

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fifth Session — Tenth Legislature**  
**Day 9**

**Wednesday, February 18, 1948**

The House met at 3 o'clock.

**SPEECH FROM THE THRONE**

**Continuation of Debate on Motion  
for Address in Reply**

The House resumed from Tuesday, February 17, the adjourned Debate on the Motion of Mr. M.H. Feeley (Canora) for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

**Hon. J.H. Sturdy** (Minister of Reconstruction and Rehabilitation): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my appreciation to the two hon. gentlemen who moved and seconded the Speech from the Throne. Those two speeches were indeed of a very high level, both instructive and inspirational. It must indeed be a matter of gratification to these two gentlemen who have served the CCF movement so long and so faithfully, that they have had the privilege of sitting in this first legislature. I have had the privilege of knowing Mr. Aitken since 1912, and I wish to assure the House that my life has indeed been enriched as a result of a long and valued acquaintance with him. I regret, along with all members, to learn of the precarious health of the hon. member from Moosomin. He has rendered very valuable service to his community, to this people-r and indeed to the Liberal party, and I trust the party will reward him in due course. I would commend too the fact that he had served gallantly in the services overseas in the First Great War. I have known the hon. gentleman for a number of years, I value his friendship although I may not approve of this politics. I regret indeed to learn of his health, and do trust that these speeches which he has been hearing from his own side of the House, particularly the one which he heard yesterday, will not contribute to the further deterioration of his health.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, and again this year we have listened to illogical, vast and reactionary speeches from the hon. member from the Mediterranean Area; otherwise his speeches were not bad. Last year I exercised more restraint than could reasonably be expected from a man of Irish ancestry; I overlooked the charges of Communism which he hurled at everyone who holds views contrary to his own. And during the past two years we have all noticed a change; and, Mr. Speaker, a change for the worse in the hon. member; a sort of metamorphosis in reverse; a butterfly crawling back into its hard-shell cocoon of suspended animation; the honourable and gallant representative, an advocate of the Armed Forces, deteriorating into reactionary parley; making affectionate overtures to equally reactionary Grits. This Session has witnessed the consummation in wedlock of the two old and decrepit parties, and I wish them joy in their marriage. I doubt if any worthwhile offspring will bless the union, however.

**February 18, 1948**

Of this I am sure; they cannot halt or turn aside the forward march of the people of this province, by this belated union. A member of the C.C.F. was recruited from the ranks of the Liberals and Conservatives in the past. The best of both these parties have joined the people's movement – the C.C.F. – and by the same token, thousands of the best that remain will continue to join the people's movement, especially now that this union of the reactionaries of the two old parties has taken place. The C.C.F. has its 'grass roots' in the farms of this province, and that is why there are 30-some farmer C.C.F. members in this Legislature. This movement arose out of the needs of the workers, and that is why there are six or seven Trade Unionist members in this Legislature.

It sprang from the aspirations of the small businessman and the professions, and that is why the balance of the members are their representatives. Never in the history of this or any other province, has there been a closer approach to democracy and, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the people of this province will keep it that way.

I was interested in the rather immature views respecting peace and freedoms, expressed by the hon. member from the Mediterranean Area, yesterday, and with all due respects to the experience overseas, the education, the legally-trained mind of the hon. gentleman, in my opinion, he does not know the prerequisites for peace – he so fervently advocates – nor does he understand the functioning of a true democracy. Peace is predicated on economic security; and because there was no security after the First World War; because there was a chaotic, appalling, breakdown of the economical lives of nations, due to unplanned, non-co-operative, "dog-eat-dog" capitalism. Such nations as Germany, Italy and Spain became infected with that proud disease, fascism, and plunged the world into another global war. Democracy implies freedom, and the only safeguard against rebellion at home and wars abroad, is economic freedom. that is why that truly great American, Roosevelt, placed foremost in the Atlantic Charter, the two economic freedoms. They are 'Freedom from want' and 'Freedom from fear'. There can be no freedom without security. A man without a job, without a home, without proper nutrition, without necessary services such as education and health; that man is not a free man; and he will strive to free himself by fair means or foul. Every unemployed man, every insecure man, as every poverty-stricken insecure nation, are potential threats to peace at home and abroad. John Galsworthy said: "The measure of democracy is the measure of the freedom of its humblest citizens." That is the aim of this Government and socialist government everywhere; to increase that measure of freedom to all people.

Yesterday, the hon. member was good enough to mention my overseas service. Yes, I was privileged to associate very closely with two generations of Canadian service men, for periods of more than seven years overseas. I may be a socialist agitator', and all the other bad things which my hon. friend sees fit to hurl across the floor of this House; but you know, Mr. Speaker, I feel that I am in very good company indeed. I am in the company of tens of thousands of veterans in this province. Men who served with my hon. friend in Britain, in the Mediterranean, and men who went on to finish

**February 18, 1948**

the war in Germany. If these thousands of young veterans, and the old veterans of the First World War, are socialist agitators' or what have you, because they vote differently and think differently to my hon. friend, then I say I am in good company. I want to tell my hon. friend a few things that he undoubtedly learned overseas, but evidently soon forgot when he got into bad political company on his return to Regina. The fighters of this War were the sons of those who fought in world War I, and these men determined that the Canada to which their fathers returned, would not be the same as the Canada to which their fathers returned, nor the Canada which they had left in 1939. Tens of thousands of veterans of World War I came home to poverty, insecurity of slum homes, destitution and want. If my friend does not know, let him know now, that there were more casualties after the first War among Canadian soldiers, than there were during it.

(continued on page 4)

**February 18, 1948**

These same Veterans of World War I saw their children, in the 'thirties, neglected, unemployed, unwanted, herded into concentration camps at two-bits a day. They saw them ride the rods in their thousands, vainly searching for employment and a decent, respected place in society; they saw them killed, in 1935, in this city, in a politically-fomented riot, when there was a Tory government in Ottawa and a Grit government in this province. They saw them bombed out of the Post Office in Vancouver; they saw 750,000 good Canadians unemployed, and a million and a half on relief under Tory and Grit administration. They saw a country – c – rich beyond the dreams of Midas – made a Heaven for the privileged few and a Hell for the many.

This is also what tens of thousands of the youth of Canada saw and experienced in their overseas services. They saw and understood that Fascism in Italy and Germany was the last stand of a diseased and decadent capitalism; they knew that the financiers and industrialists of Germany financed Hitler in order to destroy the social Democrats, the trade unions, free education and even religion itself. Many of them had read such books as Fritz Thyssen's "I Paid Hitler". Fritz Thyssen was reputedly the richest industrialist in Germany. These boys of ours saw and met socialists, the men and women who constituted the Resistance Movement in the countries they helped to liberate. These boys of ours saw the appalling conditions of internment camps, which contained not millionaires, not Tory collaborators, not industrialists nor bankers, but were filled with workers – trade unionists, intellectuals, scientists and socialists. These boys of ours developed a political sense unknown in any other generation, and that is why they voted three to one for the C.C.F. instead of the Grits and Tories in this province, both in the provincial and dominion elections of 1944 and 1945. That is why the British servicemen voted overwhelmingly for the Labour Government in 1945 in Britain; and why members of the Resistance Movements elected socialist governments in Norway, Denmark, Belgium, France and every other country, just as soon as they had thrown off the yoke of fascism.

Now, in all my friend's speeches in this House he has never offered one word of condemnation against Fascist Germany or Fascist Italy, although Fascism in these countries was responsible for the death of 30,000 of his comrades, and the maiming and blinding and torturing of an equal number more. All his anathema are hurled against the U.S.S.R., against the people who suffered horribly in the war, and lost one out of every seven of its population in defence of their country. Now, I suppose I will be called a "Commissar" for expressing decent – decent, I say – sympathy for a people who suffered greatly at the hands of fascism, and a people, incidentally, who helped greatly in winning the war. I have known that where these people are concerned – and that goes for the Germans, and the Italians – there will be no lasting peace so long as there are subjugated, exploited and poverty-stricken and insecure peoples in the world. Of that I am profoundly convinced. It is only when

these peoples become the victims of false propaganda and doctrines such as fascism, only when they become the victims of fear, victimized by exploiters, that they become dangerous and do unnatural things.

Now, coming to our Veteran Land Settlement policy, Mr. Speaker: I suggest that it was subjected to an attack by the hon. member yesterday, for no other reason than that it is very, very popular with the Veterans. It is working out most satisfactorily and will, I am confident, prove to be one of the soundest settlement schemes yet devised. The hon. member could not produce a single letter of protest from a Veteran. He admitted, by refusing to answer my question yesterday, that he had never visited a single settler on his farm. He appears, however, to have visited a great number of cities and towns, during his anti-Government propaganda campaign last year.

**Mr. Embury:** — On a point of privilege: As I informed the hon. gentleman at the time, I was going around to various Zone Rallies of the Legion, at which there are no politics involved whatsoever, nor was I engaged in any anti-Government propaganda campaign.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The point of privilege is well taken, I think. The hon. gentleman should withdraw.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I withdraw the statement; but surely, out of 1,300 Veterans, approximately, settled on provincial Crown lands throughout Saskatchewan, he could have found time to visit at least one of them? Knowing my hon. friend, however, I know he will leave no stone unturned to stir up dissatisfaction among the settlers. If it is his policy, and if he is using his high office in the Legion for political purposes, which is absolutely contrary to the constitution of that great organization, then I say all legionnaires, and the public generally, should know it. Yes, Mr. Speaker, 1,280 Veterans have settled on provincial Crown lands, and before the end of this year there will be over 2,000; nor do we intend to stop until we have settled a minimum of 3,000 Veterans on provincial Crown lands. This is the best record of any province in the Dominion.

A great deal of thought and consultation with Veterans and their organizations has gone into formulating our Land Settlement Plan. The Veterans' Legislative Committee, of which the hon. gentleman was a member, spent hours on this and other Veterans' problems, but to my absolute knowledge, the hon. member attended only one of these many meetings. The hon. member, in absenting himself, or in boycotting these meetings, showed a callous disregard of his duties as a Veteran Representative.

