

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Tenth Legislature
Day 8

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

The House met at 3 o'clock.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon Mr. Brockelbank (Tisdale): — I want to draw to the attention of the House that in Saskatchewan there is something funny going on or else ghosts are walking. Here is an item from this morning's Leader-Post, which says the Legislature was mostly devoted to glorifying and praising the centralization and control policies of the Saskatchewan Government; W.J. Patterson, Leader of the Opposition said in an address over Radio station CFQC Monday. The article goes on mentioning Mr. Patterson in several places, but the headline on the article is, "Tucker raps Throne Speech".

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE
Continuation of Debate on Address in Reply

The House resumed from Monday, February 16, the adjourned Debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. M.H. Feeley (Canora) for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. A.W. Embury (A.S.V.R.): — Mr. Speaker, to put first things first, let me at the outset of my remarks associate myself with the expressions of good will to Her royal Highness, Princess Elizabeth and His Royal Highness The Duke of Edinburgh which are contained in the Speech from the Throne. Sir, I could have wished to see those expressions at the first of the Throne Speech where they belong, and I could have wished also to see some expressions of the Government to indicate its continued loyalty to the Crown and to the Royal Family.

There are very few people in Saskatchewan who do not appreciate the value of the Crown and of its functions within our Constitution today in Canada. It is the fountain head of impartial justice, and its functions as such through His Majesty's judges, and in the person of our Sovereign are bound up all our precious and enduring principles of mercy and freedom. More than this, it is in the person of our Sovereign, His Majesty, that the sanction for all our laws exists, and without him in our Constitution to give assent to our various statutes, no law would have any validity at all, and chaos would reign supreme. In our Constitution our sovereign is our guarantee against totalitarianism.

When our Premier says – in referring to His Majesty's judges – that our courts, saying of the judges and the courts, and I do not propose to repeat again any part of the discussion which I have previously made; but referring to a remark he made in the House the other day, and refer-

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

ring as he was to our judges and our courts, that any institution which fails to serve the needs of mankind must go or perish, I think he says, he is going a long way to confirm the fears some of us have in respect to him, that he intends to break down that arm of the constitution in aid of a totalitarian form of government. Following his remarks as they follow up on an attack on the integrity of our judges, and I think it fair to say that in the opinions of most of us he is tampering with a very vital matter indeed. Now that is why I say that I could have wished to see some expression from the Government to indicate their continued loyalty and devotion of the Government to our Sovereign and the Royal Family. But in any event, I am pleased to see the good wishes of the Government extended to Her Royal Highness Princess Elizabeth, and her Consort, and I associate myself with those remarks very enthusiastically.

Now, Sir, before coming to the main portion of my remarks, I would like to tell the House that I was very much moved the other day, on Tuesday last, by the remarks of the hon. member from Kerrobert-Kindersley in relation to myself. And I was much moved because that gentleman speaks directly and sincerely upon important matters, and he does not attempt to evade the issue or to divert the attention of the House to some frivolous matter. He said of me, as I recall his words, that I acted as though he were the dirt under my feet. I think he used the words that I thought he was the sum of the earth. I should like to tell the hon. member this, that my criticisms in this House, Sir, are directed strictly and reserved strictly for those socialist agitators who go about so cleverly attempting to stir up class hatreds and pretending that there is such a thing as a ruling class in Canada, although it does not exist in anyone's mind but their own, but would like the public to believe that, for example, the Regina chamber of Commerce in some way or other is determined to hurt our people, or should be denied the rights of free expression of their opinions by way of pamphlet or any other way, but just because those views happen to be in favour of freedom of enterprise, people who would like to do the same thing for the Law Society although that society, Sir, I would remind the House, is composed almost entirely of men from the very humblest walks of life. I reserve my criticisms not for people like you, but I am talking, when I criticize people, perhaps too emphatically, but I hope forcefully, people who talk about battle-lines being drawn in Canada. Well I hope and pray God they never exist. People who do these things as they say all in the Kingdom of Heaven. If my remarks in this House have been forceful they are directed to criticize that sort of thing and not towards men like the hon. member from Kindersley-Kerrobert whose sincerity is quite obvious, I think, to us all.

The hon. member from Kindersley-Kerrobert is not a young man anymore, although he still speaks to us with the strength and sincerity of a much younger man. But he does talk like a man who has lived in this great Western province of ours for many years, and who has seen its good times and its bad times. He possibly has in his time seen the

early pioneers in Saskatchewan struggling under the burden of repaying the capital invested here at such risks to pen up the West and struggling also to pay great interest charges on that debt at eight, ten and twelve per cent. I suppose, like all of the old-timers and pioneers of the West he has seen the uncompromising behaviour of certain creditors.

I suggest to him that in the period of his experience in the West, he has also seen the enactment of various pieces of legislation designed to cure that uncompromising creditor to some extent at least. He has seen The Debt Adjustment Act which was put on the books to forestall just such a creditor, an unfair creditor, and a great deal of hardship was avoided under that very statute. He has seen the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act go on the books to force a reasonable compromise, and many hundreds of cases were dealt with under that Act – far more than were dealt with under any other statute of the legislature of its kind in respect to interest and the like.

The hon. member, too, has probably seen the activities of the farm implement companies in the early days. They used to sell to the farmers under conditional sales agreements containing very obscure phraseology. Those same companies in the early days, taking advantage of those obscure clauses in their contracts, repossessed their security in a most unfair way in those early days. But as against it, he has also seen the enactment of The Farm Implements Act to prevent that sort of thing, so the form of contract would be a matter of statute, and the behaviour of the creditors would be confined to his right in respect to granting a fair opportunity to the debtor to handle his obligations under those contracts.

The hon. member has seen The Lands Contract Act, The Limitation of Civil Rights Act and others which I have no doubt he can think of, all designed to protect the various people of our community from inequalities and inequities and hardships.

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

Now I suggest to him, Sir, in all fairness, that that is the way these things have been handled in the past, and I suggest to him that the only difference arising between him and me is that I consider that to be the safest way for us to meet our hardships and inequalities for the future. The answer to such problems as we have, sir, does not lie in embracing absolute socialism; and I say that to you in all sincerity, because I believe that a socialist is more uncompromising than any creditor I ever saw. Had though those years have been...

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I wonder if the hon. member will permit a question?

Mr. Embury: — Yes.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The hon. member has mentioned “Absolute Socialism”. I wonder if he would explain to us just what degree he believes in?

Mr. Embury: — Perhaps the remainder of my speech will tend to help him, Sir. I hope so. As I was saying about the hon. member from Kindersley-Kerrobot; hard though those years in this West have been, he and people like him, can look with much pride upon the achievements here in the short history of our province, and he in particular, also, can take some pride in having playing his part building this province up to the point at which we find it today; and I would say one personal remark — that there are very special reasons, Sir, why a Soldiers’ Representative should have a particular regard for the hon. member. Those reasons are only too well known by the hon. member and his good lady for me to say anything more about them; but I will say this — they will never be forgotten, and that particular reason will never be forgotten by servicemen, Sir, nor by Canada. I would say of the hon. member, this, Sir — not “the scum of the earth” — to him — “the salt of the earth” — and I assure him I have not an unkind work or thought in my head in respect to him.

Now, if I may return for a moment to the Throne Speech, it commences with the remark that we have become keenly aware of our economic problems, and I believe in that phrase in the Throne Speech, the person who drafted it was thinking about world and international and Canadian — perhaps national — problems; but I would suggest also that we have become keenly aware of some local economic problems upon which this government should be casting its eyes, and not inviting us here on this debate, to be undertaking the solution to international or national affairs over which we have no powers of jurisdiction. I suggest that far too much time is wasted in considering matters which are well beyond our powers and jurisdiction.

I have the feeling that this Government would like us to move forward, considering and debating whether or not the federal government has been right in respect to its farm prices policy, and a number of other things; whether the United Nations are right in opposing the Russians, or something like that. I suggest that the proper things for us to consider here are those matters which we have the responsibility of dealing with, instead of going around with our heads in the clouds, and our feet scarcely touching the ground, ignoring what is so obviously a matter of our own responsibility.

We have become keenly aware of our economic problems, all right, right here at home, and we have more of them to be aware of, too, than we had before this Government started in on us. We have been bombarded with such a (bombardment is the only word for it) bombardment of government-sponsored propaganda in aid of socialism that one begins to wonder whether socialism can be as good a thing as a lot of these people say it. If it is as good as all that, surely we would not have to have all this high-pressure salesmanship directed at us in aid of it.

I was talking to a man engaged in the lumber business up in Meadow Lake, in August of last year, and he had a few economic problems to be worried about, because the government got into business of selling builders' supplies and they had so arranged it, according to him – and I think he is right – that he could not buy any more lumber in Saskatchewan after his existing contracts ran out. Furthermore, he had to pay more for what he got from Saskatchewan sources than the Government would pay to anyone that they would give a timber lease to. The men who have timber leases, also, are becoming aware of an economic problem right here at home.

A man could go around this province and talk to hundreds of people in the insurance business, with whom the government has gone into active competition. They certainly have an economic problem. The same thing is true of insurance adjusters, several of whom have quit this province altogether to make a living somewhere else where the prospect of being strangled out of business by government opposition is not quite so formidable. Two of them whom I know, happen to be veterans, and they have had to go right out of the province altogether. If the hon. Premier wants their names I can give them to him. I would say that that would give rise to an economic problem right here at home. We are certainly aware of it.

Truckers, independent bus lines – people like that – garage-men – they are beginning to wonder about their position in respect to governmental activities in opposition to them.

I would suggest, therefore, in my comment upon that portion of the Speech from the Throne, that we should keep our own house in order first before we go reaching abroad to debate matters over which we have no jurisdiction.

There is this comment also, in the Speech from the Throne:

“My Government reaffirms its belief that upon economic planning of a national and an international character, a sounder basis will be established...”

Do you suggest, Mr. Speaker, that such a remark comes well from a government that justifies its entry into the insurance business, not upon the ground that the public was being hurt in that highly competitive business, but solely upon the grounds that it was profitable and that some of those profits went beyond the province of Saskatchewan? I suggest that if it is good business for our government to deny profits to people from outside Saskatchewan, who trade here, what is to stop people who live outside from refusing to trade with us? The last time that was tried in this province, the Italians and the Englishmen and the Frenchmen and everybody else started growing their own wheat or else buying it somewhere else. Sure on the basis

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

for national and international planning, this government has made a pretty poor start. I suggest that the government has no business going into competition with great sections of our own population until such time as it can be shown that some public hardship or abuse exists which would warrant government intervention.

The person who drafted the Speech from the Throne also seems to be under the impression that the United Nations organization is being handicapped by maladministration of this world's wealth. It does not say that it understands any other handicaps that it is having.

Premier: — It uses the word “maldistribution”, doesn't it?

Mr. Embury: — Yes, maldistribution. I am sorry. He said “The work of the United Nations in striving to realize one world is being seriously impaired by maldistribution of the world's wealth.” It sounds like Molotov or Vishineky to me. I do not think that I overstate the fact, Sir, when I say that the work of the United Nations is not only being seriously impaired, but completely sabotaged and rendered useless by the obstruction of the Russian Socialists who simply use that organization as a sounding board for world-socialist propaganda. Socialists the world over seem to lay a heavy emphasis on propaganda, so that everybody is kept stirred up and unsettled for the purpose of creating class hatreds and internal strife. Prosperity and success in any community will be the end of the socialists; and so they strive to prevent that with all their might. If we do not have a depression in this country, it certainly will not be the fault of the socialists, because they do everything in their power to cut down production and force prices up to the point where the machine must fail.

