

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Tenth Legislature
Day 11

Friday, February 20, 1948

The House resumed from Thursday, February 19, 1948.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. Peter J. Hooge (Rosthern): — According to a dispatch appearing in the Leader=Post, I am reported to have said that the C.C.F. Party showed lack of confidence in our Courts, but that the Federal Government intended to abolish the Privy Council. That is incorrect. What I did say was that there is inconsistency in the different sections of the C.C.F. Party; and that while the C.C.F. Party in Saskatchewan appears to lack confidence in our Courts, and appeals to the Privy Council at Ottawa, the C.C.F. Party in Ottawa showed confidence in our Courts by endeavouring to abolish the Privy Council and that Mr. Jaenicke, the C.C.F. member, is sponsoring a Bill to that effect.

Mr. T.C. Douglas (Premier): — Mr. John Fisher of the C.B.C. is with us today, and I think it is the wish of all the hon. members to have an opportunity not only to have the Legislature hear him but have the people who tune in on the Legislative proceedings hear him. I, therefore, am going to move, seconded by Mr. Patterson, that the present sitting now be suspended to permit the Assembly to hear Mr. John Fisher.

Premier: — Mr. Speaker, and members of the Legislative Assembly, we are privileged to have passing through our city and our province, Mr. John Fisher, who is Canadian Broadcasting Company Commentator, who has just returned from an extensive trip in Europe, and who is making a tour across Canada to speak on behalf of the Canadian Appeal For Children. He is addressing a large audience of women downtown at 3:30 o'clock and therefore his remarks will be brief, but I am sure I speak for all the members of this Assembly, when I say that we welcome him here and we wish him every success on behalf of the splendid appeal which he is making for the children of Britain and the children of Europe: Mr. Fisher.

February 20, 1948

Mr. John Fisher (C.B.C. Commentator): — Mr. Speaker, and members of the Legislative Assembly, it is indeed a great honour to be here today and to stand in this, the youngest, Legislature in the dominion of Canada, in the Chamber in which you are doing such courageous and big things. I always consider it a great tonic, and I wish it could come more than two or three times a year, to come to this great prairie province of Saskatchewan. And the thing that interests me, and always fills me with more courage, is not the breadth of your prairies, certainly it is not the friendliness of your climate; it is not the size of your sections, nor the height or the ripeness of your wheat, but it goes beyond that; it is the vision and the bigness in the minds of men. You seem to have less of the introversion, less of the prejudice, that one finds in order and more established countries and provinces. The roots do not get logged down as tightly as they do in other places – and that is very refreshing and good for our great country of Canada.

Now, I have just come back, as the Premier said, from a tour of Europe, and I am not going to take your time to fill your hearts with misery: that would be very easy, because Europe is chuck full of it. But I think in a few sentences I can give you a rough outline and perhaps answer some of your queries about this Canadian Appeal for children.

I must not, in any way, be considered an expert on Europe; all I had was a Cook's tour, and I spent most of my time battling against currency restrictions and trying to get enough to eat in the right places. But I did have occasion to sample a little bit of the misery, and especially that of young kids – children; and I suppose there is nothing more pathetic in the world than a helpless child. I think it is Canada's great hour now to be a little bigger than politics, a little bigger than war, a little bigger than the easy way of saying "Oh, Europe's a mess and it always will be". As people we must rise beyond that and recognize that the little creatures of God, called children, did not breed this war; they did not deal the poker chips of diplomacy; they had nothing to do with men's folly – they are simply the innocent victims. It would be very easy to say "they are going to spend this money, but how do I know it will reach the right hands? Europe will always be that way; always have wars". It would be so easy to say that; but I think it is a testing time now and that Canada has grown up and she is now in a great race with the other nations of the world to save the world, and we can only do it through unity.

This time, no government or no international authority is telling us that we must, we are simply asking voluntarily, and that goes right to the root of democracy – we are asked, as human beings, who have something in our pockets to help those who have not. That is Christianity to me. But it goes even beyond that, it can be purely selfish. These children who are floundering in Europe today, these poor, unfortunate victims, are not all going to die: the awful, miserable truth is that millions will die

even if we took the milk from every cow in the world, you couldn't say that millions will die; but many of them will live, and tomorrow they will sit across the table from our children. How will they act? What kind of children will they be? In the meantime, will they sour? Will they want to bring their pistols to the table; that is the great question. It seems to me that it is just a logical progression.

The danger is in not giving help to Europe now. I do not think there is any gamble, or risk, in sending help because what can a man lose by giving a day's pay? If 26 or 27 nations of the world give it there is a chance that that truth will trickle down and that the seed of the United Nations' brotherhood will take root in Europe, and who knows what harvest we will reap tomorrow from that gesture! The safeguard is this: if we raise \$100 in Canada, that \$100 is spent in this country to buy Canadian materials, and if we buy 500 pounds of dried milk with that \$100, and that dried milk is sent to Europe – let us say to Czecho-Slovakia – not one pound of that milk is distributed until the Czecho-Slovakian government has agreed to match it with food of equivalent caloric value. It might take 1,000 pounds of carrots to do it; but even after they have matched it, you have a second safeguard, and it is this one: that the food, or clothing, or help, is then administered by the United Nations' International children's Emergency Fund, which was not appointed by the people of Europe, but by the United Nations in New York. Those are the basic safeguards.

I am told by United Nations' people, many of them not Europeans, that if this aid does not continue to flow to Europe that conditions will be positively chaotic because Europe cannot come back by itself. When you think of a city like Warsaw, bigger than Montreal, with one hotel left, with four buildings out of thousands left completely unscratched; when you think that they had no sewers; no water system; no telephones; no offices; no banks; no legislative buildings, when they came back to Warsaw. You can see the enormous problems they had to face – and their primary concern is in getting things moving but they just can't reach out and produce a cow; or produce butter; or produce fat; or produce vitamins: they need that extra lift that we can give them, to a great measure, to carry them over,.

Some of you, who come from this wonderful farm province of Saskatchewan, will perhaps be interested to know that in Europe the United Nations people estimate it will be 1953 or 1955 before Europe can get back to its pre-war milk standards; and those pre-war standards were never anything like our Canadian standards, so that we must not think in terms of one "rich uncle" gift and then wipe it off the slate; we must keep helping for many years to come, and I think it is in our own interest to do so. If you talk to people in Europe there is one thing they do not want – they don't want the "rich uncle" idea; they do not want charity. They are trying. If you could visit some of the nurseries and see what they are doing with some of these children and see their efforts to train

February 20, 1948

doctors and train school teachers, it would thrill you. You see in some of these countries the Germans didn't just bomb: no, bombing is wasteful because bombs kill nitwits, dunces, fools, bright people, smart people, clergymen, lawyers; but the Gestapo had a far smarter system, they could pick out the brains of a country and in Poland 5,000 doctors were slaughtered and something like 4,000 lawyers were slaughtered, and several thousand engineers and university professors – all leaders. And in the schools of France and Belgium and Czecho-Slovakia and many of the countries of Europe, the Germans destroyed all connections with the past – all globes, all maps, all English classics, all French classics and all Russian classics. They only had German books, and these kids had to learn German; the only maps they saw were German and they had great tourist promotion schemes to visit beautiful, lovely, Germany. When you take a child of six or seven and drill that into his head, it becomes a terrible nightmare then to unscramble it. And that is what they are trying to do in Europe today – unscramble the damage done to the mind and the wounds done to the body. Europe cannot do it alone and I like to think that this is a most Christian and wonderful thing, this Canadian Appeal for Children, because never in the history of the world have 26 nations of the world been asked to, voluntarily, out of the goodness of their heart, contribute to the welfare of little kids who cannot help themselves. It is a wonderful test of the United Nations on a democratic or voluntary basis.

And we must all try and be bigger than Canada, or Saskatchewan, or Ontario. We must gradually think in the terms of the brotherhood of man, and that we are all creatures of God and all live under the same sky, and some day, somehow, just as we have struggled with democracy for centuries, we will evolve a world pattern. Well, it seems to me that here is a chance for the average individual to throw in his day's pay, or his cheque, to show the other people of the world that at least we are sincere when we talk about the United Nations.