In the allocation of these lands, we have endeavoured to be as fair and equitable as possible. The allocation committee comprise, or are comprised solely of veterans, and the land is allocated according to a chart wherein the veteran's service overseas, the length and nature of his service, the fact whether he is married or single, his proximity to the land, his residence in the community, and so on, are all taken into consideration; and if I have had one veteran, I have had a great number say to me, "Thank God this land is being allocated by this Government, rather than under the patronage system that has

**February 18, 1948**

existed in this province before the election of this government.” Now, occasionally there are complaints received regarding the allocation of lands. Where you have 25 or 30 or more applicants for a single parcel of land it is inevitable that there be some complaints. When complaints are received from Legion branches, from Rehabilitation committees, or from Municipal bodies and so on, we have set up review boards to review the allocations. To date, 43 cases have been reviewed; 22 were upheld and 21 were reversed, and I wish to take this opportunity of stating my appreciation to these committees, which are comprised of Returned Men, for the very splendid job which they have done – a difficult job, but they have done a most efficient one.

Now, under our Land Settlement Plan, the veteran enters into a lease agreement with the provincial government. It is a thirty-three year renewable lease agreement, and the veteran has the option to purchase after ten years of occupancy. The lease gives to the veteran absolute security. He cannot be compelled to surrender his lease for any except stated causes that appear in the ordinary lease, and he may refer the case to the Courts if he considers he has had anything approaching an illegal dismissal. I emphasize the fact that these boys have absolute security in this lease. They can will it – the land, their holdings – to their heirs, to their dependents. They are placed on these lands with absolutely no debt, in contrast to the situation that obtained after the last War and under any other land settlement schemes.

The rentals, as the hon. member himself agreed, are generous; from one-tenth to one-sixth of the crops produced. I am sure that the only objection which hon. member has, is because these are much more generous than the usual landlord and mortgage company agreement leases.

Now, the federal government, under the V.L.A., make rehabilitation grants to a maximum of \$2,320 per settler. V.L.A., that is the federal government, retain equity in this grant for a period of ten years, and that is why we cannot sell our land, during that period at least, to the veteran. May I re-emphasize this point because critics of our Land Settlement policy have asked us why we do not sell the land immediately to the veteran. Our contract with Ottawa prohibits our selling the land to the veteran for a period of ten years, during which time V.L.A., retains its equity in the \$2,320 grant.

I am pleased to announce that 928 grants have been made to date, in a total amount of \$2,112,000. I wish to state also that the relationship between this Government, my own Department in particular, and V.L.A. in this province, is excellent. We enjoy the complete co-operation of the officials of V.L.A., and I wish to express my appreciation to this House for that co-operation.

Now, with regard to such permanent improvements as are irrevocably linked up with the lands, such as bush clearance, breaking, irrigation, drainage – the Government will pay for and retain these particular types of improvements. Either the Government will do the work itself, as we are doing in the Carrot River area, or, if the veteran does it himself, the Government will grant remission of all rentals over a period of years until this type of improvement is paid for, to a maximum of \$25.00 per acre.

**Mr. M.J. Dobie** (A.S.V.R.): — Does that apply on the individual allocation of land or only on co-operative farms?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — That will apply on individual farms as well as any other type. Now, other improvements are provided for and owned by the veteran, such as buildings, fences, wells and similar improvements. Should a veteran decide to surrender his lease, then he may do one of two things: He may either sell those improvements to the provincial government, who in turn will re-sell them to an incoming veteran on that farm; or the veteran may sell them direct to the in-coming veteran. In any event, he will be paid in full for this type of improvement.

I want to say this – that under the lease system, there have been 32 veterans surrender their leases to date, for a variety of reasons. In some cases they were going back overseas; in other cases due to illness; in still other cases they have gone to university; every case – in all 32 cases – their leases were immediately transferred to another veteran. In contrast to that, if this land had been sold to those 32 veterans and they had found it necessary to sell their farms, they undoubtedly would have sold them to an adjoining farmer, usually the wealthiest, and usually one who already has sufficient land of his own; but under this system, we guarantee that any lease which is surrendered will be turned over to another veteran who requires the land.

**February 18, 1948**

Much was said yesterday about the Option to Purchase at the end of ten years. We are entirely sincere about that, and the Veteran will do one of two things – he will either continue under lease, or he will purchase his land at the end of ten years; and it will neither be the hon. member from the Mediterranean Area nor myself who will dictate to these Veterans whether they will continue under lease or purchase that land. We did not put in the purchase price at which this land could be purchased at the time the man exercised his option. We wished to avoid the war-inflated prices which exist today. V.L.A. purchases land now – I heard of a case just a couple of days ago, for \$12,000 – they paid \$6,000 for it, but the Veteran paid the additional \$6,000 in order to go on a half-section of land. No, we are not going to burden our Veterans with war-inflated priced land, as was the case after the first Great War.

It has been suggested that we use the assessment as the maximum price. Well, as everyone in this House knows, the assessment price is used for purposes of taxation and not for the purposes of determining the sale value of land. We state this in our agreement – that the purchase price at which he can exercise his option to purchase the land, will be the productive value of the land – the value of comparable land in the municipality or area in which the farm is located; and we are prepared to go further. If there is any dispute between the Lessee, in the person of the Veteran, and the Lessor in the person of the Crown, as to the price at which the land may be purchased at the end of ten years, then we are prepared to let it be decided by The Saskatchewan Arbitration Act.

**Mr. Embury:** — May I ask a question? If he is prepared to do that, why did he not put it in the contract?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I would like to answer my hon. friend this way. We are changing these leases, making them more generous for the Veteran. It is not a difficult government to persuade along that line; and if it provides greater security for the Veteran, we are prepared to have The Saskatchewan Arbitration Act apply.

Mr. Speaker: I would like this House to contrast this settlement policy with the Land Settlement policy which existed after the last War under the Soldier Settlement Board. It has already been mentioned in this House that of the 25,000 Veterans who settled on farms in the Dominion, over 12,000 of them were compelled to surrender their farms, to get off them due to discouragement; due to high war-inflated prices; due to intolerable debt burdens. There are only 12,000 left on those farms today, and I would point out this – that although that was thirty years ago, there are several hundred of these Veterans who still have not obtained control or ownership or title to those farms; and when this matter was brought up in the House, in Parliament, Mr. Tucker opposed it, and then in order to prevent a vote being taken on that Resolution he talked the Resolution out, thus preventing a vote from being taken.



I come now to the question of co-operative farming. There are certain trends in this province...

**Mr. Procter** (Moosomin): — Just before you leave that question: Why don't you compare it with the present settlement scheme of the Dominion Government, after this War?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy**: — Well, there are certain weaknesses there, and if you care to have me go into them in detail, I will do so, but I promised to let the hon. member from Rosthern take the air at four o'clock, so I must hustle along.

Dealing with co-operative farming, I would like to point out certain trends, particularly in Western Canada. One is a trend toward larger and larger highly-mechanized, individually owned and operated farms, which, in my opinion, is not good for the province. I would like to contrast that with larger and larger co-operatively owned, highly-mechanized, highly efficient farms. Co-operative farming means the settling of dozens, hundreds more Veterans than could be under individual land on individual farms, besides giving to these men the amenities of life to which they have grown accustomed.

I would point out, in the —co farm which now operates, they have electric lights; they are making provision for sewage, and running water, and many other amenities that we associate with modern living; and besides giving them these things, we feel that co-operative farming will give them greater security. I think that this Government should be complimented for giving opportunities to Veterans to establish —co farms in this province. It is new; it is purely —co, in the best traditions of —co organization, and we propose to give them every opportunity.

I would like to briefly outline the story of the Matador Veterans' Co-operative; where seventeen young Veterans, of all national origins — the Secretary is Ukrainian, the Manager is undoubtedly of German extraction, Lorne Dietrick; there are Scandinavians; there are Irish, (so they must be able to get along all right, or the Irish could not exist); there are two or three Scotsmen on that farm, and it must at least be economically sound, or the Scots would not be there. In all, they have had a marvellous experience there. I was talking to Mr. Len Chase, the Secretary of the Canadian Legion Pool, to this co-operative farm. I asked him about it, and he said this: "If I were a young man and were given the opportunity, after coming back from this war, and were going to rehabilitate myself by farming, that is the only type of farming enterprise I would go into." He repeated it again, day before yesterday, in a meeting in the Council Chamber. there you have the opinion of that Legionnaire; but my hon. friend, the hon. member from the Mediterranean, was invited to go out to the Matador Farm and find out for himself just what

**February 18, 1948**

kind of an organization it is; but he did not go to visit the farm, and I do not suppose he proposes to do so. Mr. Chase also informed us, the day before yesterday, that these young men had done more in one year in a co-operative way, than they could hope to do in ten years under an individual farm unit system. They went ahead and broke up, cultivated, over 4,000 acres; they established individual farm dwellings for all the married men on the farm; they now have a dam; irrigation for 360 acres; foundation herds for beef cattle and dairy cattle; they have chickens; they have set up a diversified type of farm there that is a credit to this province. It is greatly to be regretted that the experienced damage to their crop, last fall – a \$100,000 crop was entirely hailed out.

It does seem to me that these young Veterans are serving us well in this province in carrying on such an experiment and in making such a success of it. They have been greatly handicapped due to the fact that they have been refused the \$2,320 rehabilitation grants by Ottawa. That, I feel, has been due largely to the opposition of Mr. Tucker, who is well known to be opposed to co-operatives, and particularly to this type of co-operative. It seems to me that the hon. member from the Mediterranean would do well if he would put his shoulder to the wheel and help these seventeen young veterans to get these rehabilitation grants. These rehabilitation grants have been earned by these young veterans by virtue of the service they have done for their country in time of war, and they should not be made the subject of political patronage, or thwarted by those opposed to co-operative development.

Few things I care to mention regarding this – one is this – that if a veteran on the Matador Co-operative Farm should be expelled or leave the Co-operative, then under the agreement he turns over his lease to the government, which in turn undertakes to place a veteran on that farm who is acceptable to the Co-operative Farm, and the one who is expelled or leaves the Farm is guaranteed the payment of his equity immediately. If the Co-operative is not in a position to pay out his equity, then the Government will undertake to guarantee the payment of his equity. That is the degree of security which he enjoys.

I see the hon. member for the Mediterranean has returned to the House, and I would point out to him that I rather deprecated the slighting remarks he made concerning the veterans who have settled on this particular Co-operative Farm, or who are attracted to co-operative farms. I wish to assure him that they have excellent service qualifications, and that they have all been qualified under The Veteran Land Act. They all, too, have enviable war records.

I recall the case of Harold Heath, one of the veterans there, who landed on the beaches of Normandy in the first way on D. Day. He was wounded; he is a pensioner; he is a man who could not operate an

individual farm unit; but in co-operation with sixteen other veterans he and his family are getting along splendidly on that farm.