I have been much interested in hearing of the work of the Department of Agriculture. I think it fair that we congratulate the Government upon the choice of a Deputy Minister for that Department. Mr. Maurice Hartnett is a man of very considerable ability indeed, and I think a great deal of the sensible and effective planning of the Department must be laid to his credit. I am quite sure that the Saskatchewan public will appreciate any efforts made to achieve an irrigation scheme or system, using the waters of the south Saskatchewan River. This project will not only improve the capacity of many thousands of acres in the province, but should also produce a source of cheaper electrical power; and it is interesting to learn from the Speech that progress is being made in developing the re-classification and reclamation-conservation programs of the Government. The work of the agricultural representatives throughout the province will no doubt be of great assistance in technical matters, wherever they are used.

Last year, in its socialist zeal the Government removed the administration of large tracts of Crown land under cultivation, from the Department of Natural Resources, where they were simply disposed of by lease or sale or otherwise, without any follow-up supervision, I fancy – except in the case

of a lease to collect the rent – removed it from Natural Resources where that was done, to the Department of Agriculture, where they would come under the benign influence of the hon. Minister of Agriculture whose name I do not suppose it would be proper for me to mention in this debate, only by reason of the rules of the House; but the hon. Minister of Agriculture now is the landlord and supervisor of great tracts of cultivated land in the province of Saskatchewan. Now I suggest – and I suspected at the time – that – that when all agriculture has been socialized, (and before I have finished I am going to suggest that there are definite signs of such an intention on the part of the government, notwithstanding their statements to the contrary,) – but I am going to suggest that when all the land has been socialized by the promotion of these so-called co-operative farms or otherwise, that the “Commissar of Agriculture) will then be in a position to run the industry. I suppose they wanted to get the brainwork of government set up so that he could cope with it. Lately we have seen a few more bills to the same effect, in respect to water users, and irrigation...

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — May I ask the hon. member a question? To whom does he refer when he says the “Commissar”?

Mr. Embury: — Hon. Mr. Nollet.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — On a Point of Order: I would ask whether you think it is just right that the hon. member should refer in such improper terms to the advisers of His Majesty?

Mr. A.T. Procter (Moosomin): — On a Point of Order: might I point out that after all, the Commissars of Russia are supposed to be (at least) a friendly nation, and there would seem to be nothing derogatory in the allusion.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the point of order is well taken. When an hon. member refers to a Minister of the Crown I think he should refer to him by his official title.

Mr. Embury: — If I may continue, Sir: The move of the Government in transferring the Department...

Mr. Speaker: — Order: does the hon. member withdraw?

Mr. Embury: — I withdraw the reference. The move of the Government in transferring the administration of the land under cultivation to the hon. Minister of Agriculture was, I suggest, done for the purpose of giving him some superintendence over it as an industry. Yesterday, on the Order paper we had Second Reading of a number of Bills designed to assist him further in the same way. The hon. Minister of Agriculture is a Socialist, and says he is proud of it. Yes, he does! I am going to suggest to you that he is also a pro-Russian Socialist, and I wonder whether he is as proud of that? In aid of that, I am going to let the record speak for itself. I have here, in my possession, a copy of the speech that he made to this House on February 12, 1947, more than a year ago, and there are passages in that speech which leave

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

no doubt in anybody's mind as to his intentions to socialize the land. Let me quote to you some portions of that speech:

On page 11 of the transcript I have here, he says (and he is reading from a textbook): "Just as our own government, state, city, or nation, now owns schoolhouses, controls education, owns and conducts the Post Office, municipal waterworks and other public utilities, so would the socialists have government of railways, the telegraph, the mines, the factories, the lands." Then, says the hon. Minister, "and the Saskatchewan Bus." And then Mr. Embury took the liberty of saying, "Don't forget the land."

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — On a point of order: Do I take it that the hon. member is referring to the quotations I made as necessarily an expression of my own opinion? I made it quite clear to the House that I was reading from a school textbook, and that textbook was defining the difference between Socialism and the present industrial set-up. I was quoting from the textbook in question, not necessarily an expression of my own opinion.

Mr. Speaker: — The point of order of the hon. gentleman is that you did not make it plain enough that it was a quotation and not an expression of his own opinion.

Mr. Embury: — May I say for the third time, in quoting this gentleman, that he was quoting from a textbook which he had in his hand. The record of what I am saying now will show that I said that, Sir. As a matter of fact, I do not believe the hon. gentleman had a point of order; but in any event, in case there should be any doubt about whether his mind went with it...

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member will realize that I will rule on the point of order, subject to the decision of the House.

Mr. Embury: — May I be permitted to quote further, to see whether or not the gentleman's mind went with the quotation which I read to the House, by reading further the transcript of his speech: He said, "I do not see anything wrong with that — as a matter of fact I want to say for the benefit of the House that this book was not written by a Socialist. As a matter of fact I did not know it was there until I took a look a few days ago." He says, "I do not see anything wrong with that" — and he is referring to the socialization passage which I have quoted, and the land; and he says, "and the Saskatchewan Bus." I suggest to him that if the record is allowed to stand (and I am only repeating his own words to him), he sounds very much like a man who is in favour of the socialization of the land. The record leaves one room to assume that he is also a pro-Russian Socialist. Let me quote other passages from that speech. He says this, "The hon. member for the Mediterranean said that he was all for organized labour, provided it was not led by Communists. I have heard people like the hon. member talk that way before," he says. "Well, believe me, the labour unions and the membership thereof, have heard people talk that way before; but I have always found that every time we fight for the working people, whoever did anything on their own behalf, their leaders were always Communists."

Now, to be perfectly fair to the hon. gentleman, I think he meant there that if they tried to help the little fellow they were always accused of being communists. I think that was the intention of his remarks, although that is not the way they read. As a matter of fact, by the time I get finished quoting the remainder of his speech, people will wonder whether that was his intention or not; but in any event, that is what he said. I asked him right there and then "Do you approve of the Labour Movement when it is led by Communists; do you?" The hon. Premier said, "Don't frighten us," and I said "Answer the question. He cannot. He hasn't got the courage." Mr. Nollet then said, "From what I have heard the hon. member say, the hon. member sees a Communist behind every bush." Then I said, "Answer the question." Mr. Nollet then said, "I do not know of any unless he can name any labour unions that are." Mr. Embury then said, "Answer the question," whereupon Mr. Nollet said, "I am in favour of labour unions regardless of who its duly elected leaders are, and if the hon. member for the Mediterranean wants to make something of it, let him go to it," and I am going to oblige him.

Later on, he says this: "Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make one or two references before taking my seat. Sometimes when I hear the hon. members opposite criticizing us, I think of a famous Russian writer who had a pretty good verbal manner with which to deal with a reactionary type of mind, the type of mind which apparently sees no good in anything other than their own particular ideas and their own particular philosophies. This particular writer happened to be a very kindly gentleman. He was called 'The Children's Poet' – Maxim Gorki..." Then we get a long quotation from Maxim Gorki, none of which is particularly interesting to anybody except the hon. Minister of Agriculture, which winds up, saying that "the chief motto of every Philistine is 'As things have been, so shall they be'. Like a dead fish, the Philistine rots from the head down." Nice for the Russian kids, that! I should think!

Further on, he says this: "I should like to call the attention of the members of the House to another great danger which gives me great concern. We are all concerned about world peace. Wherein do the dangers to world peace really lie? In my opinion, and I have been watching for the past year or so, a gradual change in the United States foreign policy, we have gradually witnessed the development of a vicious, imperialistic policy instead, in the United States, and that gives me great concern." He goes on to say: "I think the hon. members opposite, and particularly the hon. member for the Mediterranean, should feel some concern over the fact that the secrets of the atomic bomb are in the hands of one nation, and in the military hands of one nation only." Mind you, this speech was being made at a time when the Russian Socialists were endeavouring to obtain at secret in the United Nations.

He goes on to indicate in his speech (the record is quite clear) that in his opinion the secret of the atomic bomb should be given to the United Nations. The hon. gentleman goes on to criticize the Bikini atomic

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

exercises which were then being held in the Pacific and very widely criticized by Russian world spokesmen. Here is a passage, too, which, coming from a Canadian, a person of any responsibility, in a most extraordinary remark. He said this: "It is quite significant too, that they have a new Hirohito in Japan." The hon. Minister of Agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan, calling that great American general a 'Hirohito in Japan!' And that happened at a time, Sir, when the Russian socialists were attempting to gain concessions in Korea and in the management of the affairs of Japan; and our friend chooses the timely opportunity to call that great general a 'Hirohito'!

He goes on to say – I might say that at the time of this speech, on February 12th last year, news coming from Russia indicated that they were complaining about American bases and American soldiers –

Hon. C.C. Williams: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member is speaking on something that took place in the Budget Speech of 1947, and my point of order is that his speech is on the Speech from the Throne, 1948, and his remarks are therefore out of order.

Mr. Speaker: — The point of order is not well taken.

Mr. Procter: — You cannot get out of it that way.

Mr. Embury: — Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. gentleman does not want me to pursue these unpleasant and revealing things, but I consider it to be my duty to do so. I do not believe that he is going to like it, but I have taken the liberty of saying that the record of the annals of this House show that this gentleman is a pro-Russian Socialist, and these are the facts that I based my remarks on.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — On a point of privilege: I certainly must take exception to the last remarks made by the gentleman. The inference is clearly there that I am a pro-Russian socialist, and I certainly resent it and request the hon. gentleman to retract that statement, and also, while he is at it, to retract the inference that I have a lead in to Moscow and timed my remarks to coincide with Russian policy.

Mr. Embury: — If I may speak to the point of order as well, Sir, I am quoting from the records of this very House, and have said that these, and these alone, form the basis for my opinion.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member must pay attention to what any member states in regard to his stand on matters like that.

Mr. Speaker: — The point of order is that you are imputing that the hon. gentleman belongs to a Russian Socialist group and is acting on behalf of the other country. Any remarks that you make in regard to the hon. member must not save any reflection upon his character. Also, if he repudiates, you must accept his word.

Mr. Embury: — Of course, I will accept the explanation of the hon. member, and I can quite understand his anxiety.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The hon. member has not yet withdrawn the statement that he made that the hon. Minister of Agriculture is a pro-Russian socialist, to which the hon. Minister objects.

Mr. Procter: — The hon. member stated definitely that he accepted it, and that is all the hon. gentleman is required to do.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — He accepted the explanation — he did not say that he withdrew the statement.

Mr. Embury: — Rather than hurt his feelings, I withdraw any suggestion...

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Might I inform the hon. member it is not a question of hurting his feelings, it is a question of using language and nomenclature that is not acceptable in this House.