I look at it this way, and I will just give you an illustration of a mother. I was in Prague and my photographer was taking pictures and this woman came up and started shaking her fist at me and crying; and the interpreter told me she was shouting "my baby, my baby, my baby". "My baby died because I didn't have enough food – I didn't have enough milk to nourish him". Now, that woman is sour – the United Nations to her is a far off thing, and it will continue to be a far off thing until she sees tangible, eatable, useable evidence of it. But, if her child had been saved by milk that maybe a couple of dollars from a couple of people in Regina and Moose Jaw and Halifax gave, if her child had been saved – and you know what mothers are like, they have a possessiveness and a love that man will never understand – she would never forget that; and that would be passed on because the truth will always trickle through.

In other words, my message is this: we have nothing to lose by giving, but if we don't give we have a great deal more to lose.

Gentlemen: I appreciate the honour of coming here. I would be a bloated fool if I thought it were an honour to me – it is an honour to this great Christian cause, the Canadian Appeal for Children, and I know the work of this Saskatchewan; I know how in every other cause you have rallied magnificently, and if the rest of Canada could keep the pace of this prairie province, there would be no feelings about how this Canadian Appeal for children will succeed. Thank you.

Mrs. Beatrice Trew (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity, on behalf of the Assembly, to express to the gentleman who has just spoken so feelingly of the plight of the children of Europe, our very deep appreciation of his kindness in coming before us, and of his message.

It has been a matter of great regret to me, personally, that I would be unable, on account of my duties here, to attend his public meeting this afternoon. I will confess that the thought did pass through my mind; had I been a man I might have been able to hear him at noon today.

I was deeply moved, as I am sure all the hon. members were, by his story. While he was speaking so practically, I could not help but think of our bountiful meals, our warm homes, our comfortable clothing and to wonder what can we in the province do to assist these brothers and sisters in need. I am sure all the hon. members will do everything possible in a personal way but I think we can do more and, here and now, I give notice that very soon I intend to introduce in this House a Resolution requesting this Government to take whatever action it deems necessary to do something in a tangible way to relieve the distress among the children of other lands.

Knowing that we have in Saskatchewan a people's Government — a Government dedicated to the policy of 'humanity first' and knowing that that government realizes the truth of the brotherhood of man, regardless of political or geographical boundaries, I am confident that they will find a way; a way by which the people of Saskatchewan can express, in a practical manner, as a people, the sympathy of their generous hearts. I believe I am speaking for all the people of our province; I know I speak for all of its mothers, when I request our Government to take action which, after all, speaks louder than words.

To Mr. Fisher, on behalf of this Assembly, and on behalf of the children of the world, I give thanks.

**Continuation of Debate on Motion
for Address in Reply to
the Speech from the Throne**

The House resumed from Thursday, February 20, the Debate on the Motion of Mr. Feeley (Canora) for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Tisdale): — Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but say just one word of appreciation of the fact that we have had just now the opportunity to listen to Mr. Fisher giving us a few very descriptive words in regard to the conditions in Europe today. We cannot go past that question without giving it very deep thought, nor without giving it effective material help.

February 20, 1948

In rising to support the Motion before the House, Mr. Speaker, I first of all want to pay my compliments to the Mover and Seconder of the Address in Reply. I have had the pleasure of knowing the hon. member for Canora, who moved the Address, for a good many years. I am sorry that he has decided that he must discontinue to take such an active part in public life. This province will suffer a loss when he is no longer in its Legislature. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, no one in this Legislature, deserves greater admiration for the zeal, the courage and the faithfulness that the hon. member has shown in his work in the cause of humanity. He is not only a socialist in theory, he is a socialist in practice. Any hon. members who have had the privilege of meeting with his neighbours would know just that. The hon. Leader of the Opposition, when he inferred that the member for Canora would have some difficulty in making his success as a farmer agree with his principles as a Socialist was displaying his ignorance. In the world today the cleverest most successful people are more to be found in the ranks of socialism than any other place. No one should ever run away with the idea, which was prevalent 50 years ago – the Leader of the Opposition probably hasn't learned much about socialism since then – that a Socialist must always be ragged; and must always be a failure. That day has gone by. But I am sure of this: the member for Canora will continue, to the full extent that he is able, to give service to the cause of humanity.

I have not had the pleasure of knowing the member for Hanley as long but my short acquaintance with him is one that I treasure very much. He is a great philosopher; he, too, is faithful to the cause of humanity; and he, too, will continue after he leaves this Legislature to do everything he can in that cause.

I want, also, to compliment the Premier on the address which he gave to this House. We who have the privilege of working with the Premier are very proud of his ability, and are very proud of the fact that we can say that there could not be anyone with whom it is a greater pleasure to work, in a great cause, than with our Premier.

I listened to the Leader of the Opposition speaking on the radio a few nights ago, and I have also listened to him in the House, the other day, and one statement which he made struck me rather forcibly. He stated, Mr. Speaker, that the opposition last week stepped into the breach and kept this Debate going. You know, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friends, who now sit on your immediate left, have never yet recovered from 1944. They are continually forgetting that they are no longer the Government in this province.

Mr. Procter: — You do, too.

Mr. Brockelbank: — They believe that once in a while – and it comes out – that they are still the leading big political party in this province, and the Government of this province. I have had experience sitting in the

Opposition in this House and when I sat there with my colleagues we never had the gall to assume that all of the Cabinet Ministers were going to go ahead and speak about their Departments – make their speeches in a Throne Speech Debate – before the members of the opposition went ahead to speak on it. My hon. friends should realize that they are now in opposition. An opposition has rights, rights that I want to protect just as much as anyone wants to protect them because I appreciate them. I have sat in the opposition for a lot longer term than any of the five Liberal members in this House, so I have had more experience in the Opposition than they have. But, that is in the past. They should realize when they are reduced to five members in the House, they do not run the House any more: that is what they seem to forget. They did not need to carry on the Debate unless they wanted to, but it was quite evident that they wanted to speak all right.

But now I do want to sincerely congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on the speech that he made on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, in this House. I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, why the Liberal Party, in the Province of Saskatchewan, rejected a man like the Leader of the Opposition for their leader. From the point of view of the orthodox reactionary Liberal because they are all the same – no one could be safer than the Leader of the Opposition: no one, in my opinion, could do a better job in a very tough position than he can do. But he was displaced by Mr. Tucker, and Mr. Tucker goes about the province showing that he is illogical; showing that he is excitable; showing that he can find all kinds of ways to get into trouble; the Leader of the Opposition knows enough not to get involved in debates, Mr. Tucker doesn't; Mr. Tucker is indecisive, he doesn't know what he is going to do – he has only one great quality, and that is his ability to make promises. There isn't anybody that can beat him at that – he is a champion right there. I feel sure that the members who sit in the Opposition, and particularly the Leader of the Opposition, know very well that it would be a very serious disaster if the Liberal Party were elected in this province, and they were expected to keep those promises. As a matter of fact, that is the best evidence in the world that the Liberal Party in this province has no expectation, at any time in the foreseeable future, of again being in a position of responsibility in this province, otherwise they couldn't afford to make those promises. I admit that we made plenty of them...

Mr. Danielson: — You between you!

Mr. Brockelbank: — ...but I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, and I can also tell the hon. member for Arm River, that we have a better record of keeping our promises than any other political party in the Dominion of Canada, or in any province in the Dominion of Canada.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, because of this change of leadership in the Liberal Party, it is quite evident to people who travel about Saskatchewan, who listen to what is being talked, that the Liberal Party is already showing very serious ill effects of that change.

February 20, 1948

I want to say a word in regard to the hon. member for Moosomin; and though I have never agreed with the politics of the hon. member for Moosomin, nor have I always agreed with his tactics – and I mention that because on one particular occasion he and I happened to be campaigning in the same by-election (this was in the Battleford's by-election in 1940) and he was having a meeting at a little country school-house and at that time, in 1940, the popular thing among the Liberals and conservatives was not to call the people in the C.C.F. Communists, the popular thing then was to accuse the people in the C.C.F. of being Nazis – and the hon. member for Moosomin, as he can, did a pretty good job of denouncing all the people in the C.C.F. as National Socialists. It made me pretty made, Mr. Speaker,. The member for Moosomin at that time was a Cabinet Minister – quite an old-timer in the political game; I was a private member, sitting in the opposition and I hadn't had much experience – but on that occasion, at that meeting, I asked the hon. member for Moosomin (asked him through the chairman) if they would allow me ten minutes to reply to this ridiculous and offensive charge that had been made. I did not get the opportunity.

