessary. I believe, and I am considering the words I use very carefully, I believe that the big capitalists of the United States and Canada are pretty much paving the way for another World War. By their financial support of Hitler and Hiro Hito, they made the last War possible and they can, Mr. Speaker, by their war mongering now, do more than anything else to made another War inevitable. I suggest that a provision in this Bill giving support to the capitalist, my own personal feeling is that it would be a declaration that we were prepared to get ready for another War.

I was going to say something about the nature of the amendments that will be altered; it will be noted that they practically all deal with property rights. I might point out that is one difference between the old parties and the CCF. The emphasis in our program and the emphasis in this Bill are placed on human rights as opposed to property rights. Mr. Speaker, so much was said about our indifference to property rights and the danger to the owners of property in our procedures and so on. I would just like to point out that this danger, if it does exist, isn't confined to the socialist. On CBC Capital Hill report, January 5<sup>th</sup>, Robert McEwen of the Montreal Standard, and I am sure he is not a socialist, was just citing a case of one Japanese Canadian and drawing the attention of the people of Canada to what happened to his property in the Dominion Government. Here is what he says:

Let us take just another case history, that is of a Japanese Canadian veteran named Shoki. Shoki was wounded twice while serving in the Canadian Army in the First

**March 26, 1947**

World War. In this War he and his family were evacuated from the Pacific Coast with the other Japanese Canadians. He left behind his two-story farmhouse, 19 acres of land and 2,500 chickens. Later these were sold by the Government custodian and Shoki received a cheque for \$39.32 as payment in full for this property after taxes and deductions had been made and Mr. McEwen continued, there are hundreds of similar cases.

**Mr. Procter:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Would you suggest that the Canadian treatment of the Japanese has been anything like as bad as the Russian treatment of the Japanese?

**Mr. Corman:** — Is the question: has the Canadian treatment of Japanese been worse than the Russian treatment?

**Mr. Procter:** — Anywhere nearly as bad as the Russian treatment of the Japanese.

**Mr. Corman:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I haven't the faintest idea what connection that has with the debate and neither has he ...

**Mr. Procter:** — They had a socialist Government then. I'd see ...

**Mr. Corman:** — Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that if I'd wanted to get under the skin of the Opposition I could have made far more success than I have. I thought I was avoiding anything. I didn't know I had said anything tonight that should have perturbed them. Well, it was going out like a lamb — I had better finish, Mr. Speaker. I will leave property rights then and now I was going to say something about Municipal Affairs. I believe we were told that something should be in this Bill to enlarge that whenever we do anything to give them any added power or to preserve their economy it will get raked over the coals. I am not going into that however.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when these amendments are brought up in Committee they, of course, will be dealt with individually. I would like to say here though that in this Bill of Rights we have pretty much adhered to what are generally accepted and recognized as proper things to put in the Bill of Rights. We, of course, are not going to have this Bill of Rights converted into a political platform for anybody. If we had that in mind we probably, if it was going to be a platform for anybody, Mr. Speaker, it would probably be a socialist platform. We have avoided that, but we are not going to have the Liberals write their platform into this Bill of Rights. If we did agree to it, I wonder what they would do when they come to the Saskatoon ... I am not going to speak with any thought of having it reversed and certainly while we are going out like a lamb, I want to go out with you like a lamb, Mr. Speaker. It is true and I could prove it, that I haven't referred to a thing ...

**Mr. Procter:** — Again, you have chosen the wrong ...

**Mr. Corman:** — I was told that would be it, but I accept your kindly suggestion. I was going to suggest some things that could be in the Bill of Rights if we are going to convert it into a political platform, but I will leave that until Committee stage and if I am not ruled out there I might get by with it, Mr. Speaker.

I will close just with this suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that the Bill has been called nothing but window-dressing. When I introduced it I did seek for unanimity, that, of course, is impossible, in view of what has been said about the Bill. The Leader of the Opposition called it window-dressing and just something the Attorney General had dreamed up. The Hon. Member for Rosthern in referring to the Bill used the words “instrument of oppression” and the hon. and gallant Member for the Mediterranean area described the Bill as “A cynical, callous, window-dressing for political purposes.” I may say that opposition sentiment in the House has been pretty well echoed in the Liberal newspapers in the province. The Star-Phoenix, Saturday last, said:

Mr. Corman would serve the cause of liberty better, if he would withdraw his Bill entirely.

Now, my suggestion as I take my seat in this: I agree with the Hon. Minister of Social Welfare that half-hearted consent, half-hearted approval, we don't think it is what this Bill deserves and in view of the fact that attempts have been made to blacken it, belittle it, besmear it, besmirch it, misrepresent it, and distort the Bill, I suggest that they only consistent course that can be taken by the Opposition is to show the courage of their language and vote against the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time on the following Recorded Division:

**YEAS – 39**

Douglas (Weyburn)	Feeley	Daniels
Wellbelove	Trew (Mrs.)	Darling
Benson	Hansen	Stone
Valleau (Melfort)	Nollet	Howe
Brockelbank	Douglas (Rosetown)	Aitken
Corman	Lloyd	Malcolm
Phelps	Sturdy	Thair
Murray	Cuming	Procter
Lazorko	Swallow	Danielson
Putnam	Van Eaton	Hooge
Burgess	Connon	Embury
Howell	Gibson	Valleau (ASVR)
Brown	Patterson	Dobie

The Assembly adjourned at 11:00 o'clock p.m.