Mr. Embury: — Then I withdraw those, if it is of any assistance to him; but I can well understand, Sir, why he should hate me to read these remarks of his back to the House. I repeat that this is the record, Sir, and that the inference to be drawn from that is a matter upon which the public may draw their own conclusions. I am not finished with him yet, either. Here — last, but by no means least — at a time when the news coming from Russia was critical of the existence of American bases on this continent, and American troops on this continent, to cap it all we have the hon. Minister of Agriculture in this province saying this: “I understand and know that there are still American troops in Saskatchewan, at North Battleford. I think they should be told to go home. they have no business up there at all. I should think that the secrets of the atomic bomb should be laid before the United Nations Security Council, all of them.” Now, I only read this to the House for the purpose of indicating to you what kind of a man it is who is going to be the landlord of 1,280 veterans on Crown lands in the province of Saskatchewan under their Crown leases. I do not propose to weary you with it any further, but I say, that is the man, and those are the remarks of the man, who is going to have that job to do in the years immediately ahead. Now, if the hon. gentleman says he is not a pro-Russian socialist I will take his word for it; but that also is the record. I think he will have to agree with me that the record does not sound right; but I can assure my hon. friend, the Minister, that if I had been sitting as a colleague of his, in the Cabinet of this province, when he made that speech on the 12th of February one year ago, that either he would have gone from the Cabinet I would. Instead of that, his colleagues sat with him for the next twelve months in seemingly happy unanimity. I say that they are all tarred with the same brush.

Now, this is the man who is going to administer these leases. Our socialist friends have repeatedly said that they do not intend to socialize the land in Saskatchewan; but they have said that they are going to eradicate capitalism in Saskatchewan, and they sometimes slip a little bit when they get excited, as the hon. Minister of Agriculture did last year, and seem to indicate that they are in favour of it after all. Around election

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

time, I do not suppose they will tip their hands again as they have in the past, because it is going to be a pretty hot question, if they do.

The greatest point at issue, so far as socialization of the land is concerned, insofar as it affects veterans, is the question of the right of the veteran to eventually own that land – to buy it. Now, I asked a question of the hon. Premier the other day, whether or not he would allow a veteran to come into ownership of provincial lands so that he could actually buy and own them; if he wanted to use Veterans' Land Act facilities to come into the possession of an agreement for sale where there is a definite covenant that he was allowed to buy on specific money terms, or whether he would sell it to him if he had the money outright today. I got the answer that the policy in respect to veterans had already been laid down. It is those policies that I now propose to examine more closely, to see whether or not that policy of the hon. Premier is going to be followed so that a veteran can actually buy the land of his choice, that has been rented to him by the government, either now or ever.

I suggest to you that, on this debate last year, I raised that question, since which time, insofar as putting a fixed option price in the agreement is concerned, nothing has been done. The government gives the veteran the right to be a tenant for thirty-three years, and to be perfectly fair, Sir, I think it is fair to say that they give him that right under very fair conditions indeed so far as the rental figure is concerned. When the Minister of Rehabilitation and Reconstruction, who then seemingly had the matter in hand, received some complaints (and mine was one) he changed his rental provisions, or quite recently has given indication that he will change them – instead of being from one-sixth to one-eighth, they are going to be from one-sixth to one-tenth – I think that is what he says. That sounds as though it is even more favourable, as far as rentals were concerned, than his initial proposal. The point is that the hon. Minister of Reconstruction, so far as he has anything to do with it now – and he seems to have something to do with it – he wants to keep the men as tenants, I suggest; and he does not want them to buy. There is nothing in this lease which would encourage the man to buy. That question, I suggest to you, is, in essence, an ideological question. It is the difference between a man who believes in socialism, and a man who does not believe in socialism.

(continued on Page 13)

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — The hon. member, if he knows anything about the agreement which we have with Ottawa, and it was an agreement which was mutually entered into, he must realize that there is an option to purchase...

Mr. Embury: — I am going to read the agreement.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member says he is going to read the whole agreement.

Mr. Embury: — No, I am going to read the relevant parts, or any part he wants, Sir.

My point is this, Sir: that upon a construction of that agreement, with its very low rental terms, the hon. Minister, being a socialist, does not encourage the man to buy; and I am going to suggest further, Sir, as he very well knows, that he has not, in fact, given them an opportunity to buy. And I am going to read the agreement, in a minute, so there is no need for the hon. gentleman to get up and interject himself into the middle of my speech, much as I don't think he is going to like what I am going to say about it. I suggest, Sir, that that is only an ideological question; that it is, in essence, the difference between a socialist and a man who believes in socialism, private ownership of the land or rental of the land, and that that is, in fact, the main difference between us.

It is, in the main, I think inherent in most men, and certainly in the veterans, a great many of them, to want to own their own lands. I believe, too, Sir, that as the ten years roll on, if we have any luck in farming, these men on Crown lands paying a very small and, in many cases, down as low as a tenth, it is only a nominal rental, will have some money and will want to buy that land; certainly they will want to improve that land; and if they are going to improve it and build buildings on it and wells and fences, then they will want to know if they can buy it and own it; and if that is the case they should be allowed to read their contracts now and know the terms upon which they are going to come into possession of it.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? The inference I get here, and I am sure the hon. members, too, is that these rentals are too low. May I ask the hon. gentleman if he considers these rentals to be too generous to the veteran? I know that they are infinitely more generous than that of the mortgage companies.

Mr. Embury: — Sir, is he making a speech in the middle of my speech?

Mr. Speaker: — He is asking if you consider the rentals too low.

Mr. Embury: — It sounds more like a speech to me — I do not know what he was talking about, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: — The question of the hon. gentleman was: do you consider the rentals too low?

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

Mr. Embury: — Well, I have already said, I think, several times, over the head of the interruptions like his, that I consider them very generous indeed, as far as the rental basis is concerned, and I believe had your honour been listening at all to me, he would have heard me say that several times: that as far as the rental was concerned, they were very generous indeed.

If I may say a word or two about the interruption of the hon. Minister in getting up to answer a question like that, having heard my observations as to the generosity of his treatment of the tenants, I suggest, Sir, that he had had his answer before he asked the question, and that he only rose for the purpose of interrupting me in the remarks I had to make.

Premier: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I have listened to the gentleman imputing motives all afternoon. Is he allowed to impute the motive to the Minister, that he interrupted, not for the purpose of securing information, but for the purpose of obstructing my hon. friend? Is that a proper observation in this Legislature?

Mr. Embury: — What did he do then?

Premier: — I ask for a ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — My ruling is that the hon. member must not impute motives to a member; that is not allowed in the House.

Mr. Embury: — I was wrong then. He withheld me from the purpose of getting on with it.

I suggest this to you, Sir, I know perfectly well that the hon. gentleman is not going to like what I am going to say about his lease but, within the rules of the House, Sir, I propose to say it. I am one of those who believe that the veterans will not like being mere tenants forever; and subject to the other terms of the lease, and subject to the supervision of any socialist Minister, such as the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

There are other clauses in the lease besides the one under which you pay the rentals. There are various clauses which subject him to the supervision of the Minister, and which a man who owned his land would not be subjected to. For example: clause two of the lease says: “that the lessee” – that is my veterans – “will bring the said lands into a state of reasonably efficient production as soon as conditions favourable for so doing, and resources in his possession, will permit.” And he will, “unless the permission of the Minister to the contrary is obtained, bring all arable land except that hereinafter provided, under cultivation within six years of the date hereof.” “The lessee will farm the said land in a proper and husbandlike manner, and will, in the proper season of each year, either put into crop in a rotation adaptable to the district in which the land is situated, or summerfallow every part of the said land, which has heretofore been brought into cultivation, and will use only good clean seed, free and clear of all noxious weeds, and will pull up or otherwise destroy all noxious weeds or grasses which shall grow on the said land, and will not permit any noxious weeds or grasses go to seed:

provided that the lessee may, after having first obtained the consent of the Minister, convert any portion of the cultivated arable land to pasture, or for the production of hay and fodder crop, upon such terms and conditions as the Minister may determine; provided further, that the Minister may at any time, and from time to time, waive payment of any annual rental or portion thereof as he may deem it advisable to insure the proper development of said land.”

I suggest to the House, Sir, that under clause (3) the Minister is going to have quite a lot to say about the administration and the manner in which the farm is going to be used.

Clause (5) says: “The lessee will, in each year of said term, give the Minister at least five days notice in writing of the time when he will commence threshing and he will forthwith after the grain or any part thereof is being threshed deliver to the Minister a certificate, executed by the owner or manager of the machine which threshed such grain, etc.” That is quite a usual clause in a share-crop agreement, but it is there.

Clause (8): “The lessee will not break any of the said land which is unsuitable for the growing of grain crops, provided, however, that with the written consent of the Minister, he may break such land for the purpose of sowing the same to grass, or hay, or pasture purposes.”

Clause (9): “The lessor shall have the right to supervise” – the lessor is the Minister, by the way; he is the man who is acting for the Crown – “the clearing of any part of said land on which there is any tree growth, and in the event of such supervision being undertaken the lessee agrees to conduct and carry out such clearing in the manner approved by the officer of the Natural Resources and Industrial Development. The lessee will commit no waste and hereby further agrees to save from clearing a reasonable portion of any tree growth on the said land and to use all reasonable care to protect from destruction in any manner whatsoever all three growth on any area so reserved from clearing. The lessee further agrees that if any reasonable portion of the said land does not now carry any tree growth, he will reserve a reasonable portion thereof for the purpose of planting and maintaining thereon such trees as may be supplied by the Minister for this purpose” – and so on.

So, I suggest, Sir, there are a number of clauses in that contract – one could read on to a few more – which give the Minister quite close powers of supervision over the manner in which that farm will be used. And I suggest that most veterans would sooner own their own land and not be supervised by anyone, and that it is inherent in the hearts and minds of most Canadian free man to do that.

I quite agree with the farmers of this province, that if they had to do it over again, starting out as young men on the farms here, that they would have been better off if they had stayed as tenants, and particularly as tenants under rental agreements that we have here. I do not disagree at all with the proposal that a veteran should be allowed to do that if he wants to, but my suggestion to the House is this: that in the event that he wants to buy, he should have the opportunity to buy under this so-called Lease Option Agreement.

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

Premier: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question, before he leaves the contracts? Is there not a provision in that contract to allow a veteran to purchase at the end of 10 years?

Mr. Embury: — I wonder if my hon. friend would let me proceed...

Premier: — As long as my hon. friend answers the question.

Mr. Embury: — Well, I am coming to the answer of your question now.

I suggest to you, Sir, that under this Agreement, there is not sufficient provision whereby the veteran can say that he has the right, which he can understand now, to purchase land under this Agreement. I am going to read clause (7), to the House now. I want you to listen to it carefully – it says this: “After the expiration of the first 10 years of this lease, the lessee” – that is my veteran – “may at any time during the remainder of the said term give the Lessor” – that is the Minister – “written notice of his desire to purchase the said land; if the lessee has, up to the time of giving such notice, performed and observed the several covenants, conditions and agreements by him herein agreed to be performed and observed, the Lessor –that is the Minister – “will offer to sell the said land to the lessee at a price and under terms based on fair productive value. In fixing the price the Minister shall make allowance for the cost of any clearing of said land, or done on the said land, at the lessee’s own expense, and such offer shall be open for acceptance for a period of so many days after the day on which it is made.” That is left in blank and I suppose it is filled in on the individual contracts.

I suggest that there is a vast difference between an Agreement to make an Agreement, which is one step removed from an Option, and an agreement to sell the land, which is an Option. The criticism of clause (7) is this: that it does not contain a ceiling price, or a special price at which His Majesty’ Government agrees to sell that land to that veteran, when the option carried expires. And I suggest to you, sir that in the interest of the veteran who wants to own his own land, that he should have a price in there now; that there should be a price stipulated and a clear cut option today, so that if the Government is sincere in the representation that the veteran is going to have a chance to buy that land, let us settle that here and now while the sacrifices and services of the veterans are still fresh in the minds of the Canadian public, and the Saskatchewan public, whom you gentlemen have the honour to represent.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Are you in favour of a firm price to the veteran now, or a price ceiling?