I mention one or two other cases – Lorne Dietrick, who was in the stokehold of the ‘Prince Henry’ when the troops landed in southern France and on Normandy. Those of you who have been in the Navy know what an unenviable position it is, for a sailor to be in the stokehold in a battle area. All these men had enviable war records, and I trust the occasion will never arise when the hon. member from the Mediterranean who should be upholding veterans in general, will speak in derogatory terms concerning these men.

**Mr. Embury:** — On a point of privilege: My remarks were that the Government was committed definitely, as I understand it, to following a veteran’s priority, Sir, to those who had the longest service, and in accordance with the proximity and so on; and I suggested only, Sir – not in derogatory terms to any of the men he speaks of, as he knows full well – that the veteran’s preference would be hard to exercise in the case of co-operatives where several men were involved, and you happened to have a man who wanted to go into co-operatives.

**Premier:** — That is quite an about face!

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I must accept the hon. member’s explanation. I would like to continue, Mr. Speaker, with the work of my Department in the field of housing for veterans...

**Mr. Embury:** — Will the hon. Minister permit a question before he leaves Veterans’ land Settlement? Will he tell me whether, during 1946, he or his Department had authority to make a contract with the Veterans?

(continued page 12)

**February 18, 1948**

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I do not understand the nature of the hon. member's question but we have a contract with the veterans on the Matador farm. To satisfy your curiosity...

**Mr. Embury:** — I mean any of them, not necessarily the Matador. Did you or your Department have authority to make any contracts?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I see what the hon. member is referring to. Is so happens...

**Mr. Embury:** — What is the answer?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — It so happens, on entering into these lease agreements the term of 33 years was stated and, at that time, the Department of Natural Resources was only permitted to lease land for a period of 21 years. That was, of course, corrected since, and my hon. friend knows full well that it was intended to be corrected.

**Mr. Embury:** — Did you have authority in your Department is the question.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I would like to deal, Mr. Speaker, with other activities of my Department such as housing, job surveys, business opportunities and I would like to take up also the work of the Reconstruction Corporation; our rural Building Rehabilitation Program; deal also with the Handicapped Civilian Workshop, which is an experiment which is working out remarkably well. It is an attempt being made to employ civilian handicapped people who have never had jobs or useful remunerative employment in their lives, and it is well organized and we are paying them the minimum wage, and they are earning up to 75 per cent of the entire cost of the project. I hope that before the end of the Session I shall have an opportunity of dealing with these and many other activities of my Department. And, Mr. Speaker, I promised to permit the hon. member for Rosthern to take the air at 4 o'clock, and I shall sit down with the statement that I shall support the Motion.

**Mr. Hooge (Rosthern):** — Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. members will agree that since my entrance into this House I have very, very rarely interrupted any Government speaker, and I trust that this courtesy will be extended to me by the Government members on this occasion.

I wish to congratulate the Mover and Seconder of the Reply to the Speech from the Throne; considering the dearth of material in the Throne Speech, I think they made a very commendable effort of window-dressing.

My presence in the House this Session, Mr. Speaker, may cause you some surprise because it has been frequently suggested that I ought to resign in order that Mr. Tucker might take my place. Strangely, these suggestions have always come from members of the Government and they have never, to my knowledge, come from the Rosthern constituency, nor from Mr. Tucker himself; and for this reason they were rather annoying — I think they

constitute unfair labour practices. The Premier has, on various occasions, offered Mr. Tucker a seat by acclamation, which is predicated, of course, upon the assumption that I would resign. This offer, presumably, was intended to be very generous and very attractive but, in view of the fact that it would not increase the number of the Opposition., it did not seem to be, practically, worth considering. In view of the large plurality of the Government, it seems to me that a gesture of this kind would have been much more impressive had the Premier said he would open one of their seats for me.

In this connection, I am thinking of the member for Meadow lake: the members will recall that a couple of years ago I was a little annoyed at some of the remarks the member for Meadow Lake made and I am not referring to him now on that account – any feeling of resentment I ever harboured against him was certainly purged at the time he made that very appealing speech on behalf of the infants of Meadow Lake, when he pleaded for a replenishment of the depleted supply of Pablum. I thought that was one of the most unselfish appeals that I had heard for a long time. The hon. member could not expect any adulation from these infants; he could not expect any votes from these infants; consequently there was no ulterior motive behind the appeal, but merely humanity first. I think that is one of the few instances we have had of an appeal for humanity first.

Having made that unselfish appeal, and if he had followed that by offering his seat to Mr. Tucker, I think he would have gone down in history as the (Mr. Procter) ‘the Pablum Kid’. In the absence, though, of any offer of this nature Mr. Tucker certainly did not consider the Premier’s suggestion, and he, and most of his supporters, considered he could do much more effective work outside of the walls of this confining Legislature and, for that reason, he was touring the length and breadth of the province last summer and last fall, sowing the seeds of Liberalism. I have no doubt that some of this seed fell by the way; others may have fallen on stony ground, others may have fallen on thorny ground, but I am satisfied that most of it fell on very good soil and that in due season it will bear plentiful fruit.

We have heard a good deal from the members who have already spoken that anything coming from the Opposition is merely criticism, carping and slighting; certainly anything that has been said by the members of the Government far exceeds anything of that nature by the Opposition. We have heard of the famous ‘Charge of the Light Brigade’, a number of years ago and all of this slighting, carping criticism that has been done by the members of the Government, I think, would entitle one to say that they are ‘the Charge of the Slight Brigade’.

One of these attacks, for instance, has been on Mr. Tucker, and it is particularly objectionable because he is not here. If a person attacks someone in his presence when he has the right to defend himself it is not no objectionable; but in the absence of Mr. Tucker I think that these criticisms are very objectionable indeed.

**February 18, 1948**

He has been charged with cowardice; he has been charged with not voting on a certain Resolution with regard to Old Age Pensions; he has been charged with voting against one-dollar wheat. Now, what is the record of Mr. Tucker? I just want to briefly review it for the members of this Government: Mr. Tucker was born on the farm about 48 years ago, and was raised on the farm. At a very young age he enlisted in His Majesty's Forces in the first war; he served as a stretcher bearer in that war. When he returned he entered the University of Manitoba, and I understand he put himself through that university with great distinction. After that he came to this province; he again put himself through university, the University of Saskatchewan, in a law course, with great distinction. He then started a law office in the town of Rosthern. At that time he was an unknown, inconspicuous, country solicitor. In 1935 he was elected as member for the Federal constituency of Rosthern, and he has been elected with an increasing majority ever since. Shortly after the commencement of the second war he enlisted again; certainly there was no particular reason why he should enlist again at that time – he was the father, I believe, of nine children – he had attained an age where it was not necessary for him to serve in His Majesty's Forces; still he felt it his duty to enlist, and he did so. Although he was not taken out of Canada, he took a very rigorous course of training, and finally rose to the rank of Captain. After he was discharged he was appointed as Assistant to the Minister of Veterans' Affairs, where he has done very valuable service; and I think it is generally agreed that he was right in line for a Cabinet position. In 1946 he was elected to be the Leader of the Liberal Party in this province and he, therefore, discarded his chances of being appointed to the Cabinet to the winds.

It seems to me that a record of this kind certainly dispels any charge of cowardice; when a man enlists twice; a man who has risen from a position of oblivion to the position he occupies today, surely cannot be identified with a man who would vote against the Resolution concerning Old Age Pensions, or who would vote against an increase in the price of wheat. In connection with the Old Age Pension Resolution it was, as a matter of fact, never introduced; and the matter of dollar-wheat has been explained time and time again, but still it is being repeated and spread all over this province, in an attempt to discredit Mr. Tucker among the people of this province. Then we have from the opposition members the matter of the attacks on the courts. The courts consist of counsel who were formerly very eminent in their line – I am quite sure that some of them, while they were such counsel, earned a great deal more than they do now: they made a sacrifice by leaving their private practice and taking up a position on the Bench; but I believe they accepted these positions in order to carry out their very high sense of duty.

What has been the record of our Superior Court Judges? They have been called upon, from time to time, to interpret our laws, not only while this Government was in power but also while other governments were in power. They have rendered decisions in connection with laws passed by previous administrations. One that comes to my mind at the moment is The Debt Adjustment Act —

if I am not mistaken, I think it was Mr. Justice Bigelow that held that certain provisions of the former Debt Adjustment Act were ultra vires. What did the Premier of the day do at that time, and the Attorney General? Did they broadcast over the radio that our judges were composed of lawyers who had served corporations, and were biased, and all that sort of thing? No! I think they were grateful to the judge for pointing out this defect; they bestirred themselves and enacted The Land Contracts Action Act, and established a Provincial Mediation Board, which has never been found ultra vires.

I cannot understand the attitude of the C.C.F. Party concerning our courts. Here in this province the Premier attacked the courts for, apparently, not discharging their duties to the people; but in Ottawa they seem to take a different position; there they want to abolish the Privy Council. That certainly seems to indicate that they have every confidence in our courts. Mr. Jaenicke, the member for Kindersley, I believe, is introducing a Bill – probably it is already introduced – to abolish the Privy Council. This Government charges the courts with dereliction of duty and is very anxious that the Privy Council should be retained, in order to entertain their appeals from this iniquitous court here. The Government of Saskatchewan does not seem to know that we have a British North America Act which defines certain powers, and gives certain powers to the Province and to the Dominion. they seem to think they are in the same position as the Parliament in Great Britain – that they are supreme, and anything that we do should never be attacked.

Another serious attack is on the Liberal Party itself; they charge that nothing has been done. Now, we have those Statutes, on the table over there, there are a number of them – I wish to refer to the Statutes of 1940 – I believe there are about 325 Acts in those books, most of which were passed by the Liberal administration. I looked at those books the other day and I found that 37 of them deal with municipal affairs; 15 with education; 15 with agriculture and 19 with labour; 18 with protection of the person, which is approximately one-third of those which were then in force. That shows that something of the work was done by the Liberal administration. Since 1940 two outstanding Acts, as already mentioned, were passed, The Land Contracts Actions Act, and the one establishing The Mediation Board. A number of Acts, of course, have been passed by the present Government, but I again glanced through the various Statutes and if the hon. members will also do so they will find that most of the Acts that have been passed since are in the nature of Amendments, and that those new Acts that have been passed have caused a great deal of trouble and some of them have been found ultra vires.