In spite of the fact that I do not agree with his politics and I don't always agree with his tactics I still have a good deal of admiration for the hon. member, because everybody admires a fighter. I believe he is sincere; and he has been a great fighter in this Legislature – the Legislature is just not the same when he is not able to get up and fling that club of his around at everybody in general, so effectively. I think it is pitiful, a little bit cruel, to think that he should have to be here suffering ill health, as he does today. And I certainly hope, sincerely, that his health improves. The very fact that he is here, though, must illustrate how scare Liberals are in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Federal Government is gong to continue the policy of appointing retired politicians to the Bench, there is no one I would sooner see have an appointment to the Bench, and become a judge, among the Liberal politicians, than my hon. friend for Moosomin. If there are any appointments going in that line, I certainly hope that he get it. I want it made clear, Mr. Speaker, that I am not saying these nice things about him as a matter of insurance in case he becomes a judge and I go before him some time. I will take a change on his fairness if that ever comes to be.

I would like for a few minutes to deal with my Department, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take a great deal of the time of the House. Our work in assessment has been completed in the rural municipalities; about half of the local improvement districts have been re-assessed in the north; all the local improvement districts in the south and there has been considerable progress made in carrying out the re-assessment in the urban municipalities in this province.

Plans have also been made for the maintenance of the assessment in the future, because no matter how good an assessment may be, unless you take steps to maintain it, it will soon lose its equity. If each municipality is allowed in the future to tamper with that assessment it would soon get out of kilter, and it would lose its relationship. And I do want to say that when the former Government commenced the new assessment in 1939, and when Mr. Freeman was put in charge of that particular work under the Assessment Commission, they do deserve some credit for that. They have done a good job at it.

In our community Planning Branch it has been a very busy year. There have been many sub-divisions – in spite of the fact that we are told that business in Saskatchewan is going to the dogs, with the CCF Government – there have been a tremendous number of new sub-divisions in the province of Saskatchewan. The Community Planning Branch never put in a busier year than this year. They have also continued the use of The Municipal Tax Titles Act – that is the Act under which the municipalities can proceed to get title, at very low cost, to a lot of the property which was sub-divided, some of it way back in the boom days before the first world war, which never was used for the purpose for which it was subdivided, and the sub-divisions are now being cancelled, and that work is now pretty well cleaned up.

Three villages in the province of Saskatchewan, last year, became towns – incidentally, all in the north-eastern portion of the province – the village of Carrot River, the village of Hudson Bay and the village of Preeceville, took on the status of towns. That, too, is an indication that business in Saskatchewan is just not exactly fading away completely.

The report of our Department, which was recently tabled in this House, has recently been expanded to include more information in regard to the municipalities, so that the people who are working in the municipalities can get a much better picture of the situation in different municipalities in the province, from that report. The report was very small – probably made very small in the depression years as a matter of economy; I doubt if it was very good economy – but it is now back to a size where it does give a lot of valuable information.

The Inspection Branch of the Department has had a heavy load during the past year, making the final check on the 1938 seed grain accounts, for the purpose of making the refunds; making their regular inspections and, of course, too, they have quite a few special investigations to make for some particular trouble when it crops up. One thing we are working to do in that department, wherever trouble arises between the electors in a municipality and the Council, or trouble in a Council itself, we are trying to build for a better understanding of the responsibilities of the electors and the responsibilities of the members of the Council, in the Municipality. And to that end we have published that new booklet “The Municipal System of Saskatchewan”, which does give a historical picture, and also points out the various

February 20, 1948

responsibilities of municipal government. It also raises questions – no institution, I suppose, that has been created by human beings is perfect – and in that booklet questions are raised with regard to municipal institutions as to how improvements can be made in those institutions.

The hon. member for Arm River was asking about the Committee on Municipal Boundaries. That is not quite the proper name because that Committee has referred to it a good many more questions than just the question of boundaries of municipalities. I am sorry to have to again report to the House that the Committee, which is headed by Professor Van Vliet of the Department of Farm Management at the University, has not yet made its report. The chairman of the Committee has been extremely busy, but I do hope that they get that report in before very long. In the meantime, in some parts of the province, municipal councils are becoming restless because they want some action with regard to this question of municipality boundaries, but I have told them that until we get that report we won't take action, because that report may have a bearing on what action is to be taken – in fact, I expect it will have a very important bearing. It is also true, contrary to what the member for Arm River said, that The Rural Municipal Act still contains the provision for a vote of the people in an area, which may be forced as a rural municipality – I believe the member for Arm River stated that that had been taken out at the last Session; that is not correct.

Our Local Improvements Districts Branch also has had a busy year. There is more settlement in our northern Local Improvement Districts; more demand for improved roads; more demand for services than in any previous year. A year ago we passed legislation providing for the setting up of rate-payers' associations in the Local Improvement Districts. These rate-payers' associations have been set up in most of the Local Improvement Districts, and they are of real assistance to the inspectors who have the task of administering the local affairs there. They have their meetings and they make their recommendations to our inspectors. Many of the areas which are now in Local Improvement Districts are, I think, about ready to be organized as rural municipalities. But, here again, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to recommend any action until we get the report of the Committee on Municipal Boundaries. I can say this – and I want to pay tribute to the Local Improvement District inspectors, a good number of whom have been at work for ten years or more – that they have succeeded, I believe, in establishing better relations between the public and the inspectors than ever existed before. I think some of the credit for that better relationship is due to the rate-payers' associations, which have been organized in the Local Improvement Districts.

In regard to the municipalities of the province, I can say that, generally speaking, the municipalities have continued to make good progress; they have continued to make good improvements; many municipalities have acquired better road building machinery; and practically all of them have improved their financial position. There has been a good deal of talk, at times, about increased taxation in the province; but I would like to point out to the House, Mr. Speaker, that although there has been an increase in municipal taxation, that increase has not been, in my opinion nearly as large as has been the general increase in the cost of living. That is, in regard to the general cost of living, taxes are probably lower than they were even in the depression years. Taxes have not gone up to the same extent that other costs of living have gone up; and we should not forget that it costs more to do road work; higher wages have to be paid; machinery is a much higher price; material costs more; and no matter what you do the cost is greater. So I do not think that it can be said that the municipalities have made any undue increase in taxation.

Mr. Procter: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Would you say that with the mechanized improvement of machinery for road work it costs less?

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, to move a yard of dirt, if you are doing it in volume by machinery, it is certainly cheaper, I think, than moving it by a team of horses and a slip.

Mr. Procter: — Sure.

Mr. Brockelbank: — That is true, but my hon. friend forgets that instead of moving the yard now, the municipality finds it necessary to remove five or ten years of dirt; the demand for a higher standard of roads. He is still living, I think in the time when the slip-scrapers and the little low grade were here — in fact, I think that is best illustrated by the type of highways which he turned over to this Government when we took office.

The Municipalities, Mr. Speaker, have been helped in several ways. First of all by the Department of Highways equalization grants; second by the Department of Education equalization grants, because those grants, in regard to education, have lessened the need for taxes in many of the school districts where the school tax was very high, which means there has been a field of taxation vacated and left open to the municipality. Thirdly, the grants from the Department of Public Health to municipalities that were giving medical services have assisted in keeping down taxation. The Hospitalization Plan, which has taken a real load of responsibility off the municipalities, has been of great value because a municipality previously was responsible for the hospitalization of indigent people. Indigent people are very often indigent because their health is poor; because they need more hospital and medical attention than the average people in the community; but even if the municipality must pay the hospitalization fee they get those people taken care of for the \$5.00 hospitalization fee.

February 20, 1948

And, likewise, the Health Services for pensioners; and Mothers' Allowance cases have taken off the municipality a considerable responsibility; and, indirectly, the cancellation and adjustment of the seed grain accounts has lifted some responsibility, or load, off the municipality, and off the people of the municipalities.

I happen to have in my hand, Mr. Speaker, the third page of the Saskatoon 'Star-Phoenix', dated March 7, 1942, and it is in this very paper where it is published that the Municipal men, in convention, wished to have the Provincial Government and Dominion Government cancel all charges for direct relief and winter maintenance incurred up to the end of 1940, and all seed and seeding supplies up to the end of 1937; and that the Government should accept 50 per cent of the 1938 seed grain, in full settlement of those accounts. I am just a little proud to say that, today, that is done, Mr. Speaker, and, in addition to that, on the request that was made at that time refunds are being made to those who paid more than 50 per cent of the 1938 seed grain accounts.