Mr. Embury: — If I may be allowed to proceed, I think I will be able to give an answer to the hon. Minister, as I go forward, in connection with it. The hon. Minister and I both know the discussions which have taken place in connection with this matter, and I do not propose to have anything to say with respect to those, but I do say this: it is desirable, I think, in the best interest of the veteran that a price ceiling be placed in that clause; that there should be put in there the words to indicate and firmly bind the Government and the veteran; that the price which he shall be charged when he takes up his Option, if he wants to take up his Option, shall not exceed the assessed price today. We have, in this province, one of the finest assessment commissions in Canada ; most people praise it very highly as a scientific and thorough job, and it has

many factors. I know the hon. gentlemen over there say it is not a suitable yardstick, or basis for a price which the veteran should have to have. They say they are acting in the interest of the veteran, but we say...

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: —Is the assessed value of land being used by the V.L.A. for example, in the purchase of land for veterans today? Is there any relationship whatsoever between the assessed value of the land and what veterans are paying for land, today, under V.L.A.?

Mr. Embury: — If the hon. gentleman is suggesting by his question, Sir, that it is a matter of absolute impossibility for him to protect the veteran, today, by putting in any ceiling price at all, then I suggest to him that the question is misleading. But if the hon. gentleman does not like the assessed value as being the appropriate one, then I would suggest this to him; that it is as good a yardstick to determine the relative value of property from one end of this province to another, and that if he wants to say that the assessed value, plus 10 per cent, or whatever his opinion is, then let us close with him on that. The price is being found without so much confusion in Alberta and in Manitoba — we can find a price; it is done under the Veterans' Land Act. I do not know, I could not possibly tell you, whether the assessed value has any particular bearing on each and every Land Act Contract, but I do suggest that the Veterans' Land Act would be interested in the assessment value and in the assessment of any piece of land, and in every territory of land, because they enquire into the nature of the soil and the rainfall and the other factors in relation to the value of land, before they make an individual contract of purchase with the owner, or take it into the hands of the director, and they could give a clear-cut agreement for sale to the veteran. But I suggest this: if the hon. gentleman thinks he is acting in the best interests of the veteran when he refuses, if he does refuse, and he has so far, to put a ceiling price in that option, and give the Veteran a clear-cut right to purchase, it at a price known now — if he is doing so, I suggest, because it is part and parcel of the ideological aspect of socialism that he would prefer the man to be a tenant and does not want him to ever have the clear-cut right to purchase now...

Premier: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: my hon. friend has been in this House now for three Sessions — he knows better than to impute motives either to the Government or to a Minister of the Crown; and to say that a Minister has refrained from putting a price there because he does not want to sell land is to impute a motive which is incorrect and most unfair. I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that imputation.

Mr. Speaker: — The point of order is well taken — as the hon. member knows, you cannot impute motives.

Mr. Embury: — I will withdraw, of course, according to your ruling, Sir. But that is the first time in this House that we have ever had a confession from anybody that to call a man a socialist in this House was a bad motive. I quite agree that is a bad motive.

Mr. Speaker: — No, that was not the point of order at all. The point of order was that it was imputed the Minister of Reconstruction was deliberately...

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

Mr. Embury: — Is there anything else I can do?

In any event, my hon. friend has been very successful in dropping the point in taking his objection. The point that I think should be made for, and on behalf of, the 1,280 veterans referred to in the throne Speech is this: if they have not got sufficient assurance that they will eventually be able to purchase this land under clause (7) of this agreement, and I suggest to you, in all fairness, that any man reading clause (7), endeavouring to discover what his position would be when he went to the Minister ten years from now, and that Minister alone is going to have the right to set the price, allowing only for fair productive value, and in fixing the price making allowance for the cost of any clearing on the said land – guided by those two things alone, how is the veteran going to know what he is going to have to pay for the land at any time, say between now and ten years from now?

I suggest that if a man built a house on the land, or built a fence on the land, or put a well on the land, or tried to work out some irrigation on his land on his own, that those would be improvements that are not allowed for in this clause (7), and I suggest to you that under this lease, some subsequent terms of which include that at the end of the time when he ceases to become a tenant he has the right to move the buildings off again or sell them, or something like that. But we are inviting a man, during the first ten years, to do his best to make a go of his farm – the man is supposed to improve it – build a home on it – who is going to take a chance like that? Who is going to put in several thousand dollars when the Option price may include that also? This says that the Minister will make allowance for clearing, but it does not say it makes allowance for anything else. I suggest that this clause (7) works against the veteran who is trying to do his best. Suppose he had to make up his mind four or five years from now as to whether or not he wants to build, or whether or not he wanted to improve, but he does not know the price which the hon. Minister is subsequently going to fix the value at, and what he is going to pay. Well, now, as it has been put up to the hon. Minister before now, that man may see an opportunity to buy at once, in some other province, or in some other part of the province, or go on some other land with the money he has been able to assemble; do you think, Sir, that if a man wanted to purchase land, that he would stay on the land when he did not know what the future held for him, or do you think he would go out and make his permanent plans while he was able to afford to do so?

No, I suggest to you that clause (7) works against the veteran.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? How many veterans' settlements or farms have you visited in the past year or so, to discover whether improvements are being made, whether homes are being built, or if additional lands are being brought under cultivation?

Mr. Embury: — Well, the hon. gentleman knows very well indeed, that during the past 12 months I have made it my business to visit in the following parts of the province of Saskatchewan. I have been to Carlyle, Broadview, Saltcoats, Assiniboia and Gravelbourg, Sir, I have been to Climax and Shaunavon, Tompkins, Gull Lake, Swift Current – I'm not finished yet – I will tell you who I was talking to when I was

there, I know you won't like it, you know, but I have made it my business to keep in contact with the veterans, it seems, a little bit better than the hon. Minister. This is where I stopped, Sir, I have been up to Yorkton, to Abernethy, Davidson, Outlook, Rosetown, Eston, Kindersley, Wilkie, North Battleford, Paynton, Meadow Lake and Loon Lake, too, and Saskatoon. And I may say that throughout that whole trip, I was in company with nobody but veterans of the Canadian Legion. I attended zone rally after zone rally of the Canadian Legion upon this very subject, and the hon. member need not tell me, or pretend to this House either, that he has any more familiarity with the affairs of veterans in this province than I have. And when I put forward these criticism with regard to clause (7), I do so as a result of my conversations with many, many hundreds of veterans on these lands in the province of Saskatchewan.

I do not propose to answer any more questions of that character from the hon. member. If he has any more perhaps he will hold them until I finish with what I have got to say.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — The hon. gentleman still has not answered my question, in spite of all this verbiage; he has not informed me as to whether he had visited a single farm.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I believe it is within the prerogative of the speaker, whether the gentleman has answered a question or not.

Mr. Embury: — That, I think, Sir is a fair comment in connection with clause (7), and I am sure that the House should be able to understand it from what I have said, most of them anyway.

I want to say a word before I sit down, Sir, in connection with co-operative farms, or so-called co-operative farms. During the past year I have been able to give some consideration to the proposals of the Government in relation to that type of undertaking. They call them 'co-operative farms'. On the information which I have received, Sir, and the conversations I have had with the hon. Minister himself, and with Mr. Dietrick of the Co-operative farm, and I do not see any reason why I should change my opinion in relation to those projects, as we understood them, and as I suggested they existed last year.

The Matador project, for example – I suggest to the House, in all fairness – is dominated by the provincial Government to a very considerable extent; and if my hon. friend will keep his seat I will elaborate upon that to say why I say that about it. I know that he does not like it – I am well aware of the fact that he does not agree with it, and I am not making these observations for the purpose of even trying to persuade him; I think he is hopeless, he is one of the uncompromising socialists that I was talking about.

If I may Sir, suggest certain things in respect to the contracts as we found them, and I don't say I am kindly in respect to my hon. friend either, Sir, I may say that hon. gentleman is a life member of the Canadian Legion and a veteran of two wars, and I am quite sure nobody in my position would suggest anything about his patriotic motives at all, I can assure you of that, Sir. But I do say that he is a very hardened socialist and it is upon that ideological difference that I think he and I will have to part ways. I am sorry

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

to call him a socialist with the implications that it has, however, there it is, and I am sure he won't mind me calling him a socialist as much as some of the other members of the House seem to do.

This project, Sir, is composed of 17 different leases, each of which, as far as I know, are exactly similar in form to the one which I read portions of a moment ago, with the exception of a certain clause inserted just after paragraph 13, which has peculiar relation to co-operatives alone. As framed last year – I believe the hon. Minister has accepted some modifications to it – it gave the Minister the right to cancel – in effect, without notice; it says without notice and there is no time element, so I would say without time notice anyway – in the event there was some difficulty of keeping the land in the co-operative – I put it generally. The intention is to modify it in such a way that we couldn't, and possibly shouldn't, criticize it as being unduly onerous upon the members of the co-operatives – and certainly the members of the co-operative do not disagree with it anyway. So that, generally, the land is held by 17 leases between the hon. Minister and the members of the co-operative. The co-operative entity itself is not upon the chain of title in respect to those lands at all: wherever a lease will fail it must revert back to the hon. Minister again, or the Minister of Agriculture, as matters now stand. That, I believe, is because there was an effort to obtain the Veterans' Land Act grant of \$2,320. In respect to those various leases; and I do not know that it is particularly objectionable, the effort was to try and bring them within the Veterans' Land Act and at the moment there is no authority by which they can be brought into the Veterans' Land Act. Section (9) of the regulations provides for a co-operative of ten or eleven men, and it does not make any arrangement for the existing co-operatives. I may have misunderstood various statements made by the hon. member, from time to time, that there was authority for the payment of these grants to these people at Matador, but, if there is any such authority, nobody can find it now and I venture to say to the House that there is no such authority at this moment, nor has there ever been.

What we want today to get those men their Federal grant is an Amendment to the existing regulations, and the hon. Minister knows that, or should have known it if he didn't. In any event, that is the reason why you have 17 separate leases. Those leases, I suppose, contain the same clause (7) – the hon. Minister led us to believe, not long ago, not in the House, but to the delegation that went to him – that the clause (7) was not in the lease. Well, we find it is in the lease; so that I take it the 17 members would have the right eventually to purchase their land and keep it in the co-operative, because the covenant with the co-operative enterprise is that they will do so. But the intriguing portion of the arrangement is this, to me, Sir, and that is with respect to 960 acres, I think it is, upon that tract which contains the irrigation portion and the buildings; there is a lease to the co-operative enterprise and it hasn't got any option in it at all. In other words, I look at the situation this way, Sir,: if that co-operative enterprise ever had a chance to own its own assets again – it is a question of private ownership, Sir, with me – if they had a chance to own that enterprise, then I would say one could call it a co-operative. but this land is leased by the Crown to the co-operative enterprise insofar as it affects the 960 acres on the vital area containing the buildings and the irrigation portion of it, without the right of option at all.