In addition to this criticism the Government is unfair in taking credit where credit is not due. Government, after all, is one of the biggest businesses in this province and I cannot understand why it should be necessary not to state the whole truth in connection with Government achievements. When you take an oath you state that you will give the whole truth and nothing but the truth. I am not accusing the Government of not speaking the truth, but frequently they do not speak the whole truth, and I think that is particularly so in connection with some of the works that they claim to have done. I received one of the books, with a scarlet cover, called “Progress Report from your Government”. The bottom of it says “A survey of Saskatchewan Government Activity in 1944-47”. In reading parts of this book, I think it was intended to convey to the people of this province the idea that this little booklet contains the work that has been done by this Government, and I believe that the members opposite must have the same idea, for I think it was the member for Milestone that referred to this...

(cont'd on Page 16)

**February 18, 1948**

booklet yesterday, and referred to it as being a summary of the present Government's activities. Take page one, for instance: it says that this report to the people of Saskatchewan gives a factual account of specific things your Government has done during the past four years. Turning to page five of the booklet, it is headed "Better Health for All" – "Everyone in Saskatchewan, irrespective of his ability to pay has the right to good health. This is the motivating principle behind the Saskatchewan Government's health policy. As enunciated by Premier T.C. Douglas, Minister of Health, this health policy has found expression in the number of concrete measures described briefly below." Now, this surely indicates that anything following that statement is ascribed to the present Government.

Then on page eight we find this: "Free Cancer Treatment", "Completely free diagnostic treatment and hospitalization has been provided by the Provincial Government since May 1, 1944, for cancer patients receiving treatment at the provincial clinic." This statement is actually correct, that the treatment has been free since May 1, 1944. Previously, it always appeared that the Government wanted to tell the people of this province that free cancer treatment had only been in operation since about October of 1944, but it seems to be that they want to take credit for the introduction of free cancer treatment, when the facts, of course, is that this measure was passed by the Liberal administration.

In connection with Larger School Units: they refer to Larger School Units on page 12. While it is true that The Larger School Units Act was passed by this administration, it is also true that it is largely based on The Larger Divisions Act, passed by the Liberal administration.

On page 18 we find reference to the Mediation Board, under the heading "Farm Security Act". It states that The Farm Security Act was passed at a special Session, shortly after assuming office in 1944, and it goes on to say that under that Act the farmer is protected from eviction under mortgage on his farm home of 160 acres, and that the Act also applies to widows and infant children. Then it goes on and says that Agreements for Sale are dealt with through the Mediation Board. Being stuck under the heading "Farm Security Act" would lead people to believe that the Mediation Board has also been passed by the present administration.

Then, on page 39 we find, under the heading "Farm Debt Reduction": "Saskatchewan farm debts have been reduced by \$370,940,780." I think the farmers of this province would be greatly interested to know that it is this Government that has caused the farm reduction.

Turning to the Speech from the Throne: the hon. members will all recall a character in "The Merchant of Venice", called "Gratiano", who spoke so much and said so little, that it was said of him that there were only



two grains of talk in two bushels of chaff and a person had to spend all day looking for those two grains, and that after he got through looking for them, they were not worth the trouble. I think that the Speech from the Throne comes in that category: there was a good deal of chaff and very little grain. One thing that struck me particularly is that there was no note of repentance of any kind in this speech; after all, there is hope for salvation for any repentant sinner but there seems to be nothing of this nature in the Speech from the Throne, and as it is expected there will be an election in the not too far distant future, I am afraid that there is no hope for this Government and that it will probably die “and go down to the vile dust from whence it sprung; unwept, unhonour’d and unsung”.

Referring to the remarks of the member for Canora – he claimed that the C.C.F. Party is the only that is engaged in a fight against Communism: It is strange, though, that the Labour-Progressive Party seems to support the C.C.F. – at least it wants to do so – the hon. member seems to have forgotten that the United States is very actively engaged in combating Communism, and while it is doing that it is being criticized as showing imperialistic tendencies: and their gallant and brave General MacArthur is being compared with Hirohito. He also mentioned that the Government had not only not lost any freedom but had actually created liberty. I think if he were to tell this to the fishermen in the north, or to the lumbermen in the north, or to the number of insurance agents in this province, or to a number of the local school trustees in this province, they would certainly disagree with him in this finding.

The member for Hanley complained that the people in his constituency are leaving – some are going to British Columbia – I find the same in the constituency of Rosthern, and I dare say the hon. members are finding the same condition prevailing in many other constituencies. There appears to be an almost general exodus of people from this province, and I think it is largely due to the fact that this Government, is in office here. They are trying to go to a province where the principles of democracy are being exercised and maintained.

The member Hanley also stated, with a good deal of satisfaction, that the C.C.F. had “grass roots” in Saskatchewan. He did not say what sort of grass he referred to – there are various grasses, of course – some are for rejuvenating the soil and some are infestation. We have one particular grass in certain parts of the Rosthern constituency called quack grass; and I would say, in the Rosthern constituency, at least, that this Party is regarded more or less in that nature, as being “quack grass” and an infestation, rather than anything else.

He also stated that the Liberals under-estimated the people’s intelligence. I already dealt with that in a previous address, and showed conclusively that the Liberals never did anything of this nature. I think, though, that the Liberals probably under-estimated the memory of the people of this province and possibly they should have done a little more advertising than they did. I believe there is one thing the C.C.F. do and that is to over-estimate the people’s gullibility, and I think they will find this out at the next election.

**February 18, 1948**

In regard to the address of the Premier, it seemed to me that he forgot for the moment that he is the Premier of this province; he spoke as though he was an Opposition member in the Federal House of Commons. He referred to Federal measures a good part of the time. He criticized Mr. Tucker regarding his Ottawa trip and appeared to indicate that it was useless: I think it has been clearly shown that his trip has borne fruitful results. It certainly was his duty to go to Ottawa, and the requests which he made are being followed up. While Mr. Tucker was doing it, and he was doing it very promptly, what was the Premier of this province doing? He issued various bulletins regarding this matter, and bemoaned the fact that the price ceilings had been raised, and the Minister of Agriculture indulged in the same activity; but they did not do anything about remedying the situation, while Mr. Tucker was attending to the rectification of this matter.

The Premier, I believe, made a trip to California last fall. Nobody has ever criticized him concerning that – I did not mind him leaving at all; in fact I do not think a great many people in this province would mind if he went to California and stayed there. I, personally, dote more on his absence than I do on his presence. I think he went to California to teach some of the students there something about the ethics regarding religion: that is a very worthy subject, no doubt, but if the Premier could find time, between trips to California, to also deliver a series of lectures to some of his followers regarding ethics in connection with politics, it might improve the tone of the remarks of some of the Government members – they seem to indulge in referring to Liberal activities as “stinking” and “rotten” and so on; those terms may be very expressive and they may indicate the levels of the minds of the speakers, but they certainly could be improved upon and I think, possibly, a few lectures on political ethics might be very well undertaken.

The Premier also spoke about the Excess Profits Tax and, as I understood it, suggested that the present Federal Government had removed it entirely. I may have been wrong in understanding him, but that is what it conveyed to me. The fact is, of course, that only part of the Excess Profits Tax has been removed. But I believe it is a fact that the entire Excess Profits Tax has been removed in Great Britain – I believe that is one of the very first things they did – they realized that for an industry to thrive there must be a measure of profit and they removed it at once.

The Premier also, with a great deal of pride, spoke about the profits of the Crown Corporations but I think he might, in all fairness, have told us that the larger part of these profits had been earned by The Power Commission and the Telephone Company, both of which were bodies created under the Liberal Administration. After the profits of these two organizations are deducted from the profits, mentioned by the Premier, there is not a great deal left; particularly if you were to deduct what should properly be deducted. I wonder if the Premier, in estimating this profit, took into consideration the interest on the money invested; I wonder if he took into consideration the cost of the Planning Board, or the taxes which were lost by the municipalities, or the

departmental expenses in connection with these various Crown Corporations. If these various debits were charged against the remaining profits, I think there would be very little left and possibly it would show a debit. We were also told that a number of companies had started in this province: I think it is equally true that a number of companies that discontinued business, and it is certainly true that a number of individuals have left, not only professional men, but farmers and tradesmen as well.

There is one expression that I wish the Premier had not made, and that is that he has devoted his life to the Kingdom of God – that seemed to me like the statement of a Pharisee. We have been told that the Labour-Progressive Party is endeavouring to devote its existence to the C.C.F. Party, and the C.C.F. Party say they do not want this devotion at all – I think that the Creator would probably say that the devotion of the Premier, at least in some of his activities, is not wanted. I think the Premier may be very well acquainted with the political geography of this country; but I think, as far as spiritual geography is concerned, he should endeavour to revise his location and he will find that he occasionally wanders out of the Kingdom of God.

We were told, also, something about a present for Her Majesty. The Premier stated that if the present had been made several years ago it would have consisted of fish and beans: well, of course, we were not talking about the ‘thirties at that time; but, assuming that we were now in the same plight as the ‘thirties, as far as I can gather from despatches, that Her Graciousness would have even accepted a present of fish and beans. But, seeing that we are now living in the year 1948, and that she was married in 1947, this gift would not have been so appropriate because the time the fish and bean present might have been made was a time when Her Majesty was still studying, and I think a present, which would have been more appropriate to her at that time would not have been fish and beans, because she was not conducting a household at that time. I think she should have been given something in the line of study like “The Regina Manifesto” and “Make this your Canada”. Had a present of this nature been sent to her she would probably have been able to prepare herself for the present ideology now followed by a number of her subjects.

In the radio address the Premier gave on the fourteenth of last month, if I remember correctly, — I was on the road between Hague and Rosthern – but I believe he said it was government for the people. I thought at the time that a more appropriate title would have been: a government of 12 people, by 12 people, for all except 12 of the people.

The member for Area Number One, referred to class distinction, and to the ruling classes, and to Timothy Eaton; this is just in line with what a good many others have said. It seems to be their aim and object to create hatred just as the book “World of Today”. In that book we find, for instance, some account of a person enjoying a nice home in the city of Winnipeg, which is electrically lighted and has a furnace; the occupants have a piano, and the two children are being portrayed as one playing the piano and the other one probably playing the violin. It is a very restful picture of

**February 18, 1948**

wealth and prosperity and comfort: and then it goes on in the next paragraph and refers to some squalid conditions in other parts of Winnipeg. The object seems to be to create discontent and jealousy, and such remarks made by the member for Area Number One has that same object. He referred to Timothy Eaton, for instance. Well, I believe that Mr. Eaton started with almost nothing – is it a crime to acquire something in this Canada of ours? I think that is why people came to this province; I know that is why my folks came to this land; it was because they considered it to be the land of opportunity and personal initiative. If we keep everyone down to the same line of work and the same level, we will never make any progress at all. I believe there must be a number of people in the city of Regina, today, who probably started with almost nothing and have made a great deal of progress, and enjoy the comforts of life – in fact a great number of the members of the Government are now in a much better position than they were before. I think people who make progress should be commended instead of being criticized, and hatred should not be stirred up between classes, just because one does a little better than the other.