When you remember that we have equalization grants for road building; equalization grants for education; equalization grants for health services; a hospitalization plan; health services for pensioners and others; and the cancellation and adjustment of these old accounts, I want you to compare that with the statement made by the hon. member for Moosomin, at this same convention in March, 1942,— we have the picture here of the hon. member for Moosomin — and this is what he said, according to the 'Star-Phoenix': "No grant increases"; "Municipalities will have to carry bigger loads, Procter announced". That is the headline in the paper, hinting that road grants to the municipalities would not be increased, and I will show you figures to prove that they weren't. "The Hon. A.T. Procter, Minister of Highways, suggested to the delegates of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, Friday, that the time was coming when some of the burden of finance should be passed on to the municipalities." Mr. Speaker, what a change! What a change!

Or even compare this situation here in Saskatchewan...

Mr. Procter: — Is it not a fact that since that speech you obtained, as a government, a readjustment of your finances with the Dominion?

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely correct, and it is also correct that either in 1942, or about that time, the former Government signed an agreement with the Federal Government at Ottawa, which meant to them an increase of two or three millions, but they didn't say a word about giving any of that to the municipalities.

Insofar as the additional subsidy which we have received, under the agreement with the Dominion, more than that has been passed on to the municipalities, either directly or indirectly, through these various

services, carrying additional proportions of the cost of education and health; additional grants and services in various fields have either directly, or indirectly, assisted the municipality to the full extent of the increase in the subsidy.

Or, compare the situation which we have here and the situation of the provinces bordering us. I have the financial statement of a municipality in Alberta and on that statement there was an item of three or four thousand dollars for Mothers' Allowances; three or four thousand dollars for Old Age Pensions, and the municipality was helping to pay both of those, which they do not have to pay here in the province. They also pay somewhat the same in the province of Manitoba. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the municipalities in Saskatchewan – in fact I am sure of this – were never in the past used any better than they are today: not as well. and I think, also, that if we look closely into the situation across Canada, we will find that our Saskatchewan municipalities have just as good, if not better, treatment from the Government than any of the municipalities in any other part of Canada.

I want to tell the House some of the things that the Liberals did to the municipalities – I am not going to tell all of it because I do not want to be speaking until midnight – it is generally regarded that the property tax field is the field for the municipality except insofar as the Public Revenue Tax is concerned: that revenue tax has been so long in effect and collected by the Liberal government that I am sure they would have no objection to it – but, other than that, the Liberals, when they were in power, when they sat on the right of the Speaker here, they invaded that property tax field other than through the Public Revenue Tax. The Liberal Government said to some of the largest corporations operating in this province “we will give you exemption from property tax to the municipality if you will pay us some money”. They sold out the rural municipalities, and the urban municipalities in this province on taxation: and they were taking \$404,000 a year in railway taxation in lieu of property taxes which should have gone to the municipality. These are the people who now talk about giving more assistance to the municipalities. What did they do? A proper provision for railway taxation will probably bring to the municipalities from half a million to a million dollars, but for \$404,000 the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan sold out the rights of the municipality to tax that property.

And they did something else too. The Liberal Government collected a lot more of the Public Revenue Tax from the people of this province than we are doing today. A lot more.

Mr. Danielson: — It took you four years to wake up.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, waking up in four years, Mr. Speaker, is a lot better than never waking up at all – after 34 years.

February 20, 1948

The Liberals collected a lot more public revenue, and I will deal with that a little bit later to show you some illustrations, by municipalities, of how much more Public Revenue Tax they took out of the people in the municipalities than this Government is collecting from the same people.

Now, I want to deal with this question of the Public Revenue Reserve account which my hon. friend from Arm River called a “slush” fund. I do not know whether it is a “slush” fund, but I suppose he is an expert in judging those things – he probably should know. I do not think it is a “slush” fund; but if after I describe it to the member of this House they want to call it a “slush” fund, that is all right with me. He raised some question about the amount: he mentioned first \$1,260,000 odd, and then he mentioned the Resolution which spoke of \$1,000,000. I explained that at the last Session of the Legislature, but apparently my hon. friend didn’t understand. I shall try and explain it again.

An account was set up – a reserve account – I do not know just exactly what you should call it – money was paid into it, but at the time no one knew what was supposed to be the purpose of the fund, and I say this because I do not know whether the fund had any purpose or not: whether that account was set up for political reasons or not I do not know, but I feel sure the Liberal members are much more keen on refunds than they would be if they sat here.

The actual amount of Public Revenue Tax that was paid between the time of the new assessment coming into effect in the first municipality and being in effect in all of them, which was in excess of the amount which would have been collected had the assessment all come into effect at the same time, at the beginning, was not \$1,260,000, but was approximately \$1,000,000 – and that is why the million was mentioned. But that is entirely in passing and beside the point.

My hon. friend also referred to some Board that had been set up in connection with this fund, and he didn’t refer to that Board in very complimentary terms either. The chairman of the Board is Mr. G.H. Freeman, chairman of the Assessment Commission, and an employee of the former Liberal government – I have a very high regard for the ability and integrity of Mr. Freeman. One other member of the Board is Mr. C.G. Bryden, Secretary of the Association of rural Municipalities. The other member of the Board is a Mr. **Metheral (or Metherell)** from the Department of Highways. I just want the hon. member for Arm River to know about whom he was talking when he made the derogatory remarks about that Board.

Last year, for the first time in the history of this province, there was an attempt made to give grants to rural municipalities for the purpose of road building on a basis of need. No one claims that that was a perfect success. A formula was devised to measure the need of municipalities, and I am not going to go into the details of that formula

because I want to speak a little bit about the formula which will be used this year, which is slightly amended: but I want to give you some examples of the grants given in 1947 under that formula; and with this Board of Review as an appeal board to the municipalities wholly, or partly, located in the constituency of the hon. member for Arm River. And, with that, I want to go back a little bit into the history of grants in that constituency, to see what they got in the good old Liberal days.

I have the figures here for these municipalities – there are 11 of them – from 1941 to 1947, and when I use those dates 1941 means the 1941-42 fiscal year for the province but it is the 1941 road construction season in the municipality: In 1941 these 11 municipalities received in road grants from the Liberal government \$1,855...

Mr. Procter: — What about the bridges?

Mr. Brockelbank: — ...that was grants to the municipalities – my hon. friend wasn't talking about bridges.

Mr. Danielson: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Will you repeat that statement, because it is so absolutely ridiculous; I know better myself.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I agree that it is ridiculous – but it is true, ridiculous or no. Rural Municipality 221 – nothing; rural Municipality 222— \$805.80; rural Municipality 223— \$350; Rural Municipality 251 – nothing; Rural Municipality 252 – nothing; (it takes a lot of those to add up to much) Rural Municipality 253— \$450; Rural Municipality 254— \$250; and rural Municipalities 281, 282, 283 and 284, nothing: \$1,855.80. In 1942, Mr. Speaker, this same group of municipalities got twice as much as that – they got \$3,783.40 – a magnificent sum, they must have felt rich that year, in getting that. And, Mr. Speaker, one municipality out of the 11 got \$1,220.15 – and do you know that municipality is the second highest assessed municipality – the second highest municipality in the group – and the municipality with a consistently low mill-rate of five and one-half mills: and they get \$1,220 out of a total grant to the 11 municipalities of \$3,783. And my hon. friends over here talk about our equalization grant being a “slush” fund.

Mr. Danielson: — Will the hon. member give me the number of that municipality?

February 20, 1948

Mr. Brockelbank: —Rural Municipality 283.

Mr. Danielson: — What did they get?

Mr. Brockelbank: — \$1,220.15 in the fiscal year 1942-43.

In 1943 they just barely held their own, these municipalities, with \$3,633 – just barely held their own. But in 1944, something happened that year, and it doubled again. These 11 municipalities got \$6,764, and that is the best the Liberals ever did for them in that period, and that was an election year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in 1947, with the equalization grant in effect, these municipalities received, from a C.C.F. Government, in my hon. friend's constituency, not \$6,000 but \$12,900...

Mr. Danielson: — Their own money.