Now, if that lease were held from a private individual such as the C.P.R., or the Hudson's Bay, or somebody like that, then they would be bound in law within the terms of the lease, and it would last for 33 years, or whatever term was stated in the lease. Such leases are not unusual in law, but when you enter into a lease with the Crown, under The Provincial Lands Act, as my hon. friend well knows, the Crown has extraordinary remedies and prerogatives and I suggest to you that in respect to the lease on the 960 acres on the home area, as I would call it, that it is completely dominated by the Provincial Government and that there is no right to purchase it amid all the Crown prerogatives applied insofar as that is concerned. I have never seen the lease, Sir; I have never seen that lease, and no person who has given any study to it outside the Government that I have me, has ever seen that lease. The hon. Minister undertook to let us have a copy of it, yesterday, and I am sure we are all going to be very interested indeed to see what it contains; but I do suggest to you, sir, that in the absence of an option, a lease with the Government is not an adequate security to the undertaking.

Insofar as the remaining 17 leases are concerned, true, they have this option and perhaps if I could get my hon. friend to agree to put a ceiling price in, in each one of those options, then I believe that we would be able to say that the man had a right to take up his option and own his land and bring into the co-operative as a private enterprise; because co-operation is private enterprise. Co-operation is private enterprise – there is no particular socialist ideology connected with that movement, and I am sure there are very few men in that movement who would appreciate the hon. gentleman yonder trying to “tie a political can” on the movements “tail” either. They do not know they are socialists – you may think they have to be, but they don't have to be.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? My question is this: has he ever visited, at the request of the veterans themselves, the Matador farm, and have the members of the Matador farm made representations to him, on behalf of these rehabilitation grants, and what has been his actions?

Mr. Speaker: — He is asking a question; do you wish to answer the question?

Mr. Embury: — The hon. gentleman's question is quite lengthy. I have taken the matter up with Mr. Dietrick and discussed it with him quite fully and I think probably the hon. gentleman knows the communications which passed between us. I have never been to the Matador farm myself, I am not a farmer and I do not know much about it, but I have discussed it very thoroughly as far as their contracts are concerned, and those are matters which I may say that I probably know more about than the unfortunate people who are being, I suggest, victimized by the hon. Minister in the long-term arrangements which he is making in this matter. I suggest this, Sir, in connection with it, that on the failure of any one of the 17 leases – suppose a man drops out, as no doubt they will in the years ahead – the land then reverts to the hon. Minister; the hon. Minister says he will not lease it to anyone else but a member of the co-operative. That is all right, but I think the hon. Minister should also covenant with the co-operative, or with somebody, that he will lease the land – that he will not

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

refuse to allocate it at all. At the moment, as matters stand, they are dominated by the Government because the Government is in a position to control everything they do and that is the reason I say that, Sir: they control each of the 17 members under this individual lease, and they control the co-operative entity by reason of the lease upon the home area, as I will call it, and I suggest to the House, in all fairness, that it is completely dominated by the Government. My hon. friend states to me that that is not the case.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I do not know whether this is deliberate misrepresentation or not, I trust not. but this matter was explained to the hon. member no later than yesterday, and he is aware of the terms...

Mr. Embury: — Has the gentleman a point of order?

Mr. Speaker: — I am waiting to see.

Mr. Sturdy: — If a veteran leaves the co-operative, then it is true he surrenders his lease but he will be replaced by another veteran acceptable to the co-operative.

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. member state his point of order?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I am merely correcting a misrepresentation made by the hon. member. He intimated that the Provincial Government placed another veteran on that farm...

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. gentleman has not a good point of order, and if he will sit down the gentleman will have a chance to reply.

Mr. Embury: — Was it a point of order Sir? I think it was just taking the opportunity to make a speech — I do not know — we have that quite often.

My submission is, in the light of the existing contracts, the fact that there is no option, that the contract upon that home area which is so vital, being with the Crown, that it is dominated by the Crown and with respect to the 17 other leases — one of which I have, or very similar — I suggest that that is dominated very considerably by the reason of those passages which I read, by the Crown also.

In those circumstances there are very few co-operatives would consider that that was a co-operative entity or a co-operative enterprise. I suggest to you, sir, that where an enterprise of that character is Government dominated to a very considerable extent, that it loses its character as an independent private co-operative. the definition given to the House, last year, by the hon. Minister himself in respect to co-operatives, as I recall, had something to do with the question of whether or not it was Government dominated — and I suggest that from the construction of these contracts that it is, in fact, Government dominated: and if that is the case then it is not truly co-operative, but part of a Government enterprise, and it is not what one should call a co-operative enterprise, but more properly called communal or collective enterprise; it is not a co-operative at all.

Those are the reasons that I have for advancing that view, Sir, and I may tell you that there are a great many people who are concerned about the activities of the Government in those collective farming enterprises; because the considerations which apply to the Matador project also, I believe —

which I have attempted to tell you about between speeches of the hon. Minister of Reconstruction and Rehabilitation – also applies to the Carrot River proposal. I have never seen any of those contracts, but I do know that the statements which have been given to the House in respect to them indicate that collective farms, or whatever they call them – similar sorts of farms – are to be started up there; but instead of having 17 men, the one that we hear about has 10 and, as such, perhaps it may be that we can bring it within clause (9) of the regulations under the Veterans' Land Act and have a better than even chance of getting the grant. However that may be, the point that occurs to me in respect to the Carrot River project is this: that all of that tract undertaken by the Government apparently is to be given to those who will go into this kind of an agreement with the hon. Minister. I suggest to you, Sir that we are committed, and this House is committed, and this Government is committed, to giving a preference in allotment of provincial lands to those who served their country best in this war; to those who served the longest overseas; to those who have the greatest need; to those who have given the greatest sacrifices to Canada by reason of their services – those should get the preferential treatment, and that was agreed upon. But, Mr. Speaker, it is not possible to find among a number of ten or twenty chaps who will go into a co-operative enterprise – in fact it isn't easy to find any Canadians who like going into that sort of thing – but among the people that they would be able to find who will go into what is, I suggest, a Government dominated proposal like this, people who happen to be the class of people we would like to give the preference to in allowing them to go upon Crown lands. As a consequence, you will get chaps who have not as high qualifications who are allowed to get on that land as against fellows who do not want to go into one of these things, who are not allowed to get on the lands.

I suggest to you, sir, that there should be some portion of this Carrot River tract – the Government insists on putting this sort of a farm into operation up there, or several of them – but there should be some portion of that tract, for which this Government is putting out something like \$20 per acre probably, in clearing it; it might be a little less \$18 maybe, but around there, and it is going to amount to a very substantial sum of money – but they should allow some part of it, at least, to go to the man who wants to go on as an individual and farm his own land as an individual. And that, I suggest to you, is a valid criticism as far as veterans are concerned.

I am well aware of the fact, as the hon. Minister has suggested, that the men who are on these farms at Matador are very well pleased with the arrangements they have been able to make on that tract of land. I would not suggest to the House for a moment that those men are complaining at all, they are not – as a matter of fact, it would be very wrong of them if they did complain about it. They have got themselves onto one of the finest tracts of land in this province, capable, as to part of it, of being irrigated – I believe parts of it are that heavy Rosetown clay, the same type of soil we have around here – but anyway it is good land. they have had advanced to them – I believe they have to pay it back, or the Government holds some sort of security from them – but anyway they got an advance from the Government of \$37,500 in lieu of their grants under the Veterans' Land Act, which is to be repaid to the Provincial Government when and if the Federal Government

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

ever makes the allowance to them but they had that money and the use of that money; they had government priority for their equipment; they had government priority for their War Assets buildings that they got; they got treatment which hundreds and hundreds of other veterans in this province could not get from anybody for love or money, and they are very pleased indeed; and why wouldn't they be pleased! There is no question about that at all; but the real criticism which I have in respect to both these projects, not only at Carrot River but at matador as well, is that it seems to be one of the means whereby part of the land in Saskatchewan is going to be socialized, and that is my sincere objection in respect to it. that is the way the land was socialized by the Russian socialists; they took veterans of the wars and displaced persons and put them on tracts of land all over the arable portions of Russia, and they expanded and extended those to the point that they finally squeezed the independent farmer owner, known as a 'Kulak', out altogether and sent him off to Siberia.

Now, these gentlemen talk about the socialization of the land. They are embarked, I suggest to you, on just such a program as was seen in Russia which commenced in 1923, and accomplished possibly ten years later. that is the real danger in respect to it, Mr. Speaker.

Before I sit down I would like to say this: that last year I expressed some of the anxiety that people like me have in respect to this Government. For example, I suggested last year, (and it has never been denied by the other side of the House) that they were doing the wrong thing when they published pamphlets of a known, acknowledged Communist like Dyson Carter. Nobody has ever said a word to justify that, and no word of explanation came to us from the benches opposite.

You take the public's money – take your money and my money and republish the works of an acknowledged Communist, prepare a mailing list and put the thing in an envelope (or however you do send it) and send it through the mails – and we pay the postage. That sort of thing, I think, is fairly criticized. Nobody wants that sort of thing in this country at all.

This Government did it but the only answer you will get is a frivolous evasive excuse having nothing to do with what has been alleged against them. The only thing I could get out of the hon. Premier was that I shouldn't run around trying to get a coalition nomination in Regina: he said that I saw pink elephants –it is pink socialists I see. He said a lot of things but he never said a word about this communist propaganda that they printed and sent out at public expense. What kind of an answer is that? How do you expect your critics to have any sort of confidence in you unless you will admit, at least, that you were wrong, or seek to give us an undertaking that you will never do such a thing again? We are not going to sit here – no member of the House, and particularly a veteran – quiet in his seat when that sort of thing goes on. the hon. Premier said that he could not understand why I had changed my views in respect to the Government during the first two years I was home: does he think that any veteran in this country worthy of the name is going to sit here and watch his Government republishing Communist

literature and sending it out at public expense, and when he is charged with it have nothing more to say than if he was a veterans' representative he would not be running around looking for a coalition nomination in Regina. Let me tell you this, Sir, that I do not care, and could not care less, whether I am a suitable candidate for a coalition election in Regina – I do not care in the least – but I will say to the hon. Premier and the House, too, that it is about time all of the decent people in this province got together, no matter what their politics are, to put an end to that sort of thing. In many places a coalition government is probably the best way of doing it, because I feel that any government that is going to engage in that sort of activity should be driven from public office and public life. That is more a question of patriotism than it is of politics, but I believe with a coalition, whether I am in it or not in it, we would have the best possible answer; and it is the thing he fears the most, and I hope the people of this province will adopt it wherever it will have the effect of removing him from public office.

Certainly, that sort of talk is no kind of an answer to the criticisms that were made. I think it is about time, Sir, that we put an end to some of the more extreme activities of this Government. I do not like to sit here and hear people talk about the subjugation of our courts – I do not think it is right and I think it is dangerous; I think it is time we recognized the ambitions of the Government. As far as I have been able to discover them, they are very considerable. It is the ambition of the Government to socialize the land and it is time we put a stop to this irresponsible socialist agitation. The hon. Premier occupies an important place in Saskatchewan – to talk about “battlefronts” and “class hatreds” and “ruling classes”; he knows those things are not true, Sir, and I believe that coming from so important a person in the province of Saskatchewan, they are very damaging indeed to the community as a whole.