The member for Kindersley referred to the School Divisions as “a stillborn child”. I do not know why he used that expression; it might have been called a well-behaved child; it did not attract a great deal of attention, but why it should be called “a stillborn child” on that account I do not know.

**Mr. Wellbelove:** — On a point of privilege: if the member would look up, he would find I was referring to The School Divisions Act, passed in 1940 by the Liberal government, as “a stillborn child”.

**Mr. Hooge:** — That is what I referred to, Mr. Speaker, and he called the Larger School Unit “a live child”. This child, though, for which the member takes credit, what was done with it? They took this child and they forced it on protesting unwilling foster parents: that is precisely what happened. Usually when a child is adopted there is some investigation made as to the home of the proposed foster parents, whether the home is going to be suitable for the child, and so on; whether it is wanted, whether they love this child; but, in this case, this child was simply forced on unwilling foster parents who are now treating this adopted child as an unwanted child – that is precisely the position.

He also referred to the Mediation Board as having prevented foreclosures. Well, this Mediation Board was a creation of the Liberal administration and with The Debt Adjustment Board prevented just as many, and probably more, foreclosures. He also referred to the unfair newspaper headlines. I saw one the other day in the Regina Leader-Post, and it said that “Government net profit tops five million dollars.” I think that they should not object to a headline like that. On careful reading, later on, it showed that the profit came from the Power Commission and the Telephone Company, but just to read the headline one would think that these Crown Corporations (people generally think of the new companies as Crown Corporations, they are not yet used to the idea that the Power commission and Telephone Company belong to the Crown Corporations); if they did not read the text

very carefully would think that the Crown corporations – that is, the cannery, shoe factory, woollen mills, and so on, actually have produced five million dollars. Then again, in the matter of headlines, I would refer the hon. member to the headlines which appeared in the paper at the time that a writ was served on the Attorney General, and on the Minister of Natural Resources – headlines about invading the sanctity of the Cabinet, and all that sort of thing. Actually, the fact was that the Bailiff had come to this meeting of the Cabinet at the invitation of the Attorney General, so I think the hon. member has nothing to complain of in the matter of headlines.

He also stated that the C.C.F. was a “virile child”: certainly I think he is right in one respect and that is in calling the C.C.F. “A child”; as a child, like the C.C.F., is immature. But I really think it is unfair to any innocent, unsophisticated, human being, to be compared with the C.C.F. Party. Certainly, as a child, this Party exhibits very little filial affection to its father, the late Major Williams – I did not know the man personally, but from the reports concerning him he was a very estimable gentleman in many ways and, with the exception of one member who made some remark concerning him, I have not head any member in the House say much about him – and since he was the father of this movement, one would think that a little more regard would have been paid to him when this Government was formed. I would not say that this Government is an ordinary child – I would say it is a “spoiled brat”.

**Premier:** — I do not care what the hon. member calls the Government but the reference to Mr. Williams, it seems to me, is most unfortunate. A Resolution of condolence was passed by the members of this House, when Mr. Williams came back, after the last election and was a Minister of the Crown... I am on my feet and there is no reason why the hon. gentleman should get up on his feet. I am stating my point of order. I am not responsible to the Leader of the Opposition, I am responsible to you, Mr. Speaker, and I am telling you what it is. I think that a reference to any former member, who has now passed away, is indeed bad manners, and if the hon. gentleman is a gentleman he will withdraw.

**Mr. Hooge:** — Mr. Speaker, I fail to see the point of order. I made no disparaging remarks concerning the last Mr. Williams, in fact I am endeavouring to show it was the very opposite. I regretted the lack of appreciation expressed by the members of this House concerning the father of this movement – that is the only point I was endeavouring to make. I was not talking in derogatory terms about the late Mr. Williams – nothing was further from my mind, and I do not think my remark could be construed, by any stretch of the imagination, in that way.

**Mr. Speaker:** — On a point of order, I must admit that I did not catch entirely what the hon. member was saying, and as far as I heard he was making no derogatory statement, as far as Mr. Williams was concerned.

**Mr. Hooge:** — The member for Kindersley referred to the matter of rural electrification, and I think it will be a matter of deep regret to a farmer to hear that there is no hope for rural electrification except to install wind-electrics. This is definitely contrary to the promises which were made during the campaign: we understood at that time that rural electrification was certainly one of the planks of this province, which would be implemented very shortly.

**February 18, 1948**

However, the reference to the wind electric does not come as a surprise to me, because wind, after all, is a commodity which is quite extensively used by the members of the Government.

The member for Bengough referred to the Prairie Farm Assistance Act as being a socialistic measure. Well, I certainly cannot see anything socialistic with regard to it – it is a social measure, undoubtedly; but not a socialistic measure. He also stated that the Liberals were afraid to form Larger School Units. Well, the fact that an Act was passed in 1940 regarding Larger School Divisions, clearly shows that they had the courage of their convictions, in passing this scheme, which is very similar to the one now in force, with the exception that it is not compulsory. So that the question of being afraid does not enter into it at all.

The member for Biggar made the very unfair statement, I thought, that the Leader of the Opposition was being retained because Mr. Tucker could not stand alone. I think it could be very well said, with equal truth, that the services of the late Mr. Williams were retained because the present Premier could not stand alone. There is just as much truth in one statement as the other.

He also defended the Education Tax, and this was rather surprising to me because it is about the only measure I have seen defended by this Government. One of the statements in defence of it was this: “Why withdraw the Education Tax? Why doesn’t the federal Government withdraw the Sales Tax?” Well, the federal Government tried to lead the way in this respect – it withdrew the Gasoline Tax; but immediately this Government re-imposed it, so I imagine the federal Government thinks what is the use of us cancelling any taxes, because they are immediately being re-imposed by the Saskatchewan Government, and wasted in various ways, so we might just as well retain these taxes and use them for beneficial purposes.

I was rather surprised at one of the things the hon. member said. I am used to having members attack Mr. Tucker; but this is the first occasion in which any member of this Government has seen fit to even drag one of Mr. Tucker’s daughters into this debate. He made the remarkable assertion that the reason for not following up the invitation for a vote in the various districts where it was proposed to establish Larger School Units was because his Department had not had time and that they also wanted to show these districts the record of Larger School Units. I think, as far as the Rosthern Larger School Unit is concerned, it is well over a year since the notice of establishment was first given and it seems there are some districts where it must be two years and it is rather remarkable that they haven’t found time to call the vote yet. They found time to have votes concerning Health Regions in the meantime, but they never seem to find time for this. I think, actually, the reason for not calling a vote is that it might bear the same fate as some of the votes in connection with the Health Regions.

He also referred to the contribution the lady teachers of this province performed in becoming the wives of farmers. If this was intended to be a joke I could not see the point; if it was intended to be an advertisement for Larger School Units, I think it was rather a poor advertisement, because Larger School Units are supposed to be the answer to everything. They are supposed to be such an improvement on the former system that one would think the teachers would be anxious to stay and make it their life job, but instead of that, they seem to be leaving in large numbers to marry, so it is a rather poor advertisement.

If it was intended as a gesture of appreciation, I certainly do not think the lady teachers will regard it as such. We have hundreds of these young women going out into the country to the rural schools to teach – I know something about the conditions because I taught in rural schools myself. Some of the districts are quite isolated, and you probably do not get any mail for a week or more at a time; you probably do not get to town for a week or more at a time; you probably have no telephone connections, and it is very lonely. I think some of the lady teachers are doing a very nerve-wracking job, under conditions to which they are probably not accustomed, and I think they should be entitled to at least some word of appreciation from the Minister of Education, instead of the mere suggestion that one of the contributions they are making to this province is to supply the marriage market. I shouldn't be surprised, in view of the Premier's statement, in a news item, there will probably be a matrimonial column in connection with the Department of Education.

He also referred to the great improvements that had also been achieved under the Larger School Units. Well, I certainly am very glad to see any improvement in connection with the School Districts – nicer buildings, more nicely painted; larger libraries and sanitary facilities – all these things are certainly very acceptable, and some, probably in the nature of embellishments, could be dispensed with; but, I think, after all, we must not forget the matter of cost. This matter of cost, Mr. Speaker, is now engaging the minds of a great many people: the costs of education are rising steadily. Education is something that we cannot stop and, for that reason, I think we must give it very careful consideration because it is a continuous process and we have to make provision for it for many years to come, and we should very seriously consider it. Before we embark on certain things we should consider whether we can continue; it would be most unfortunate if we embarked on a certain course of conduct and could not continue in that particular line.

I think another matter that we should consider is this: what objective are we reaching in the matter of education. We have been told that every consideration should be given to the child. Certainly! I agree with that. A child is endowed with a brain and also with a soul and I

**February 18, 1948**

think we are probably emphasizing the brain too much – we are doing everything for the training of the child, but are we educating the soul of the child? I think there is quite a difference between training and education – I think we must face these two things: how and where to find the money to continue with education, and also we should find some means of stressing this other phase of education, namely, the education of the soul. I think that the training of the brain is certainly being emphasized a great deal now. We can also train animals, but we cannot educate them; we should not merely train a child, we should also educate it and never lose sight of the fact that the child has a soul. We should build character, and that is the thing that is not being sufficiently emphasized today.

The member for Wilkie made one of these typical speeches of our political agitators. He wandered all over the world and objected to the various armies still being maintained. Surely he is an intelligent man and must know about the spread of Communism – this Government is stating that it is very much opposed to Communism and that there is no connecting link between it and Communism – and these armies are being maintained to prevent the spread of Communism. Surely he should not object to any country endeavouring to do its best to prevent the spread of Communism.

He referred to the Silkin Bill. He seemed to try to show us that it was innocuous, innocent, with nothing behind it; he said he had it but had never read any of the provisions of it; he should have read us some of the innocent provisions of the Bill, if it was as mild as he stated.

He criticized Canada for helping China and for providing them with arms. Well, here it is again, a thing that is generally acknowledged that Russia is helping the Chinese Communists in their battle against all the rest of the population, and surely he should not object to Canada helping the Chinese government, in order to put down the rise of Communism there.