Mr. Brockelbank: — He says its their own money; well, I will tell you a story about that one, Mr. Speaker. there was a re-assessment took place: in Rural Municipality 221, according to the arguments of my hon. friend, the Liberal government of this province, for the last 20 years, had been taking out of the municipality \$4,400, every year, more in Public Revenue Tax than we are taking out. In Rural Municipality 222 the Liberal government was taking out of that municipality \$4,800, every year, more Public Revenue Tax than we are taking out. I can go down the whole list – in this group of 11 municipalities, in this Liberal member's constituency, the Liberal government was taking \$34,000 of Public Revenue Tax more, out of the people of that constituency than the C.C.F. government is taking out. It is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Party feels guilty about the Public Revenue Tax. It is no wonder that they want a C.C.F. Government to pay for their sins of the past; it is not a bit of wonder.

Mr. Danielson: — Let me tell the hon. member that there **are** ____ **much** larger than he has mentioned which were cancelled out in Public Revenue Tax and were never collected.

Mr. Brockelbank: — But this wasn't for just one year, or during the depression; but on that assessment, the Liberal government was collecting, year after year, approximately \$34,000 more in Public Revenue Tax from those people in those municipalities than we are collecting.

Mr. Procter: — And it was a Liberal government that wiped it out, not you.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I am quite willing to give the Liberal government credit for starting the new assessment, and I already have given them credit for it – that is one of the good things they did, but like a whole lot of the things which they might have done, they were too late. Some of them they never did at all and that one was another one that was done too late. I think that pretty well gives the picture in the Arm River constituency.

Mr. Danielson: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question/ How much grant did the municipalities get for Municipality 253, Municipality 254 and how much did Municipality 283 get out of this equalization fund last year?

Mr. Brockelbank: — I do not mind giving him the answer: 253 and 254 and 283. Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says a statutory grant; there is no such thing as a statutory grant, he doesn't know what he is talking about, when he says that. There isn't a statutory grant at all; it is a flat grant. Well, there is a lot of difference between flat and statutory. Ask my friend, the hon. member for Moosomin, if you want to find out. These three municipalities got the minimum flat grant, Mr. Speaker. One of them got \$600 because it was a larger municipality; one got \$550 because it was larger than regular and the other got \$500. But these three municipalities are three of the wealthiest municipalities in that constituency. Now, one of them, the wealthiest, Rural Municipality 283, in 1942 received \$1,220 out of \$3,700 which the Liberals gave to the whole 11 of them; and then they talk about equalization!

I do not know, my hon. friend may believe that it is a good thing to give to the rich and take from the poor – if he does, it is all right, but I don't. I am not going to support that kind of a policy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with the formula, for a few minutes, to be used in the coming year. I cannot give you too many details of it but I do want you to have a little picture of it. The formula is based on a perfect score of 100 points; the municipality which, according to this score, makes 100 points is not entitled to any equalization grant. The 100 points is divided up among various factors. For example, the soil rating – that is, the productivity of the soil – is given 24 points, because the productivity of the soil is a very important measure of the ability of the people of that municipality to pay for their own improvements. That means that rich municipalities with rich soil certainly won't get as much equalization grant. For provincial highways, both primary and secondary, there is 20 points: if a municipality has two highways crossing through the middle, that is a large part of their burden lifted, and they do not need so much grant. The municipality with a lot of highways would have the full 20 points scored against the, and the municipality with no highways would have no score against them at all. Then there is 14 points for the municipal mill-rate of 1947 – the previous year's mill-rate. We believe that in a municipality where the people are only willing to pay 4.5 or 6 mills, municipal mill-rate, they either have pretty well all of the improvements

February 20, 1948

or else they do not want those improvements very badly. These improvements are primarily the responsibility of the municipality, and so there are 14 points given for the mill-rate, and the municipality with the higher mill-rate will get more grant to assist them.

Mr. Danielson: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Does he take it for granted the municipality with the low mill-rate is so well off that they do not need to levy higher, or else they don't want to? There is the possibility that they cannot pay any higher taxes, which is the case in some of these municipalities.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, if the re-assessment, which my hon. friend's government started, is correct; and for which they laid down the principles; if it is correct, then it is fair to compare the mill-rates between the different municipalities in the province – to take it as a long-term picture. And I think the assessment is fair.

Mr. Danielson: — You had better go and check back then.

Mr. Brockelbank: — For topography – that is, whether the land is hilly, rolling, prairie, coulees, rivers, and so on, swamps, there is 14 points. For bush cover, 12 points; for population density, 10 points; and for degree of stoniness 6 points, making a total of 100 points.

Mr. Procter: — Then you had better put in an Appeal Board.

Mr. Procter: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Do you consider it is fair that those municipalities, along the Qu'Appelle, for instance, and the North and south Saskatchewan and also along the Pipestone, where they have all these ravines and gulches and hills and slopes, and so forth, should only have an allowance of 14 points?

Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, Mr. Speaker, actually, that isn't the only allowance they get, because the presence of those physical features has a very definite effect on certain other factors here, particularly 'soil rating', and you will find 'bush cover' enters into it, and also 'stoniness', and so forth.

Mr. Procter: — Why, the thing's absurd!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, my hon. member for Moosomin may say it is absurd, but it is a whale of a lot better than anything he ever had, when he was sitting on this side of the House. 'By guess and by politics' was the rule for handing out road grants in those days.

There will also be this year, I expect, a Board of Review, to which any municipality may appeal if they think they have been unjustly used.

Mr. Burgess: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Is it that these points are to be used this year? Will there be an opportunity for the principles in these points to be discussed by this Legislature, or is it a Departmental decision?

Mr. Brockelbank: —I think that could be discussed, probably, on the estimates; there is an item in the estimates, and there will be quite an opportunity to discuss it.

We have given it very careful study and I do not say it will be permanent; but I do say that it is better than anything that the hon. member for Moosomin ever thought of when he was Minister of Highways.

It is quite evident, Mr. Speaker, from what I have seen going on in this House, and in this province, during the past year, that the Liberal party in this province have one objective, and that is to wreck the C.C.F. Government in the province of Saskatchewan, even if it means wrecking the province at the same time. No political party which puts the welfare of the province first, which every political party should do, would do what the Liberal party is doing today in regard to Old Age Pensions; in letting the Federal Government out of responsibility; no political party would do what the Liberal party are doing today if they were interested in the welfare of the province, and promise to the people that they can get another ten million dollars' worth of services, and at the same time five or six million dollars' worth less taxes out of the same money. They know better than that. The Liberals are going about, spending their time, crying that we should pay a milk subsidy; that we should increase Old Age Pensions; that we should pay increased grants; that we should reduce taxation – my hon. friend refers to the Education Tax as a “stinking” tax – if it “stinks”, Mr. Speaker, it is a Liberal smell it has.

Mr. Danielson: — I took my cue from the hon. member for Swift current; he is the one that called it that.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I do not know whether he had a point, or what kind of a point it was. But the funniest thing of all, in the political field today, is the efforts of the two old parties, who have been “at daggers drawn” all during my lifetime – and I wasn't born just yesterday – is their efforts to get together all over Canada, and is going outside of Canada, too, now.

There is a little article in the Leader-Post this morning, under the dateline of “Glasgow, February, 19”, headed “Labour retains Paisley Seat” – and the Labour candidate won by a majority of 6,500 votes. Listen, Mr. Speaker, the by-election was the first of the 37 since the general election in which the government was opposed by a joint Liberal-Conservative candidate. They are even getting it over there.

Up in the Melfort constituency they had some jockeying around, and finally they got together with the coalition candidate and nominated a Liberal, didn't they? But the funny part of it is, I wonder what he is going to do when he comes into Tisdale where there is both a Liberal and a Conservative candidate; which one he is going to talk for. It is going to be lots of fun watching.

February 20, 1948

Or if he goes to Moosomin? What will he do there? You know the Liberal Party in this province might pretty well be compared in its dying day to an old panther, growling around and picking off some game wherever it had the chance. And the conservative Party might very well be compared to an owl – a solemn old owl that didn't see very much and was sitting huddled up in a tree in the shade. And I don't see anything better than this little poem as a good illustration of the Liberal and conservative Parties today:

“I passed by his garden, and marked
with one eye,
How the owl and the panther were
sharing a pie.
The panther took pie crust, and gravy
and meat,
While the owl had the dish as its
share of the treat.
When the pie was all finished
the owl as a boom,
Was kindly permitted to pocket
the spoon.
While the panther received knife
and fork with a growl
And concluded the banquet by
eating the owl.”

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the Motion.