I do not see the reason why the public of Saskatchewan should be compelled to listen to the remarks that I have quoted from the speech of the hon. Minister of Agriculture. He says that he is not a pro-Russian socialist, and I take his word for it; but I say that the record stands for itself, Sir, when those remarks were made. I do not think we should be attaching the professions. I think, Sir, that it is time the people of Saskatchewan came to recognize what this Government is honestly trying to do, and it does not sound as benevolent as you would try to have us believe; and I must say, for my part, I am opposed to them, and have no confidence in them, as far as the Speech under Debate is concerned, and the Motion under Debate is concerned.

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

Mr. L.W. Lee (Cumberland): — I want first to congratulate the Mover and the Seconder of The Address in Reply along with other members, for their very well delivered addresses, and I also regret that owing to health and other personal reasons, they will not be serving this Government for another term. I also want to congratulate the Opposition on their very well delivered speeches, not saying, that I agree with their ideology, but I think it is a very good idea to have some of that here in this House. If we did not, I think we would be inclined to get rather lax. I think that is just what happened in some of our foreign countries. Maybe in Germany, for instance. I think it is a very good thing that we have some of these old radical, worn out ideas continually kept in front of us, and I think we will see the results of that in the next election.

We have heard quite a lot in this House about what this Government is doing; what we have done; the bad things that we have done. The Leader of the Opposition referred to the far north; the fur, fish and timber of our northland. He said that they were absolutely in control, or that this Government had taken absolute control over fur, fish and timber. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask if fur, fish and timber should not be controlled by the Government or should it be controlled by a few private individuals whose only purpose of controlling it is to exploit it for their own individual ends? I think, Mr. Speaker, that fur, fish and timber should be under control of the Government elected by the people; that fur, fish and timber belong to the people, and I think it is the duty of the Government to see that that is carried on as a business and as a profitable business to the people and the province as a whole. I know, in the past, that has not always been done. The province did not have very much control of their fur, fish and timber resources in the north, a few years ago.

There has been a lot said about our fishing industry in the north and about this Government taking complete control over that fishing industry. I just wonder if we have taken complete control. Now, we did in certain areas set up fish filleting plants, but we did not do that on our own. In 1944

(continued on page 27)

the federal government was formed to that, by the fact that some of our fish going across the Border to the United States had been condemned by the Pure Foods authorities and turned back. That practice apparently had been going on for some time. Finally the federal authorities were forced to take action, so they passed this Whitefish Inspections Act.

Now, that Act no doubt forced us to close a good many of our lakes here in the north. The Act said that we had to grade our lakes "A" or "B" depending on the infestation in the fish in those lakes. This Government, which was new at the time, saw that something had to be done immediately if we were to permit the people of the north to earn a living, whose livelihood depended on fishing, and we immediately went to work and started to classify our lakes, and this Act says that any fish from "B" lakes had to be processed – filleted – before they could be exported or put on the market. We were on the spot; so we immediately began construction of filleting plants as soon as we had the information available to permit us to do that. Today, the Government has three filleting plants in the north, one of which is mobile up at Meadow lake, and the other two at Lac la Ronge and Beaver lake are up-to-date filleting plants. There is no obsolete machinery there.

Mr. L.M. Mapion (Athabasca) — How much filleting has been done so far in the Meadow Lake filleting plant?

Mr. Lee: — I could not say how much filleting has been done in the Meadow Lake plant, because I have never been there.

Mr. Mapion: — Well, I can tell you how much: None.

Mr. Lee: — As I have said, these filleting plants are up to date. They will take care of the fish for years to come. Had those plants not been erected these three lakes, and there are many others in those areas, would have had to be closed, with the result that the natives would have been forced to ask for Government for relief, because at that time there was very little fur in those areas. The long-haired fur was almost extinct at that very time.

Now, the Opposition say that we have practically taken over everything up there, and that there is no private industry at all. Two of these plants are on the east side, in my constituency. On the other side we have the Len Waite fisheries which have been in operation for a good many years. Now, we did not interfere with his plants – he is operating today, apparently very successfully. There was nothing to have stopped him or anyone else from coming in and putting these plants up on our side, but no one ever hinted of an intention to do any such thing, and that is the reason the government took this action. As far as having a monopoly on fishing up there is concerned, that is absolutely wrong.

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

There has also been quite a bit of criticism about the Fish Board. Well, the fishermen had been asking for some sort of a stable price – some sort of Board that would give them some guarantee that when they invested in nets and equipment and went out on that lake to fish, they would have some returns for their efforts. In the past they had had no guarantee whatever as to what the returns would be. Maybe, before they went out to fish, buyers for certain fish companies would tell them – “Well, I think probably we will pay ten cents a pound, or twelve cents a pound.” Then they would go out and fish, make a big catch, deliver them to the buyers, and after they were delivered – well, prices had gone down and they could only get two or three cents a pound, with a promise of a little more later on. I know a number of cases where the fisherman did not get anything for his catch. He delivered it “on spec.”

Mr. Mapion: — What companies were supposed to be buying fish, that you are talking about?

Mr. Lee: — There were a number of them. If you want their names, you had better go up north and ask the fishermen. But you can find lots of them. As a result of that, they asked us to do something to stabilize fish prices, so we held meetings with them, and finally came to the conclusion that a Fish Board was the only thing that would answer the purpose; similar to our Wheat Boards that we have down here now. We decided we should have a Fish Board to market the fish – one that would guarantee them a certain price so that when they invested in their nets and equipment and went out on the lakes, they would know that they were going to receive at least something for their efforts when they returned.

Some people say that in other provinces they were paying ten or twelve cents a pound, at least paying higher prices than we were paying at or near these fish filleting plants. Now the fish from “B” lakes are fish that could not have been caught and exported if it had not been for these filleting plants. “A” lake fish are fish that can be caught and exported just as they come from the lake, without any processing at all. There is a vast difference in these two fish – one has to be processed, and in the process half of the fish is waste; then you have your packing, your inspection, your paper, your boxes, your cold storage; you have a tremendous expense in putting up fish in a shape that you can offer to the public and guarantee that it is a good food product. Those comparisons that we hear are quite often – well, they are trying to compare our “B” lake fish with “A” lake fish in other provinces, and there is no comparison at all. It would be just the same as the farmers down here comparing Number One Hard Northern Wheat with, I would say, rejected “smutty” wheat, or even a lower grade than that, if that were possible.

As to our timber resources, we hear quite a bit of comment from the Opposition – I believe it was the member from Rosthern who made the comment that the lumbermen do the work and the government takes the profit, or words to that effect – so I would just like to give a little comparison. When the Liberals were in power a few years back we paid \$3.00 a thousand stumpage for this timber, and we sold that lumber at from about \$10.00 to \$15.00 a thousand. That is all we could get for it up there in the north; so that we were paying

the government from one-third to one-quarter of the value of that lumber. Today, our dues have increased slightly – not very much. Today, the government has only taken one-tenth to one-twelfth the price of that lumber. Now, I would say there is a vast difference there. If we were taking the same portion in comparison to price, to the value of the lumber, we should be taken about \$10.00 or \$12.00 per thousand – something we are not doing, and I can say that the timber men and the sawmill men in the north are, most of them, very well pleased with our new regulations with regard to timber. They have specially commented on the roads which we have built in these different forested areas, and we have far more up-to-date fire-fighting equipment than we ever had before. I remember that last year on several occasions, in the vicinity where I live, farmers not far distant from the forest reserve burned bush fires; and within an hour Forestry men were out there to see what was burning; and they had been watching the smoke from towers fifteen miles away. They could not just tell, on account of the way the smoke drifted, whether it was in the Reserve or outside of it. I think we have a very efficient staff in the Forestry service today.

We are also making quite a study of parasites and trying to find methods of overcoming them and keeping them from destroying our timber; our Larch in the north was practically destroyed on account of a beetle that came in from Europe a number of years ago, and it was as a result of that, that most of our Larch trees in the north have been destroyed; however, we have a young growth coming up, and in time this will be merchantable timber. We also have this beetle pretty well under control. It is being combated by bringing in other parasites that kill the beetles. When we take into consideration that our forest resources were practically depleted here a few years ago, I think we can be commended for making these severe regulations, and curtailing the harvest, so as to continue to have a little to harvest from year to year.

In regard to fur in the north, you will hear the Opposition saying that the government is compelling the trappers and dealers to sell their furs at Regina at the fur auction sales. Well, I want to say that they do not – outside of two pieces of fur, rats and beaver. Now the rats and beaver were almost depleted in 1944, and under the old methods of trapping they would have remained depleted; that is the reason that this Government took control of rats and beaver, and today rats and beaver are only trapped by permit, and in areas where they are sufficient to guarantee seed for the next year. If there is not a surplus over the seed for the following year, no permits are issued. If we had had that policy years ago we would always have had plenty of rats and beaver, because they have increased to a point now where they are very plentiful, and you can see the results of that in dams and rivers and lakes throughout the north. This new system of fur conservation, by organizing the trappers into conservation areas, is, I think, something that should be commended. Meetings were held before we suggested it, with the trappers throughout the north country, to get their ideas on it, and the majority of them took to it, and decided it would be a very good thing. Today, most of the north country is organized into conservation areas. In these areas they elect a council similar to our municipal councils down here. These councils have the power to make bylaws, they meet several times a year

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

with the Government Game Branch officials, and make recommendations to them. Then the officials, together with these council members, debate the issues brought up and co-operate in making laws that will tend to conserve the fur as well as to give them the rights that they did not always have in the past. Today, their trap line is protected. They have the right to supervise that line and keep anyone else off it. If anyone trespasses, they are liable and can be prosecuted. I was going to read an article here by one of our trappers in the north, but I do not believe I will take up that much time. He is Secretary to one of these areas, and he was not wholeheartedly in agreement with us when we first brought this in; but now he is very much in agreement, and any of you who might see the Western Producer for February 5, can find his letter in 'Open Forum'. His name is J.W. Eckdahl of Smeaton, Saskatchewan. He says this in his letter that regardless of what political power we have in the future, they will never be able to take this trapper set-up away from them.

In regard to our fur Marketing Service down here, in my constituency I have talked with quite a number of trappers. I asked some of them to give this Marketing Service a trial and quite a number did. In almost every case they would take their fur, they would divide it in two parcels, trying to divide it as evenly as possible; then they would ship one parcel to the Fur Marketing Service, and the other to the company or firm with which they had been dealing. In every case referred to me, they received much more at the Fur Marketing Service, and one of these men told me that he received almost double – he said he could hardly believe it.

There is something else that many are probably not aware of. Quite a few of our fur dealers in the north patronize the fur auction sales down here, and I think that is pretty good proof in itself that they receive better returns than they would marketing them to local dealers. But as far as 'having' to market their furs here is concerned, no trapper in the north 'has' to market any fur to the Fur Marketing Service, outside of muskrat and beaver. He can market any other fur anywhere he wants – he can sell it to a storekeeper, he can sell it to any dealer, anywhere he wants. Muskrat and beaver are the only two that he has to ship down here, and the reason for this is in order for them to keep tab on it, keep it from being 'bootlegged' – in other words, by shipping the fur down here they have to issue permits for these furs and then they can check back and tell whether they have been over-trapped, and so on, and it gives them better records to go by.