He also criticized General Marshall for failing in his mission to China. I think that is most unfair, to criticize a man for failing to reach an objective. He at least tried. Generalissimo Chiang Kai Shek has been trying for years to establish freedom and to establish peace and harmony in China, but the socialists in Russia are stirring up trouble and keeping it alive, and General Marshall took the trip to China to try and assist him, but he failed. Why should he be criticized for that? He at least made an attempt to establish peace and order, while the Russian Communists are everlastingly stirring up trouble.

In connection with the member for Shellbrook, I wish to congratulate him for his reference to the late Mr. Williams. He referred to the cases pending in court under free enterprise, and seemed to think that is a weakness of the free enterprise system of government. I think this shows the strength of the free enterprise. As soon as they see some of



their citizens are transgressing the law, they take the necessary steps to correct it. That is what is taking place under a free enterprise government. In the case of this province, however, it is not actions being taken against people transgressing – from the number of cases we have pending, it appears to be the Government is the transgressor.

The member for Turtleford made the rather remarkable statement that he had heard two law students, in a casual conversation, and that they said lawyers and liars were synonymous terms, and apparently wants to leave with us the implication that just because two law students said that, the whole fraternity must be judged by this irresponsible talk of two law students. One would imagine that the C.C.F. Party considers the law students not quite as bad as lawyers because they have, in the constituency of Hanley, I believe, selected a law student to be their next candidate.

He also said that the C.C.F. had done more for the north, according to what some Liberal told him, in one year than the Liberals in ten. I do not know whether the hearing of the member for Turtleford is poor or not, but it is just possible that this Liberal may have said that the C.C.F. did more to the north in one year than the Liberals did in ten.

He also seems to be proud of the fact that one of the speakers on this side of the House had referred to the Minister of Natural Resources as the “King of the North”, and his “Kingdom”. Well, I think that after the next election, when the “King of the North” hears the election results, he will probably say “a horse, a horse, my kingdom for a horse”. He will be wanting to get out of that “kingdom” of his.

Let me now briefly refer to the constituency of Rosthern. I consider it a privilege to represent this constituency which wages in this Socialistic wilderness in this province. It has been a bulwark of democracy for 42 years, and it is significant that many of the people in this constituency are immigrants, or descendents of immigrants who have had the advantage of being able to compare governments, and by virtue of this comparison, they have always chosen a Liberal candidate to be their representatives in the Legislature. They have done so ever since this province was formed, and I venture to say that in the next election they will elect Mr. Tuck with an overwhelming majority.

I would just like to point out that apart from being a very good government, Liberalism tends to prolong life. there are many constituents in the constituency of Rosthern and it would take too long to enumerate them all; but I would just like to refer to a few of them, of various nationalities. There is Mr. Kaminsky, a Ukrainian who died about a month ago

**February 18, 1948**

and he was over 90 years of age. Last Sunday, when I was in Rosthern, a certain Mrs. Peter Abrams, a Dutch widow, was buried and she had attained the age of 94 years. We have in the town of Duck Lake a staunch Liberal, a French Canadian, by the name of Mr. Courchene – he lately attained the age of 84 years.

In the town of Rosthern we have a citizen in whom the members of this Government have, for a number of years, been quite interested because there used to be a question on the Order paper asking “Is Mr. Gerhard Ens a Liquor Vendor at Rosthern, and what is his age? This question has not been asked lately – the members seem to have forgotten Mr. Ens for the time being – I think it is merely an oversight on their part. Since they showed so much interest in Mr. Ens, I just want to remind them that Mr. Ens is still alive and on the 24th of December he was 84 years of age. He is not the Liquor Vendor at the present time; he resigned some time ago and his assistant, a veteran of the first war, was appointed to be Liquor Vendor. His assistant was discharged by this Government some time ago, and a veteran of the second war was appointed in his place. I think this Vendor gave satisfaction, not only in Rosthern, but in places where he had been sent to assist when other Liquor Vendors were absent on vacation – and we were all very glad to see that this veteran of the second war, who was wounded in the war, get the appointment. He only held the appointment, though, for a very short time when some other party was sent and he is now again merely the assistant.

**Mr. Fines:** — Would the hon. gentleman explain why he was let out, would he like to tell the House?

**Mr. Hooge:** — The first one?

**Mr. Fines:** — No, the second one, not the old one. The fellow we appointed as the Vendor taking his place.

**Mr. Hooge:** — I made some enquiries about that, Mr. Speaker, and I understand that this Government, like the C.P.R. which hates them so much, has a system of seniority, and I was told that this man was appointed to take the place of the present Assistant had some little seniority and for that reason he got the job. Personally, I do not approve of this system. The veteran who held the job before was a resident of Rosthern and had his home there; he was wounded in the war; the other man, as far as I could see, had not been, and I think that should have been taken into consideration. I do not doubt that there is some merit in the seniority system, but we felt that we should have like to have seen the other man retain that position.

**Mr. Fines:** — You are referring to Mr. Morris are you?

**Mr. Hooge:** — No, to this second one, a man by the name of Neufeldt. but, referring back to Mr. Ens, I stated that he attained his 84th birthday on the 24th of December. Shortly after he attained his 83rd birthday he had the distinction of being invited to be one of the first to receive his

Canadian Citizenship in Ottawa. On his 84th birthday on the 28th of December, John Fisher of the C.B.C. devoted a special broadcast to Mr. Ens, and some of you may have heard it. I just had a letter from my wife, today, and Mr. Ens had been in the office and was quite well, and he hopes that he may attain his 85th birthday, and I am sure he would be very glad if Mr. Tucker, on that occasion who will probably then will be the next Premier, would extend felicitations to him.

In talking about this matter of age, I just want to mention that I do not think that the candidate for the C.C.F. Party has yet been selected in the Rosthern constituency, and I would like to mention that the two adversaries that I had in the last election have since then been both seriously ill; one of them, in fact is still very ill. I, by faith and grace, seem to have escaped any serious after-effects. I am not making this statement in the nature of any threat, but I just want to mention that in passing, that this Liberalism seems to be conducive to health and that anyone who wants to be the candidate for the C.C.F. party, it might be wise to caution that, in addition to making the usual deposit, he should also make his last will and testament, and at the same time make his peace with God and so on, before he engages in this contest.

As far as the constituency of Rosthern is concerned, I think it is admittedly the “Cinderella” of the province. And owing to a series of incidents I am rather inclined to think that we can blame some of the ills on the Planning Board created by this province. I think it is more than a matter of coincidence, some of the things that have happened in the constituency during the last year or so. We have had a series of poor crops. As far as the highway was concerned there was no gravelling until this fall, although I have repeatedly asked the Minister of Highways to do some gravelling, but nothing was done until shortly before the snow fell. And then this belated gravelling caused a very serious accident: it was reported to me that gravelling was being done on the highway and I couldn't believe it – we hadn't had anything like that done for a number of years and I didn't think it was true, and I think others felt the same way about it. In fact, one was so curious that he saw the gravel on the road and thought it couldn't possibly be gravel and that it might be merely a mirage, transported probably from the constituency of Rosetown in some way, and he actually drove into this gravel with a truck, with the result that he overturned and was killed.

We have had several public functions. On at least two of them we had light failures just when the festivity was at its height. Then again, in the matter of insurance adjustment; quite a number of our people have been subjected to a great deal of delay – their automobiles were taken to Prince Albert and North Battleford, causing a great deal of delay. So it seems to me that these things happening in the constituency of Rosthern can only indicate that there is some sinister plot going on by the Planning Board to cause as much misery as possible.

**February 18, 1948**

Fortunately we are not dependent on this province because we would be in really bad shape if we were. We are people who, although we did not have too bad a crop last year, are not in too bad a shape because we are in receipt of the Family Allowances from the Liberal Government at Ottawa; we get the Prairie Farm Assistance bonus; we get the Wheat Producers' payment and in that way are able to subsist.

The hon. members will recall that there was a vote in proposed Health Region No. 8, which also affected the constituency of Rosthern, and you all know the result of that vote. The town of Rosthern actually voted in favour of this proposal, but many other towns and villages in the rural districts did not follow this example. As I say, the citizens of the town of Rosthern voted in its favour but as the idea was not adopted generally I would like to point out, in spite of what the Government assures us to the contrary, the health conditions are not nearly as good as pictured.

There are very many parts of the province where there is no doctor; I think that in some respects some of the districts are really in worse condition, in this respect, than they were in the pioneer days. I know that in the constituency of Rosthern there is only Duck Lake, Hague and Rosthern where there are any doctors, and I think the same conditions must prevail in a number of constituencies where people cannot reach a doctor with travelling very long distances. This is a very serious condition, particularly in winter. It seems to me that instead of spending so much money on Health Regions, it would be a better idea to endeavour to encourage doctors to locate in more of these smaller towns. At present there seems to be a tendency for the doctors to go the cities only, but if doctors were subsidized, say to the extent of \$2,000 or \$3,000, I believe that a great many would locate in some of the smaller towns, and I think that, in a measure, it would do what this Health Region is supposed to do, not only in providing medicine but also in providing medical attention, and I think it should precede the establishment of Health Regions.

I would like to say a few words on the matter of Mental Hygiene, which has been mentioned to me on various occasions. The hon. members are familiar, more or less, with the procedure in regard to the committal of patients: the patient himself has very little to say about it; it is generally done on the evidence of friends, relatives and doctors. Once the patient is in the hospital his position is really worse than being in gaol, because if you are in gaol, or before you go to gaol, you have a chance to give your own evidence and can have counsel. If you are convicted, you have a chance to appeal and get out on bail, and have various measures of defence, but in the case of a patient being committed to a mental hospital he has none of these opportunities. As I say, his word is not generally taken into consideration at all – he is committed on the evidence of relatives, friends, doctors, and so on. Once he is in there, there is no way of getting out

unless the Superintendent, or the Minister of Health, will grant his release, and I think this is a serious matter.

The only provision in our Act for an application for review is within the first 15 days, before the committal is actually completed. It seems to me that there should be some provision in the Act whereby, on the application of friends or relatives, anyone that has been committed should be able to apply for a Board of Review, quite independent of the hospital authorities, for a review of the case.