Hon. I.C. Nollet: — I wish first of all to associate myself with the kind remarks made in appreciation of the Address given to the House, this afternoon, by Mr. Fisher. I was thinking, as Mr. Fisher was speaking and expressing the fine sentiments that he did, that it will indeed be a great day for humanity when we have finally arrived at that road in human progress when we will cease to think in terms of competitive economise that lead to destructive wars, two of which we have witnessed in the space of some twenty years' time. I hope that day will arrive when never again will women and children be the victims of the wars we have witnessed in our own generation.

I wish also, Mr. Speaker, to join with my colleagues in proffering my congratulations to the Mover and Seconded of the Motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne. It must have been a matter of genuine satisfaction to the hon. member for Canora to be able to point to the record of achievement and accomplishment of the present administration in the short space of four years. I believe it can truthfully be said that the CCF Government has implemented their election mandate more faithfully than any other administration in the history of the Province of Saskatchewan.

The hon. member from Hanley gave his usual thoughtful contribution in seconding the motion. He is to be congratulated not only for the fine contribution that he has given within this House, but also the excellent contribution he has given to the advancement of the principle of 'Humanity First' in the course of his long career in the progressive movement.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the hon. member from Moosomin whose integrity, courage and perseverance is beyond question. Under the tremendous handicap of ill health, it is indeed gratifying and inspiring to see the hon. member take his seat at this Session of the Legislature. The hon. member from Moosomin can be assured that though we disagree with him politically, nevertheless we regard him in the highest personal esteem.

My commendations would not be complete without also congratulating the hon. member from the Mediterranean Area for the very excellent contribution he gave in assuring the re-election of a CCF Government when the next provincial election takes place. In spite of the fact that in my speech of a year ago, I did suggest to the Opposition that a more constructive form of criticism was in order, I regret that so far the criticism has followed the usual pattern of conjuring up political bogeys from pure figments of imagination, with the emphasis on appeal to unreason and the fear complex to which the people of the entire Dominion are being subjected by

February 20, 1948

the various capitalist front organizations in support of their political fellow-travellers who represent their interests in Parliament and the Legislature.

Mr. A.W. Embury (A.S.V.R.): — Does the hon. gentleman still think that General MacArthur is a Hirohito?

Premier Douglas: — Go back to grade ten!

Hon. I.C. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, the next time the hon. member asks me a ‘yes or no’ question, I want him first of all to answer a ‘yes or no’ question for me. Is he willing to do that?

Mr. A.W. Embury (A.S.V.R.): — Anytime I have the floor.

Premier Douglas: — Ask him if he has left off using the Legion for political purposes.

Hon. I.C. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, the reason for this pattern of attack is not hard to discover. In the first place I believe it is intended to deflect the minds of the people away from serious economic problems at home, particularly with reference to rising costs of living and the general uncertainty of the future that prevails. In the case of the political fellow-travellers opposite, it is intended to serve three main purposes: first, to detract attention away from their own bad record of administration during the long period of ‘do nothing’ Liberal Government; secondly, it is intended to provide a convenient ‘smoke screen’ to cover up the ruinous policy being pursued by the Federal Government at Ottawa — a policy that has betrayed not only the farmers but the working people as well; and thirdly, it is calculated that this form of attack will focus attention away from the excellent accomplishments of the CCF Government in implementing a program that has its origin deep in the needs of the common man.

Every thinking man and woman in Saskatchewan knows that this Government has accomplished more in four years in this regard than any previous administration has in twenty years. When one considers the effects of the decontrol policies of the Government at Ottawa, one can readily understand the reasons for the present hysterical pattern of criticism. I can assure hon. members opposite that they are going to hear a lot more about Federal policies, inside and outside of this House, including Mr. Tucker who, since he chooses to remain associated with the Liberal Government at Ottawa, must take full responsibilities for their policies.

Perhaps I should feel particularly honoured that the hon. member from the Mediterranean Area has singled me out for his special type of attention. I feel honoured because every time a reactionary Tory directs special criticism, and particularly his type of criticism towards you, you can always be assured that this type of critic-

ism will reduce the dignity and stature of the critic and is bound to result in enhancing, in the eyes of the electorate, the recipient of that type of criticism. This type of criticism merely serves to lower the critic in the eyes of the electorate and enhance anyone to whom that criticism is directed. Were the hon. member not so biased and narrow in his viewpoints, with the background and training he possesses he could and should give a more constructive contribution to the debates in the Legislative Assembly.

I am certain that the farmers of the province will not be greatly impressed with his references to myself. They are quite accustomed to this type of attack and always consider the source. My contribution to the struggle of the farm people will stand on its own record. I do not suppose, Mr. Speaker, that I would be in this House today, had it not been for the economic injustices that have been perpetrated on the farmers of Saskatchewan over the long years of Tory and Liberal rule. It was because of the fact that the Old Parties were not able to find a solution for the problem of agriculture that the farmers, in conjunction with their full brothers, the working people, decided to take political action in their own behalf. I have myself gone through all the bitter experiences – crop failures, price disappointments, and other handicaps under which farm people of Saskatchewan labour.

February 20, 1948

I have myself gone through all the bitter experiences; crop failures; price disappointment, and other handicaps under which farm people of Saskatchewan labour. I do not suppose there are any people anywhere that have contributed so much to the national wealth and have received so little in return. I have long ago dedicated myself to the task of, in my own small way, assisting in rectifying this condition. My whole life-long career has been associated with the soil, and with men who till the soil; I know their hopes, their longings, and I have witnessed their despair; there are no finer people anywhere in the world than our Saskatchewan farmers. As I love the soil so I, by natural inclination, love the people who till the soil: and I have a deep sense of my obligation to them as their elected representative; regardless of personal attacks, I will not be deterred in my determination that the farmers of our province, and elsewhere, will find their rightful place in the national economy, in accordance with the great contribution that they have given. This, my farmer friends thoroughly understand.

There are many things that I could say to the hon. member for the Mediterranean Area in regard to stirring up dissensions, and in reply to his imputation that the only reason that lands were being transferred to the Department of Agriculture was that I would become the landlord of 1,280 veterans. The hon. member will regret that statement, and will be ashamed of ever having made it. And he will have ample time to think it over when he goes to his future reward of political oblivion.

I can assure all lessees of Crown lands that I fully appreciate the responsibility that is mine in connection with serving their needs, and they can be assured that the personal needs of the individual will come first. The reason these lands were transferred to the Department of Agriculture is simply this: first, agricultural lands naturally belong under the administration of the Department concerned with agricultural development and improvement. The Department of Agriculture has the administrative personnel to properly implement sound, overall agricultural policies, designed to achieve, first, sound agricultural stability in our province and then to obtain optimum production and land utilization, to the end that the agricultural plant of this province achieves ever higher production goals, and thus raise the general standard of living of our farm people and, at the same time, maintain vital social services without undue burden.

Then, too, the administration of lands under the Department of Agriculture permits consistent policies being followed in regard to land administration generally. By way of example, the Department is, at the present time, emphasizing and giving encouragement to diversified farming, particularly livestock raising. We have, therefore, accordingly, devised a grazing lease policy that would give encouragement to this industry. We have so devised this grazing lease policy with the end in

view of giving definite encouragement and assurance of long-term tenure, and a lease rental based on a sliding scale, to tide in with the price of cattle and the carrying capacity of land; and thereby assuring to the stockmen of Saskatchewan that regardless of what the market's ups and downs were, their rental payment would remain relatively stable, and in accordance with the price of their livestock.

In spite of all that has been said regarding the transfer of land to this Department, perhaps the hon. members do not realize the important advance step that has been taken by this province in this regard. We have received commendations from agriculturalists all over the Dominion for having taken this step. I take pleasure in reading comment from a very outstanding agriculturalist in the province of Alberta, in this regard, as printed in *The Calgary Albertan* – I think it explains very clearly just why we transferred lands to the Department of Agriculture. And, by way of contrast, I would ask you, my friends, to compare the insinuations made about it by the hon. member from the Mediterranean Area – insinuating that there were ulterior motives, and that some “commissar” was going to take over the control of these lands, and, I presume, regiment people. Here is what this high-ranking official in Alberta said: (by the way, this particular gentleman is opposed to the C.C.F.) – he is responsible for the statement: “the Saskatchewan Government has just made the biggest and most important change in land administration reported in this country, in the last 50 years. It is the transfer of provincial lands from the Department of Natural Resources and Mines, to the Department of Agriculture”. (I should say that it is the Department of Natural Resources here.) “Although this may seem a trifling matter, it embodies vitally important principles. The theory on which it is based is that land owned by the Crown is not an ordinary natural resource, like coal or timber, but is an integral part of the farm life of the province or the nation. It is not an entity whose only concern to the government is not how much can be realized from it, but it is the very basis of the existence of plant and animal life, and, particularly, human life.