There is a lot more I could say about my constituency up there. There are roads and many other services that we have obtained since this government took power. There were less than 600 pupils going to school when we took over in 1944, and now there are over 1,000. We built approximately twelve new schools – most of them new, some of them remodelled and brought up to date – also we have adult classes at some of these schools. There are nurses in connection with some of the schools, who co-operate with the teachers. We also have the hospital service that you have here in the south, up there now, and the Ambulance Service. We have surveyed and opened up a number of new town sites and areas in tourist centres. The highway is completed in to Lac la Ronge; and in saying that we are driving out private enterprise, or that we do not permit them to operate alongside of government enterprise, we have had quite a number of applications for various businesses going up in the area where the highway has been completed – really more than they will be able to accommodate at the present time.

I know one man who sold his business at some other place for \$17,000 not very long ago, and he is going in there and is going to invest that \$17,000 right there. That does not look as if private enterprise is afraid to go in and invest their money. There is another man who wants me to try to get him a lease on a piece of land along the Flin Flon highway. He told me that he was prepared to put in \$25,000 and said he might spend \$40,000 before he was through – that is, in putting up a tourist site, cabins, hotel and so on, and he wants to accommodate hunters and fishermen, as well as other tourists. And that is not all – there have been several other men who have asked if they could get leases on pieces of land along the Flin Flon highway as well as along the Lac la Ronge highway, and in almost every case they are intending to put in from \$10,000 to \$20,000 worth of capital, in order to make a site that you could ask the tourists to visit and make their home for a while.

As far as mineral development goes, I do not think that private capital is alarmed at all. We have one new mine that just opened up this past year, the New Core Mine, and we have quite a bit of activity in the field north of Beaver Lake. I know that there are quite a number of claims that were staked in there fifteen or twenty years ago, and they have been lying dormant – nothing has been done about them – we had a Liberal government in power all through those years, but capital did not come in – I do not know whether they were afraid or what was the reason – but now they are going in there with drills, and they are drilling, and going over those claims that were staked fifteen or twenty years ago, and there is quite a bit of activity. I think there is going to be a little mining centre in there; and the same thing has taken place at other places up there. That does not sound to me as though private capital was afraid that this government was going to socialize everything.

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

Now, there is one thing that I would like to mention before I close. I have condemned this government ever since 1944 for not doing more along those lines, for not going into it ourselves. We had a Liberal government for years, and they knew that the farmers and the province was buying oil from away down in the southern United States – Oklahoma, Texas – which was all very well, we should trade with those States; but we have been buying vast quantities of oil from those countries and it has run into millions of dollars. Not only that, we have been paying millions in freight on that oil. We have a formation right here in Saskatchewan – and it has been known to us for twenty to twenty-five years – a formation that is favourable to oil pools. It is a formation that carries the necessary fossils to make this oil. I know we have had a few holes drilled here and there by a few companies; sometimes they have been drilling for oil, but most of the time I do not think they have been. I believe there are around eighty or eighty-five holes, less than five hundred feet deep, and anyone who tells me that an oil well five hundred feet deep in Saskatchewan, is an oil well – well, he is just taking nonsense. I do not think there is any place in the province where one could find oil, less than a thousand feet deep, and any oil company knows that as well as I do.

But I do think that we have vast oil resources in the province and I do condemn both the present Government and the old Liberal Government for not paying more attention to it. Just recently, in the last few years, some of the larger oil companies have been getting quite worked up over the oil possibilities here in the prairie provinces, and they have been doing some prospecting and drilling. I know they worked in our adjoining province, in the Leduc field, for quite a while, although it was not until last year that they really brought in a well. Whether or not they were drilling all that time for oil, I do not know. They may have just been drilling to see how large the field was. I know they have also drilled quite a bit here in Saskatchewan, but we do not know whether they were drilling for oil or just drilling for information. Possibly they just want to know where the oil is so that they can open up at some future date. I know that happened down in the United States – I should know it, because I invested my own money in it – and of course lost it. It is not always the large oil companies that do the prospecting. Usually you will find that it is the little companies organized by farmers or businessmen – possibly the promoter has worked for some large oil company at some time; but the promoter that forms these little companies drills the well (in some cases he just dusts it to get information on the underground structure.)

(continued on Page 33.)

I do not blame any company for coming to the province here and drilling a lot of holes, maybe in their own minds they are quite sure we have the oil there. They drill a number of holes and then pull up and go on and they know in the future, they can come in at any time and open that up and go ahead and develop it. It seems to me they have just a little too much power.

We talk about free enterprise. I do not think today, governments have enough control over enterprise, I think private enterprise controls our governments. I will just give you a little instance of that and would like to read an article I clipped out of the Leader-Post the other day and I quote: "Oil imports cut again," Vancouver, February 10: Following similar steps by Imperial and Shell oil companies, McColl Frontenac announced Monday it was cutting imports into B.C. by 40 per cent, reducing the province's already short supply by another two and one-half per cent. Standard oil of B.C. announced it would probably freeze imports at 1947 levels. Reason given by all companies for their action is the refusal of the B.C. Government to allow them a four and one-half cent a gallon price increase. The Public Utilities commission allowed distributors three cents a gallon". That sounds pretty much to me as though the oil companies are telling the government just what they can do, and what they can have and cannot have. I do not think this government would be doing anything wrong if we went into the oil development business here in the province of Saskatchewan ourselves. If we are going to wait a long time now and there is very little development outside of the Lloydminster field.

Another indication that we have vast oil reserves here is in reference to an article in the Leader-Post from Imperial Oil through their President, Mr. Henry H. Hewetson said in the city not long ago that they were putting in a pipe line from Leduc to Regina which would cost around \$30,000,000, also run a branch to Calgary and extend this line on to Winnipeg.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think they are putting that line in for one little oil field alone. I think, and I am not going by my knowledge of oil, I am going by quotations of some of the leading geologists in America: They have said they think the Prairie Provinces is probably the next big oil reserve of North America. Well I think myself that Imperial Oil knows that there is quite extensive oil resources in these western provinces, and maybe right here in our own province, so I would certainly like to see this government make a start in oil prospecting. We cannot have oil development until we have found the oil. Considering the fact that we are spending these millions of dollars for U.S. oil and freight to get this oil up here,

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

I think that farmers and the people of this province can quite well spend a million or two dollars putting down holes to see what we have under this ground we are standing on. It might just mean that in a few years we would become a great exporter of oil back down to the United States instead of taking their oil. It might mean that the revenues of this government, if they went up that high, that the taxes of the people throughout the province could be cut to a very low figure. I know a number of towns and cities in the Southern States of Texas and Oklahoma that were tax free just on account of oil royalties. They built their sidewalks, and libraries, and I would like to see something like that happen here in the province. According to some of these leading geologists we might just have that right here. As far as it being a gamble, I do not think it is; no bigger than growing wheat or anything else. We farmers do not know what we are going to get in the spring; we go ahead and invest a couple of thousand dollars in seed, gas and labour, and do not know if we are going to get a cent back. We do it year after year after year, and quite often we did not get any crops back for three or four years. I myself have had no crop now for two years in the northern part, of this province; we still keep doing it. Why then is putting down a few holes to find out if we have oil, why is that such a big gamble?

If we take into consideration the size of these oil companies today, if we just look up their history from the time they were first formed up to the present time, I do not think we would say oil prospecting is a gamble, I think we would say it was one of the best investments we could put our money into. In fact I would advise some of the members here to just look up the history of some of these oil wells here, and they would get quite a surprise.

And so, Mr. Speaker, in closing I would just like to leave this with the House, the importance, to my way of thinking, second to the atomic energy in importance today – I cannot think of anything that is as important as oil and, as I said, I would like to leave that with the members of this House and would like to see a substantial sum set aside for oil prospecting in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I support the motion.

Mr. F.K. Malcolm (Milestone): — I have listened with a great deal of interest and profit to the addresses on the Throne Speech debate by hon. members in this House.

In my remarks I wish first to associate myself with the statements and sentiment expressed by the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply and also with those of the Premier and Members of the Cabinet who have spoken, along with others on the Government side who have contributed to the discussion. I would like also to express appreciation to the Opposition members who have spoken for whatever constructive criticism they have offered.

Our party system of government is very apparent in Saskatchewan from time to time within these walls. Some of us who have been among the more quiet members, these four years, have found it an interesting experience. Sometimes we have refrained from our remarks in order to save time and repetition. Each one of us I suppose has been impressed in somewhat different manner.

If I may be permitted, I would like to say just a few words about Democracy with reference to our government's progress as referred to in the Speech from the Throne and a few words about my constituency, Milestone, which I have had the privilege to represent.

First may I place on the records a few words about my constituency, which begins just eight miles south of the city of Regina. It is some 60 miles long and 42 miles wide; it stretches from Lajord west to Drinkwater on the north, from Yellowgrass west to Kayville on the south. It is largely a grain growing area with considerable mixed farming, and some ranching is done in the southwest. We have a clay product manufacturing plant at Claybank where some of the world's finest bricks are produced., I believe some 30 or 40 men are employed. Some of our citizens in the constituency have been prize winners with fine horses and cattle, one as far east as Toronto, Mr. William Mitten of Grey, who won the Grand Championship in the three-year old Belgian class last year. In the field of prize wheat, one of our citizens has long since won distinction as far away as Chicago, in the person of Mr. Mitchell. About 40 per cent, or perhaps 50 per cent, of the constituency is composed of heavy land, but it produces excellent wheat crops. Naturally we have many farmers in that area who are among the leading and most successful farmers in the province. In this connection, it is interesting to note that many of these well-to-do farmers are among the best supporters of this present progressive government, having contributed many thousands of dollars to promote Co-operative Commonwealth education. These farmers are apparently not afraid of regimentation or of losing their farms because they know what constitutes real economic freedom as well as political democracy, and this government stands for just that.

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

They remember the results of the old party administrations throughout the years past.

About one half of our constituency is not so well blessed with good land, and consequently there are areas in which there have been hard times from crop losses through drought as well as other causes. I would say, among other things, there are two main problems in the Milestone constituency, not foreign to the other constituencies. One is the unstable and often unfair prices for agricultural products over which of course the Provincial Government has very little control.

The second is all-weather roads providing outlets for many who have lived most of their lifetime in these areas, hoping to get good road outlets to the market centres of the province. This is a matter the Provincial Government can do something about, and it has already made considerable progress but not as much as I would like to have seen. It is fair to say, however, that some very good municipal grants from this government have been given to municipalities who in turn have co-operated in making a start on what will be all-weather market roads as they are built up to completion. It should be mentioned, I think, that the greatest expenditure on highways in our constituency is being made on the new Soo Line highway as an inlet for American tourists. This highway I believe, is considered to be part of the proposed Federal highway system.

There is one very prosperous area leading just south of Number six which is composed of very heavy land in which roads are quite impassable in wet weather. I believe these people are entitled to a gravel highway which would only be a matter of a few miles along the C.N.R. and it would supply a long felt need: the first 15 miles or so to Number six highway, the people in that area have provided in one year – I am told – in gas tax a great proportion of the cost of an all-weather road.

I refer particularly to the rise in Co-operative Associations who I understand have had a half-million dollar turn over in their business in one year, and that was largely in farm fuel. The trucks operated by this Co-operative use this short piece of road I have referred to, and I hope the day will come when that road will be made an all-weather road, and I am sure the municipalities are quite ready to go out and co-operate with the government in that project.

While for personal reasons, Mr. Speaker, I declined the nomination for a second term in that constituency, this I would have you know is not necessarily my 'swan-song! In fact I might enjoy running on a CCF ticket against some of the Opposition members.