I am not implying any incompetence in connection with the staff of our Mental Hospitals, I do not know the Psychiatrists or the Commissioners at all – that is not the point: the point is, that these people are in the mental institutions, and we have all heard of cases where friends of a patient think he may be being detained altogether too long. It is possible that these psychiatrists may have made a mistake – we all know if a doctor makes a mistake, a patient has at least an opportunity to go to another doctor and consult him. The poor patient in the Mental Hospital has no such opportunity – he must abide by the decision of those in the hospital, so that the position of a patient in a Mental Hospital is really much worse than that of a person in gaol. I think this is a matter that this Government should take into serious consideration, in amending The Mental Hygiene Act in such a way that on the application of relatives or friends, application may be made to King's Bench Court, in order to review a patient's case from time to time. Surely that is nothing more than fair and just.

I think, particularly in view of the impending election, this matter is of particular importance to the members of the Government. A lot of members will be candidates in the next election. As far as the candidates who have been selected by the Liberal Party are concerned, I think they will wage this campaign in a very cool and collected manner, because they will feel they are waging a just and winning battle; but the C.C.F. candidates will be in the position that they will not only have to defend this peculiar ideology, but they will also have to defend the record of this Government. It is quite conceivable that they will have difficulty in doing so, and they may get excited; they may get angry; they may start to pound the desks; they may start to pull their hair and go through various antics, and it is just possible that some people might think it is manifestation of insanity. Should such an unfortunate thing occur, it is possible that some of the Government candidates might find themselves in one of these Mental Hospitals, with no hope of getting out, under present conditions, so I think it is most important just for that reason alone, that we should have some of these cases reviewed.

**Mr. Valleau (A.S.V.R.):** — On a point of order: I am not absolutely certain of this point but notice has been given of a Bill to Amend The Mental Hygiene Act, which is listed as number 16, in Committee of the Whole,

**February 18, 1948**

and we have already given it second reading. I would suggest that all the arguments the hon. member is making can also be repeated on that Bill, and it is going to involve repetition to give the same argument twice and since notice has been given, and it is already before us in other form, it should not be discussed at this time.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. gentleman has the privilege in engaging in fantasy, if he so thinks fit.

**Mr. Hooge:** — I would like to direct a few remarks to the Attorney General, and I am sorry that he is not in the House. It is a matter of economy that I wish to mention, in connection with estates.

It frequently happens that an estate possesses property not only in Canada but in some foreign country, generally the United States, and it has always been the custom until recently that when you make application for letters of administration or letters probate, the filing fee is limited to that part of the assets situated in Canada. For instance, supposing an estate is worth \$15,000, and the assets in Canada are only worth \$5,000, the filing fee has always been paid on the \$5,000; recently, however, there has been a ruling by the Attorney General's Department that the filing fee is to be paid on the total value of the estate, irrespective of where the property is located. This, I submit, is quite unfair, because the filing fee in connection with the other portion of the estate has already been paid on some foreign land, and I think this should be corrected.

I would also like to congratulate the Attorney General concerning his pathetic utterances in connection with the next election – it really must have taken days of concentration, study and thought to arrive at that conclusion, which he told us about not so long ago.

I also wish to congratulate him on his ability as a radio artist. If I had that talent I would endeavour to commercialize it; I would endeavour to contact some firm dealing with cosmetics, and to secure that job I would say to the people of this province: "Ladies and gentlemen, you have seen how the complexion of this province can be effectually wrecked by the application of wrong political principles and, similarly, a beautiful complexion can be wrecked by the wrong cosmetics". And I think an appeal of this kind would be irresistible.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a privilege to be a member for the constituency of Rosthern for the last four years. I am not seeking re-election, and I am sure that in the person of Mr. Tucker, who is the next candidate,

the constituency will be very well represented after the next election, because of his greater ability and because of the great opportunity which he will have as the probable Premier of this province.

I regret that my efforts in connection with this House have been of very little avail, but it is a measure of satisfaction to me that I have certainly done nothing, to my knowledge, which has been ruinous to the Province. I am very loyal to the province, I have been here for over 41 years; my children were born here; I expect to stay in this province; I realize I am just any ordinary “carrier of water and hewer of wood”, but if I engage in this labour I like to do it for myself, I do not like to do it for the State, and I am hoping that most people of this province will come to realize that they do this for themselves, and I would appeal to them to forsake their queer ideology, which originated in the perverted brain of Karl Marx, and forsake this fantastic political gospel which is contrary to the laws of God and the inclination of man, and to forsake the idolatrous worship of State; and to hereafter plan and execute the individual design so that the collective pattern might result in the progress and destiny for which this province was intended.

Before closing I would just like to refer to some remarks which the preceding speaker made with regard to the member for Moosomin. He referred to the member’s record, and I thought it was a very fitting and appropriate thing to do, some others have done the same; but I was shocked and amazed when he said he hoped that the member would be duly rewarded by this Party. This certainly cancelled everything the hon. member had said before. Some of the members spoke quite feelingly of the hon. member’s record, and I think they were quite sincere – they appreciate what he has done and recognized it. It has been my privilege to know the hon. member for four years and I feel satisfied that anything he has done has been done out of a sense of duty, and not with any idea of reward at all, and I think it is most unbecoming for the Minister of Reconstruction to suggest that the hon. member has been doing all this in order to get some reward. I feel quite sure that in discharging the duties of his office, as he has done so capably, and so well, is enough reward for the member for Moosomin.

**Hon. Mr. Corman:** — I am sure that he did not mean that. All the members on this side of the House concur in the views the member for Rosthern said were expressed before.

**Mr. Hooge:** — Certainly anyone that was here I do not think could help but get that impression from the remarks of the hon. member. He distinctly said that he hoped the Liberal Party would duly ‘reward’ the hon. member for Moosomin for his services.

**February 18, 1948**

In connection with the options that the Minister of Reconstruction spoke about, I fully agree with the member for the Mediterranean Area, and I was rather surprised that the Minister of Reconstruction entirely missed the argument of the member for the Mediterranean Area. He was speaking about 'ceiling' price but the Minister of Reconstruction defended the policy of the Government for not inserting the price in the contract, by stating that he did not want to have the present inflated prices. But, if the suggestion of the member for the Mediterranean Area were followed – he did not advocate that a fixed price should be inserted in the contract, but a ceiling price – if the ceiling price should later on be found to be too high, anything below that could be adopted. He also said that the assessed value was fixed for taxation and not for sale. I think the assessment that has been done by experts in this province, has been very well done and should be taken into consideration, as to the type of soil, productivity of the soil, and all that sort of thing – it has been very well done, so I think that is one of the best barometers, the best criterion that we have for value today. The Board of Review, under the Farmers' Credit Arrangement Act, for instance, when determining the ability of the farmers to pay their debts would invariably be guided, to a large extent, by these assessments.

In connection with the Resolution that the Minister of Reconstruction said was talked on by Mr. Tucker. I doubt very much whether the Minister has the actual facts in that connection. I spoke to Mr. Tucker about that some time ago – there was some reference made to the same Resolution, I think, in a previous Session, and I took particular pains to ask Mr. Tucker what had actually happened – and he said that the matter, to which the Minister referred, was then under consideration by a Committee, and, therefore, it was quite improper to introduce a Resolution in the House before the Committee had made its report, and it was on that account the matter was not disposed of. It was not that Mr. Tucker killed this Motion by talking about it interminably, but it was quite in accordance with parliamentary practice that the matter was not decided until the Committee had brought in the report concerning it.

He also stated that it was well known that Mr. Tucker was opposed to co-operatives. Well, I think that he is the only man that knows it – the Minister of Reconstruction – I think everyone else ought to know that Mr. Tucker is very much in favour of co-operatives. In fact he has, on many occasions, publicly stated that instead of having these Government-dominated Crown Corporations it would be much more feasible if co-operatives were formed to let the people run these things instead.

Mr. Speaker, I have probably spoken a little longer than I should, and I shall now conclude and state that I shall oppose the Motion.



**Mr. Alex D. Cannon** (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, I haven't very much time so I will do my best to try and get finished by the time of adjournment.

I do not know whether I have a great deal of contribution to make to this Debate because, after listening to the very fine addresses, I feel that possibly everything has been said that I could say. However, without getting too monotonous, I would like to extend my compliments to the Mover and Seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. To make it very short, I will say that the hon. member for Canora gave an excellent address, and I know that everything in it stems from his loyalty to the cause of the common people. I would say that when his early sojourn finishes here, he won't need to worry about taking an asbestos suit with him.

As far as the member for Hanley is concerned, it really tickled the cockles of my heart when I heard him give his address. The sincerity, and everything contained in his address, I am sure was appreciated by all the House. I know that when you really get the friendship of a Scotsman, you really have a close friend indeed. I would suggest, too, that anyone not having the advantage of a little Scotch in them, should hasten to get in that position, because you certainly feel much better.

I would also like to extend some compliments to the members of the Opposition. They certainly are doing a great service to the C.C.F., not so much to the citizens of the province.

I would, though, sincerely extend my best wishes to the hon. member for Moosomin. I feel that he is more or less outstanding in the fact that he can throw the thrusts across the House, but he can also take them, and we do like him for it.

We heard quite a storm in the House yesterday and about the best comments I can make in regard to them is, that when I was out in the member's room, when the telephone rang and I answered the telephone, and a lady asked me who was the member that was speaking. I said: "the hon. member for the Mediterranean". And she said: "did you say Mediterranean?" I said: "yes". She said: "not wonder he is all wet".

I am possibly one of the poor layman that has to rise to the defence of the worker, and I know that I spent many years at hard labour, not because a judge so desired but because it was just simply my lot to toil. So I am, naturally, interested in some of the things that take place in the province in regard to labour and I am really concerned in regard to the Labour legislation and the treatment it is receiving in the courts. We heard quite a storm, and possibly it should take someone with a better capability to handle this delicate subject, and I am not going to go into it very deeply, any more than to say that there is no organization that the members of the Government haven't the right to take issue with and criticize. Naturally, when you see the promotions to the Bench coming from men who have been pretty firmly tied up in certain political parties, you cannot help but feel that they might be sometimes a little biased when rendering decisions.

**February 18, 1948**

If that is putting it too bluntly, Mr. Speaker, it is just because I cannot help it, and I want to let you know that I have a reason for saying that. For example, there was a member of this Legislature that had been promoted to the Bench, and I do not think he sat in Court more than possibly one sitting; but could you imagine a C.C.F. person, and particularly the person he referred to, getting a square deal in a Court of Law. For instance, in this House, and this is an item I am reading from the Leader-Post, an extract of February 21, 1939, and it says, "Davis' attack on Phelps, C.C.F. member, creates uproar in Legislature", and then it says, "Heaping ridicule upon the head of Mr. Phelps, who had preceded him, Mr. Davis suggested that it would be fitting after he had passed to the great beyond, that his head be cut off and put up over the speaker's chair." This brought a protest from Mr. Phelps. Mr. Davis replied that he was not suggesting any such thing; but he believed that it might be in the interest of the C.C.F. Party if somebody slit his throat or if someone punctured him, but he would not suggest cutting his head off, particularly in this House; and the Speaker ordered that the Debate be kept to the amendment under discussion.