“Saskatchewan has a Department of Agriculture with scores of trained technicians dispensing expensive and invaluable advice to farmers settled on their lands. the Alberta Department of Agriculture, for instance, have been doing a great deal of work on livestock; disease prevention; livestock improvement; soil conservation etc., for two years now it has brought famous American soil conservationists to this province to address municipal conventions: the government, through its agricultural department, does all that for land belonging to private individuals, but the government owns millions of acres of lands in its own right – most of it is not settled and not even developed. This is completely under control, in the case of Alberta, of the Department of Lands and Mines, which might have one or two trained agriculturalists on the staff but which, on the whole, has not taken a proper land-owners interest in this land. There are countless thousands of acres of land in east-central Alberta, for instance, which have been abandoned and reverted to the Crown. The province should have grassed this land; if it had done so ten years ago, when the farmers were moved off, large ranch enterprises could have been established by now.

February 20, 1948

This land would have been productive; it would have been improved, but, as it is, it has gone back to weeds, sage, buckbrush and, here and there, to patches of native grass. Any Department of Agriculture – and Alberta has one of the best – would never have permitted that to happen. If it had been in control it would have applied the same wisdom, scientific training and experience to this land as it offers to private farmers. It would have seen that the land was given the best of care; it would have greatly enhanced the total agricultural welfare of the province. Saskatchewan has taken the lead – the other provinces should not lag behind.”

That is what a very prominent agriculturalist said in the province of Alberta. This appeared in the Calgary Albertan, and I am not at liberty to disclose the official’s name who was the author of this particular article but he is very high in the Department of Agriculture in Alberta.

Mr. Patterson: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. You ruled the other day...

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to take full responsibility for this article.

Mr. Speaker: — Could you give him the date of the copy that it was in?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It is in an editorial appearing in the Calgary Albertan dated Tuesday, December 17, 1946.

Mr. Patterson: — An editorial?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — A statement appearing in the editorial.

Mr. Patterson: — And the date please?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — December 17, 1946.

Mr. Patterson: — I do not want to interrupt the Minister but I want to ask him a question before he moves away from the transfer of land from the Natural Resources to the Department of Agriculture. Has he dealt with that phase of his remarks?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — What was your question?

Mr. Patterson: — No, I say are you finished dealing with the transfer of the lands?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Yes.

Mr. Patterson: — Well then, I just want to ask two questions; first, has the transfer of the school lands involved, are the school lands now under the Department of Agriculture?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Yes.

Mr. Patterson: — Well then, secondly, the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture has not been tabled yet, am I correct in that?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Yes, that is right.

Mr. Patterson: — Now the Annual Report of the Department of Natural Resources has. It contains no report on the administration of Crown Lands that I can find, but it suggests they have been transferred to the Department of Agriculture. Will the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture for 1946 – 47 contain a report on the administration of Crown Lands in the province that appeared in the report of the Department of Natural Resources?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Well I presume it will, Mr. Speaker. I have not seen the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture yet myself, we expect it shortly from the printer and it will be tabled in the House in due course.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to present the reasons why a land lease policy has been adopted. I want to say that the reasons are not ideological, but have been born of necessity and have been emphasized by past experiences, particularly as they affect the individual farmer. Perhaps, it would be as well to trace the course of land tenure in Saskatchewan and compare experience acquired.

First of all, in the early pioneer days we had the homestead policy. The purpose of this policy was to encourage people to bring land under cultivation. With the performance of residential duties and other improvements, plus a \$10 fee, a man was granted title to his land. The usual experience has been pretty well summarized by

February 20, 1948

a farmer when he said, "when I first homesteaded here, this land was covered with prairie grass and scrub. Now that I have broken it all up, it is covered with a mortgage". That has too often been the case, particularly in light of the fact that with the advent of power machinery, a quarter-section of land under no circumstances was an economic farm unit. True, in some cases, pre-emption homesteads were granted, but this did not prove sufficient, and most farmers were unable to acquire a sizable economic unit. The only alternative was to purchase land from some of the land corporations who had large tracts of land given to them, tax-free for many years, and with no condition for improving same, as was the case with the homesteader. Of course, the improvements the homesteader made enhanced the value of the adjacent company land. The company merely needed to wait until the homesteader was driven to purchase more land. It can truthfully be said that the farmers of Saskatchewan gave more than their contribution to the construction of railways. The railway companies had received a hand-out of 32,000,000 acres of land in Western Canada, mineral rights and all, by outright grant. The Ancient and Honourable Gentleman Adventures of the Hudson Bay Company were given a grant of well over 6,600,000 acres distributed throughout the country in sections or three-quarter section parcels.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That is "free" enterprise.

Hon. I.C. Nollet: — They received their titles without any work, but the farmer, after many years of toil was never able to acquire his title.

These landlords successfully exploited the farmers of Saskatchewan with the promise of a title. So successfully, that many of the homesteads became mortgaged as a consequence. Their biggest contribution to the economy of the province has been exploitation and debt. The land debt of this as a consequence, grew to unbearable proportions until large scale cancellations and reductions were imperative in order to keep the farmer on the land. Far more farmers have died without titles to their land, than have retired with titles to their land. It is interesting to note that the biggest land grabber of them all, the C.P.R., now has the brazen effrontery to challenge the Mineral Taxation Act, and serve write on two ministers of the Crown, rather than going direct to the court.

The free enterprise governments of past years also thought it would be a good idea to sell land and get into the landlord business in a truly capitalistic way. The School Land Trust Fund of the province has been built up to a large extent at the expense of the individual farmer who foolishly endeavoured to outbid his neighbour, thus paying as high as \$30 an acre for land that had a

productive value of only \$3 per acre. Oh, yes, the free enterprise governments were in the landlord business for their pound of flesh in a big way, and at the expense of much hardship to the unfortunate individuals who purchased School Land. The School Land Trust Fund was built up with no reference to the social needs of the farmers who, perhaps due to the heavy burden of indebtedness, were unable to even properly clothe, shelter and feed their own family, to say nothing of educating them. I could point out many concrete examples to the hon. members opposite of such occurrences. I would like to point out just one to show what this type of policy has led to in many, many cases, far too many cases in Saskatchewan. I could take the hon. members down to the Lands Branch and show you literally box cars full of land accounts extending back over the years that tell identically the same story.

Here is a particular parcel of land situated up in the constituency represented by the hon. member from Arm River. It is a good case in point. I just had occasion to go through the history of this land a few days ago. I find that here is a parcel of land that was sold in 1917 – three-quarters sold in 1917 and one-quarter sold in 1929 – at a purchase price of \$11,212. Let us just follow the case history of that ridiculous policy. We come down to 1937 and 1938 when some of these cancellations were made which I had reference to, that were devised not so much in the case of the landlord to assist them but to keep these farmers on the land. They were ready to leave, the burden of indebtedness was so great. In 1938 this particular farmer paid in \$7,464 on this land, he had cancelled in 1938, \$10,750. This account was written down and the claim set at \$4,300 and since then this amount has increased again to \$6,600 in the good years, years of good prices. This history can be repeated over and over here and there all over the province.

Mr. Danielson: — What years were these good years?

Hon. I.C. Nollet: — Which year as I referring to?

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, the year it rose to \$11,000.

Hon. I.C. Nollet: — In the period from 1938 up to 1946, another \$200 of interest went on top of that again. It seems to me that a reasonable way out...

Mr. Danielson: — That is in the municipality where the Minister of Municipal Affairs took the road apart away; said they were all

February 20, 1948

wealthy farmers in there.

Hon. I.C. Nollet: — Now, here is a former lessee on this land, I might say that three of these people are three that have died without titles to their land, and there was a lessee on the land who also wanted to purchase and repeat the same process. We have discouraged them from doing so because we know that on the record of performance even if that man were to purchase that land at the reduced price he would never be able to pay for it. Now in cases of this kind, I should say all of this could have been prevented had a sensible lease-hold policy been adopted in these early years, the same as was done in the case of the grazing lease. I can see nothing wrong with the Crown giving long-term lease dispositions; in fact, I see everything in favour of it.