I have a very high regard for these constituents and I have no doubt that for the next election or the next legislature in this province, those people will return as my successor, the new Co-operative Commonwealth candidate as their member, in the person of Mr. Walter Erb, a farmer from Lang.

Now I wish to say just a few words about Democracy as it is related to our Government, because I believe a few words may well be said from time to time on this subject in our day. Democracy, as I see it is not only a political philosophy; democracy is a growth. Indeed I think it is a phase, it had its roots in the Christ of some 1,950 years ago, and from Christianity and Christian ethics it must get its continuing life. But freedom gained from democratic procedure over the years is not a gift of nature, and the freedom gained by democracy is often easier won than kept. It is, as I understand it, a way of life in social organization and must be used constantly to achieve its purposes, which is namely to make men and women free to achieve the highest of which the human mind and heart is capable in true and lasting happiness.

One of the greatest statesmen and leaders in North American history, and one whom we often refer to, gave us a definition of democracy, which in practice as being 'Of the people, by the people, for the people': the great Abraham Lincoln whose name will ever live and be cherished by people who live for and love freedom.

Looking around the world over the past 20 or 30 years and observing what has transpired under other forms of government, resulting in human suffering and starvation with all its result and sorrows, and at the present day facing the ever-increasing social unrest, surely all thinking people in this country agree that the Democratic system of government with an official Opposition is to be desired. I think the majority of us in the Western world agree that, notwithstanding the undesirable features of Democracy, and how sometimes it is slow and cumbersome a democratic form of government with its official Opposition is the best form of government for constant and lasting progress: the philosophy and the firm belief that mankind, according to their understanding, are capable of governing themselves. I often wonder, when I listen to some of the debates, how many people believe that in some of our parliaments, people who are capable of governing themselves through their chosen and elected representatives with every registered citizen free to use his franchise and make his own choice as to the party and government he desires; the philosophy and belief that even though I may dislike what a citizen may say or think, I shall do my utmost as a citizen to see that he may always have the right to say or think it. And to my mind, no matter how right a party or government may be in their own ideas, an opposition who will rise above partisanship and offer constructive criticism, in order that the best may come to all, is the kind of Democratic government we all desire.

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

To my mind, and that is one of the reasons I have mentioned it today, democracy is once more on trial in this present day, and perhaps as never before. Thinking of the percentage of votes that are cast in some of the elections in the recent past, surely thirty or forty or even fifteen percent of the voters of the country cannot forever act for the rest and expect to obtain the best results for all. Lack of interest in public affairs, to this degree at least, is a real threat to democracy.

One of the present-day causes for indifference to government affairs, as I see it, on the part of many of our citizens, is because they get disgusted with the cheap partisanship sometimes displayed in our parliaments from time to time in the name of constructive opposition. We all enjoy humour, now and then; but I feel, Mr. Speaker, as a humble private member, that we would do well to have less political jibing and more helpful criticism. We may try to kid each other in this House, we may get unfair or unearned press headlines, but we cannot kid the people of Saskatchewan, because they have memories. While it is against my deepest desire as a general rule, I am constrained, Mr. Speaker, on this occasion, to make one or two comments in answer to one or two criticisms I have listened to, particularly after listening to the honourable and gallant member representing the Mediterranean Area. I wish to congratulate him on his constructive criticism, but I wish to concur in the remarks of the hon. member from Kerrobert-Kindersley when he said that this honourable and gallant member for the Mediterranean Area is capable of something better than he has contributed, and I would add, in his unwarranted abuse of this government and of some of its Ministers. I would like to ask, in all kindness, since when has he become the champion of freedom from regimentation and control, upon which he has done so much talking?

I would like to take you back to the 'thirties for just one or two illustrations – and I could give you more. I hold in my hand a farmer's grocery relief order of 1934, created by the Party upheld by the hon. member mentioned – a Saskatchewan Relief Commission grocery order, number 'so and so', Regina, January 5, 1932. "Authority is hereby given to...to deliver merchandise as set out on the reverse side. From the following list the holder hereof selects his or her requirements. Merchandise not on this list is not to be supplied, "such as drugs and a number of things we might mention, and recollect all too well. On this list, Mr. Speaker, we have a number of items – potatoes, beans, pot barley, rolled oats, Epsom Salts, and a few more items of that nature. I would like to ask whether or not that sounds anything like control?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Sounds like free enterprise.

Mr. Malcolm: — I also recall that in my home town, when I was a candidate for the C.C.F. in the Gravelbourg by-election of 1935, the hon. Leader of the Opposition – then Premier – addressed a meeting there in which he tried the same technique that is still used by the old parties, in which he attempted to frighten my neighbours and friends by stating that a C.C.F. government

would tell them what they could produce, and even what time they would have to get up in the morning. I remember that prophecy very well; but he overlooked (and this to me is the irony and the nonsense of some of the arguments of the Opposition) the fact that the very people whom he was addressing had already been told and ordered what they could eat, and they had no choice. They were told by his government at Ottawa how much they could produce, what they could sell of it, and what price they could get for it; and the latest thing that has come from Ottawa is this new farmers' income tax form, in which it asks him, among other things, "cash on the person or on his farm" (I presume that would probably be in some hole he had dug); "grain held for sale," – I have not seen the income tax form for the manufacturers, but I am wondering if they have to list every last thing that they have in stock for the market. I am sure the farmers of Saskatchewan will appreciate this, and to me it gives a great deal of evidence as to how much faith the federal government have in the farmers of Saskatchewan.

The Parties with the philosophy these hon. gentlemen represent, controlled and regimented the people of Saskatchewan almost to death until the Saskatchewan people turned their backs on them and resolved to build and to elect a government with a humanitarian outlook, with controls, not for the few with a profit motive, but for all the people of this province, that we might all share in the abundance which the Creator has made possible from time to time.

The old philosophy to which I have referred, not only forced Saskatchewan farmers into economic slavery, but by that economic slavery broke their morale and the spirit of hundreds of the pioneers of this province, and drove many to mental hospitals or to premature graves. Moreover, they also broke the spirit of hundreds of our young people who were robbed, for a time at least, of their birthright because, through no fault of their own, they were unable to set up their homes – they were without jobs and without a means to live like other human beings, as images of their Creator, having dominion over all things in the earth. They were worse off than some of the lowest things in the creation, for they had no place either to eat or sleep; and when they went out to seek jobs many of them finally found themselves in relief camps. Some people have a way of forgetting these things, but under the same profit-motive economy which we still have in Canada, how far are we from a repetition of this, at the present time? I knew many of those young people, and have followed many of them in the years since. They were counted the "scum of the earth", but when the war broke out these young people did as fine a job as did any generation before them. I recall that on one occasion our Prime Minister, during the war, warned that the New Order to follow the war would have to begin before the war ended, and yet these young people came back to the same profit-seeking economy which they had left; and they, with the rest of us, are still deprived of economic democracy. This, I think, is well illustrated by the fact that the elected members at Ottawa are sometimes like voices in the wilderness and in a large measure still subject to the dictates of big business and the profit seekers and the profit motive. There, in practice, we have the same jungle law as ever in our national economy; and

Tuesday, February 17, 1948

when we hear cries of 'dictatorship' and 'regimentation and control' from the Opposition and those representing the old order, it comes in very poor grace, for we have just that, at Ottawa; and the present administration in Saskatchewan came about as a result of the unfair treatment of the old Parties in office. Some people do not like to hear that because it is all too true. They now come forward and tell us how much social security they are willing to provide if elected again in Saskatchewan. I fear they will put it into practice in the same way as we hear it being done in some of the P.F.A.A. administrations, where one farmer gets a drought bonus and his neighbour in the same or more favourable circumstances to receive it, does not get it, although he, too, pays into the fund from every bushel of grain he sells.

The present government in Saskatchewan was elected to make a start in establishing a true economic democracy, and it was elected by the rank and file of Saskatchewan people who were fed up with the results of many years of old party government. I do not believe the Saskatchewan people will be fooled again.

Turning to the Throne Speech for a moment, I think one has only to examine it and to make some intelligent effort to prove the facts it reveals, to realize what tremendous progress has been made, step by step, in the various departments, in three and a half years in office. For the first time in Saskatchewan we have not only political democracy but also economic democracy, as far as it may be applied in a province in which the government elected by the people was handed a well-considered economic program for action, worked out over the years by the farmers and labouring people of this country. This Government, as I see it, with all its faults, and criticism that comes from time to time from the Opposition, has done its best to put that economic program into effect, with only the common people of this province as its bosses. For this reason, our people have never had more encouragement to take their citizenship seriously and make democracy work; yet, as a result of indifference, democracy may for a time again be lost.

Now, I want to refer to The Bill of Rights passed in this House a year ago. In my opinion, this is indeed a democratic principle and the expressions of freedom in it ought to encourage every Saskatchewan citizen to exercise his franchise in future elections. I want to emphasize from my little corner as best I can, again: Intelligent and responsible citizenship is the hope for the building of true democracy on which we may build a Christian society. I would like to make one or two references further to the Speech from the Throne. I would like to pass on a word of encouragement to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and to this staff for the information they are sending out from time to time, and for the little booklet that has come to our desks called "The Municipal System of Saskatchewan", December, 1947, in which the history of municipal government in this province is summarized, and mentioning some of the personages who have contributed in local government affairs over the years. I would like, also, to commend the hon. Minister of Natural Resources, better known now, I understand, by his Opposition, as the "King of the North". I would like to commend him and his staff for the great progress that has been made in his Department under great odds; for the various booklets of information dealing with our natural resources and their development. I would like, too, to commend the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of the Co-operatives for their work; and a lot could be said (and I hope will be said) constructively, for the work that is being carried on in these Departments for the good of Saskatchewan farmers. We might also enumerate the special efforts of this Government as referred to in the Throne Speech, in their very extensive planned health services, including the Department of Nutrition, of Physical Fitness, and

recreation programs, which I think are very excellent; as well as the forecast for additional Old Age Pensions.

I am not one who claims that all administration has been without fault, and at times I have been somewhat critical. This, I think, is anyone's right in a democracy; but in the overall picture, I submit, Mr. Speaker, the majority of my constituency will agree with me in saying that this Government's program has been most remarkable and beyond the realization or the appreciation of many of the people of the province.

I would like to make just one reference further to this new publication called "Progress Report From Your Government" from 1944-47, and I would submit that any citizen who believes in democratic progress, who would take the trouble to compare what has so far been accomplished, compare that with the considered opinions of those who laid down the program, cannot but agree with us that this Government is working for the ultimate good of all. I shall support the Motion.

Hon. Mr. Study: — I move the adjournment of this Debate.

Mr. Speaker: — The member in moving to adjourn the Debate wishes to continue on the Debate which is now under consideration, on the main motion for the Address in reply. To be allowed to do that would necessitate certain further procedure in this House to regularize the situation.

Premier: — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the House, if it is agreeable by everyone concerned, I would like to move:

That the Debate on the proposed amendment of Mr. Danielson to the Motion of Mr. Feeley for the Address in reply, be further deferred until Thursday next.

It was understood the other day, that it would be deferred until tomorrow. The Minister of Social Welfare has just got back and if the House is agreeable, we might defer the Debate on the amendment until Thursday. I would so move – seconded by Hon. Mr. Brockelbank.

The Motion was agreed to.

Premier: — Mr. Speaker, I move the House now adjourn.

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