Now, I suppose at that time that the hon. gentleman, Mr. Phelps, just said to himself in a whisper, that he would see him in Hong Kong before he would bowl him over, and that is where he sees him today. Some place near there, at any rate.

We hear a great deal about the C.C.F. being a sister or a brother-in-law to the Communists. Of course I am sure that that is not going to have any effect at all. I remember the hon. gentleman from the Mediterranean Area, sitting opposite to me – I do not know why he moved, but, however he did, unless it was to practice coalition – at the time he was sitting here he showed me the platform that he was elected on. You will remember, and Mr. Speaker, you can correct me if I'm wrong, but I think I stated at that time to the hon. member that his platform was very, very similar to the C.C.F. platform; and that is what he was elected on. He just smiled, and as I took it, a smile of acknowledgement. Now he turns around and here we are all Communists. Well, you cannot make the people believe that Alex Cannon is a Communist – people that know – or any of the other members that I would chose to mention. This shouting about Communism at every turn; then your roof leaks, why, it is Communistic infiltration; and when the sewer breaks, why, if it 'Communist underground' activity. This just is not going over anymore; I think, maybe, you would do a greater service to the province and to your political party if you, for a change – and this is real fatherly advice; I would not give anything else – you would give us credit for something. There must be some things we are doing, and I believe it would enhance your argument in your criticisms and possible gain more support, if you would at some time or other give this government credit for some of the things it has done; and then more notice would be taken in regard to your criticism. That is the advice that I know will be graciously...

**Mr. Procter** (Moosomin): — We will try and find something good to say about you?

**Mr. Cannon:** — Now, as I said before, you cannot make the people believe that I am a Communist – and I am no angel – I am just an ordinary chap trying

to get along. I learned a lot of good points on my mother's knee, and of course I learned some bad points likely, at other joints. I am doing the best I can and something is being shown for it.

Now, this Davis that I mentioned – I think maybe I should say a little bit about it now. We have heard that Davis from Meadow Lake; and the other Davis – I just cannot recall his initials – they have been storming and telling stories about the C.C.F. It seems to me that these Davises are pretty hard to handle.

Some years ago there was a young lady who asked me if I would not do something about having her name changed, so of course, naturally always willing to oblige, I went ahead and did all I could to see that everything was carried through; and I am glad to say that the change was really beneficial. Raised a nice family – in fact; strange, the children look a little bit like me – and she is a good cook too. However, I forget to mention that she chose the name of Connon, of course.

Now, there have been a lot of statements made here – I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition said something about “They laboured to build mountains and produced a mouse.” Well, of course, I always think of the Trestrail days; they laboured to save their shirts and produced a louse.

Then some reference was made, and this is where the people of this province really did register a protest: reference was made to the Nollets and the Lloyds, and so on; and the people in no uncertain terms elected the Nollets and the Lloyds, and what have you, to this government; but they certainly got rid of the Staines and Kerrs, while they were doing that.

Now, we will take the average voter; he will just simply not go into things possibly as steeply as some of the speakers have suggested – not that I mean that he should not – but we have to realize just what the average person across the board will do when it comes to the next election. They will not pay any attention to, for instance, statements like “the Liberals were the bulwark of society for many years.” They found out in 914 that the ‘bull’ would not work; so there is no use in throwing anything out like that and just expect to get votes, because you really have to show them something, and it is the things that they see and feel that will determine whether this government is returned to office.

So, when the farmer and his wife decide that election time has rolled, they will be surprised at how short a time it is since this government was elected. Mary will likely say to John, “why gracious me, it does not seem long at all”. He'll say, “no! no!” Because you had to wait six years the time before. So, the two years being cut off, that of course,

**February 18, 1948**

make the time appear a little shorter. You will say that we had better take a check up then and this will be an intelligent vote, and we will just see now what the different parties have to offer, and they will try to find the Liberal platform. Well, that will be a conundrum; but they will remember a lot of things and they possibly will not have to do so much digging. They will remember the 'thirties, and I do not have to mention anything about that. They will realize, too, of course, that the press is biased and there is no use of reading that except possibly if they read the North Battleford paper – and I am going to say right now that the two papers in North Battleford; I do not know whether they are supporting this government but I will give them credit, and I want to register that in this House, that they do conduct journalism in the highest way, and we get the news as it should be sent out – the truth – not distorted as it is in many instances. Well, I think we own something to a newspaper that will do that. They will go over the records of the Liberal Government; they will remember several things that they promised and they will conclude, now, 'we were promised some of these things in all the pre-election contests, but they never were implemented'. They will think of the different things that the Federal Government is doing. The farmer will think of the grain situation, the agricultural policy; he will picture his steer where he is doubtful whether he should feed it coarse grains or whether he should sell it; he will think of the advice that he gets from Ottawa, with regard to that; and he will come to the conclusion – "all I've got is a bum steer anyway".

They will look up the C.C.F. program, and they will find plenty in that. First of all, in my own constituency, for example, I get along very well with not only the C.C.F. people, but the Liberals and Conservatives there. They are a very intelligent group of people in my constituency; you will readily see that. I would not be here if they were anything else. That is right, and that is why you get a clean bill of health before you come down here. The reason that the people in my constituency will elect me – just the same as they will in the other constituencies where they have a C.C.F. member – they have had an opportunity to become acquainted with their representative. He does not just come to them a short time previous to election, but he is percolating around there all the time – not just simply driving into a C.C.F. yard, but he drives into the yards of the Liberals and Conservatives, whatever they are, also. The people know when I go around, this year, that it will not be for votes, because that is the habit and a practise that I thought I was intended to do as a representative.

I am going to tell you that a lot of these people are finding out that they do not need to just simply grab a hold of a name and just hang on to it, and that is the last. They are starting to do a little thinking; starting to realize that we are not the vicious people that we

were branded to be, that we are willing to do the things we think will be better for all concerned, and allowances will be made too for the odd mistakes. Why, everyone realizes that to do a job and get at it there might be the odd mistake here and there; that certainly does not spoil the real job at hand.

In going around my constituency I do all the things that members do, if you want to suggest that I kiss the babies, sure I do, they are lovely to hold and I do not mind having a little Johnson's Powder on my lapel in fact those older than the babies are nice to behold, and those a little older are nice to be held. However, what does it matter after you come home from a hard days chore if there is a little lipstick on your cheek, it is all in a days work. So we have a lot to show the people and a lot to tell you about the Battlefords. We have beautiful scenery there, and I invite you all, if you ever have an opportunity, to come to North Battleford and go around the different places there. Yes, we have the mental hospital, and I am going to tell you that I invite everyone here to visit there and go through the institution.

**Mr. Benson** (Last Mountain): — You would not lock the door when we got in?

**Mr. Connon:** — No, it would not be altogether necessary, because you would be so much at home — I do not mean you, personally — but a person would be so much at home when they got in there, all this fear of going in and taking a rest would be completely brushed aside. I was there Christmas Day, and the patients had had a contest decorating the wards and there was a prize for the best decorated ward. I am going to tell you, it did your heart good when you went through there and found what a wonderful job they had done, how clean the place was. About the only thing you could say would be that it was somewhat over-crowded. But to my way of thinking, people should not get the idea that these hospitals are places to dread. In fact, if at any time you feel yourself slipping a little, it would not hurt to go up there and take a rest, and there would be no shame in it.

We have a museum there, the police memorial and Indian museum, and I think the official opening takes place next summer. There is only one relic that we have not had in the place yet, but we will possibly find that in due course. We think possibly we should have a Liberal in there just to mark that ancient organization, and the children to follow will see it as it should be, standing still, not moving.

The hon. Minister of Natural Resources, I would congratulate

**February 18, 1948**

him on the very fine job he has done there. Already hundreds of people have visited these memorials and we are expecting a large number of tourists next year. I would, in the nicest possible way, appeal to the hon. Minister for a little financial assistance possibly if it was necessary. At the same time, the tourists while they are there, would want to go on to Meota Lake, a lake about 30 or 40-minute drive, and I would ask the hon. Minister also if he would help the people there who are really trying to help themselves. They have, I think, spent around \$1,400 or \$1,500 in beautifying the lake, and, seeing that people are willing to help themselves, I would ask the hon. Minister if he would be good enough to give them a little assistance to do the job. It would add not only to the beauty but to the number of people that depend on Jackfish Lake, and there is also quite a fishing industry there that would help bring returns sufficient to warrant asking for a contribution of that kind.

I must congratulate the Minister of Highways for the very fine job he has done in our constituency; and there again the people see what has been accomplished, and they know that this story about highway construction and the deplorable condition of the roads just does not stand up when they can see and feel the benefits of good roads. It takes a long time to build a road, and people appreciate that very fact.

We have a airport there and under The Housing Corporation, and The Department of Reconstruction, 73 families comfortably reside at the airport, and it really alleviated the crowded housing conditions in North Battleford, and I am sure that the people of North Battleford appreciate that help and convenience. they have a hall and a store there, and everything is handled for the convenience of the people some few miles out from North Battleford.

In closing I would like to mention some of the things the people are thinking. I met a lady and she had witnessed the arrival of the Ambulance Plane to pick up a patient in a district not far from North Battleford. And using the lady's words, I will tell the story to you. She said, "The news got around that the plane was coming out to pick up this patient, and we all climbed into sleighs and went out there to wait for the plane to arrive. The patient was there on a stretcher and everyone was laughing and quite happy when all of a sudden they heard the roar of the plane." She said, "I do not know what happened, but I felt something heavy coming over me and I could hardly understand when I looked around and saw among the 40 or 50 people, the odd tear running down their cheeks. With the least of delay a nurse came out of the plane and the patient – in a few minutes – was in the plane. I felt even heavier when the plane rolled away, and I looked around and could hardly see a dry eye; and a man with a hard voice looked up at the plane in the silence and said 'Humanity First'." I think, Mr. Speaker, that is why this government will be re-elected by the majority of the people of this province who are intelligent.

The House then adjourned at 6 o'clock P.M.