Mr. A.W. Embury: — Are you in favour of the fixed ceiling price in the option.

Hon. I.C. Nollet: — Absolutely, we are talking about veterans' lands now.

In addition to the burdens of land payment, the farmer of the past has been subject to high-priced farm implements, repairs and general production costs, plus a variable price for farm commodities he sold invariably far below the cost of production. This type of economic anarchy regimented farmers into the encumbrance of their land which further removed the prospect of ever obtaining title there to. The farm debt of this province at one time equalled the total land value of the province. These are the fruits of free enterprise as far as the farmers are concerned. Bitter fruits indeed! And the farmers will never forget the type of government that was responsible for these conditions.

It is quite evident too, that crop failures increased farm production costs, since operational expenses must be carried forward to increase when no provision is made the creditor and debtor will share the losses of natural hazards on the same basis. The lack of recognition that farming is a business with set costs and therefore, must require set prices in relation to fixed costs, and in addition, because no recognition was ever given to a crop failure provision to protect the debtor, debts have grown to the point that even after successive reductions, the debt still was not paid off but continued to grow. One of the characteristics of the capitalist economy is that the farmers must always remain relatively poor and in debt. I wish to point out that land companies, mortgage companies, the C.P.R. and H.B.C. have never recognized the social needs of the individual. Any monies they

collected were their own private profits. Monies collected on public lands on the other hand are monies that go back to benefit the farmer in providing him with public services. That is the primary difference between the status of a farmer occupying Crown lands under lease and the status of a farmer under agreement of sale or the tenant of a private landlord. In the case of the C.P.R. for example, a farmer pays the money into the C.P.R. land offices in Calgary and kisses it good-bye. It is lost entirely to the Province; the C.P.R. or H.B.C. take absolutely no responsibility for the education of the people of this province or for the health of the province; so I am suggesting that if all of that land were Crown lands, those revenues that are now lost to society would again be recovered and available to provide the services required by a modern society.

The above enumerated factors are the reasons why good modern homes are not a common sight on the prairies of Saskatchewan. These are the reasons that our rural population must put up with substandard living conditions. It is only since the CCF Government came into power that consideration in land contracts has been given to the social well-being of the farmers. The generous lease terms provided, plus rental remission in crop failure years, is a positive guarantee that the farmer will receive an adequate income entirely for his own use, which will be utilized to properly shelter, clothe and provide necessary comforts for his family.

I am sure that we will in the future find more satisfactory living conditions on cultivated Crown land than on any other type of land tenure. Land means very little to an individual if he is denied the right of a share of crop that will enable him to accomplish this end. After all, the reason the farmer works and tills the soil is to have a home to live in, and not to pay unending interest on impossible indebtedness. To me, Mr. Speaker, the individual is all-important. I would have nothing to do with a lease-rental policy that would not take into consideration the well-being of the individual on the land. The long-term renewal lease is the farmer's guarantee that no mortgage company or land-grabber will ever take it away or collect an unreasonable rental toll, as has been the case in the past. In addition, the nominal rental paid to the Lands Branch comes back, as I said previously, in the form of social services to the farmer. The Crown stands as the guardian of the people's interest in all matters be they land, education, health or social services generally. I see nothing to fear or lose here, but everything to gain. I believe that an investment by the Crown in the good soil of Saskatchewan is the best expression of its faith in the future of our province and the best assurance that our farmers will have the protection of government in all matters pertaining to their well-being. Public institutions and agencies are designed to protect the common good, not to

February 20, 1948

exploit the individual, as monopoly enterprise does. I should like very much to see a further extension of the protection afforded by democratic institutions in order that further guarantees of security can be extended to our people as safeguards against the exploiting profit-seeking monopolies whose sole purpose is to make profits from the labours of those who toil, and who do not take any responsibility whatever for the social well-being of people.

I should like also to make some reference to the former Soldiers' Settlement Scheme after World War I. There are quite a number of these former soldier settlers, many long since departed, who live in my own district. Many of those remaining still do not hold title to their land. I would suggest to hon. members opposite that, if they are so concerned about titles, something should have been done long ago regarding the titles to those men. We should have at least erased this blot from the records before establishing the veterans of World War II. I think it would have been a fine gesture. It is to be recalled that a delegation representing the old veterans, went to Ottawa on precisely this matter. They were turned down cold by the Liberal Administration there. Considering the contribution made by these men in war services, and the contribution since made to the general wealth of the Nation, I believe that if anyone has a case for obtaining title to their land, they have. They have earned it in every respect. They were given the land in the hopes of obtaining titles. Largely because of conditions already enumerated, they were unable to obtain that title. I, therefore, believe it would be a commitment fulfilled, and the rectification of an injustice, to grant their titles without delay. If it is titles that the hon. member for the Mediterranean Area is concerned about, here is a good cause to which he can address himself.

I have previously mentioned ever-increasing trends towards larger operating farm units. This is due largely to the fact that mechanization of agriculture has meant increasing investments in capital working equipment, and subsequent pressure towards expended operations in order to economically carry the increased capital overhead.

I might mention that in – I believe last night's 'Leader-Post' on the Editorial page, I do not know how many hon. members have read it but it's headed – "Small Farms Dwindling'. It indicated that according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, our operating farm units in Saskatchewan have dropped since 1939 from some 139,000 operating units to approximately 125,000. In this we see a very serious trend. If this trend continues there is every

possibility that our operating farm units in Saskatchewan could drop to 50,000 and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that condition and that end is not a healthy one. I think that the land resources of our province could be so administered as to enable the optimum possible population to derive their living from the soil here. I note that the Hon. J.G. Gardiner is all in favour of doubling the population of the Dominion, but here we have a trend that is going exactly the other way. We are fighting against – and we know it – economic conditions over which we have very little control; but the Department of Agriculture certainly would be dilatory in its duty if it did not do something to check that general trend.

This is indeed an alarming tendency and proves a problem, whether we like it or not, that must be solved. I am inclined to think that the number of people acquiring their living from tilling the soil should largely depend on the productivity of that soil, and should not be governed by uncontrolled economic forces. In the interval, some method of protection must be extended to the smaller farmer if he is not to be liquidated out of farming by the tendencies of the times. I am certain that our agricultural area can successfully and adequately give a good living to a greatly increased number of farmers. The leasehold policy gives assurance to the small holder that he will not be liquidated in this process. The co-operative use of farm equipment is one method that can be used to real good advantage. The other is the pooling of land resources, as well, which will enable not only better land utilization and better farm practice, but will also greatly reduce the overhead and operational costs and, in addition, provide a division of labour that will enable people in rural areas to receive the full blessings bestowed by the modern machine age by thus providing more leisure time and social amenities as presently enjoyed by the people living in the urban centres. There are great possibilities in this direction, and I can see nothing wrong with people voluntarily co-operating to help themselves at home. After all, co-operation, like charity, should begin at home. These new concepts are being forced upon us whether we like it or not, and we do not adopt policies as we have done because of ideological reasons, but because of necessity, if our farmers are to achieve a rightful status in society. This can and will be done on a voluntary basis with no government-ownership implied. Any responsible government would be foolish to continue to pursue an old policy that has failed to give decent living conditions and security to our farm people. It would be the easiest thing in the world, politically, for any Government to ignore these responsibilities as they have ignored them in the past. But these are things that simply cannot be ignored. They must be faced courageously. And I hope that out of the experiences our farmers have had, and relying on the intelligence of Saskatchewan farmers, we can be sure they will give full

February 20, 1948

endorsation to the present land policy. They have already given full endorsation to this policy over and over again. Not only do we get this endorsation from the organized farm leaders, but endorsation comes every day from individual farmers, over my desk.

Let me remind the House that our good soil from which all life springs does not belong to this generation alone, but is the natural heritage of generations still to come. The soil is not ours to exploit and ravage, but ours to preserve and to use so that it will be passed intact to the generations to follow. The Divine Creator meant it thus. Governments live in perpetuity. Government, as the guardians of the soil, must think in these terms and in addition it is the duty and the responsibility of governments to guarantee a fruitful world to those who till the soil. The noblest expression, in my opinion, of honest labour.

As the Minister of the Crown given custody of this great natural heritage, I say to hon. members and to my farmer friends, my first and greatest loyalty is your well-being, security and happiness, and I am honoured and privileged to be your servant. I pray and ask the guidance of our Divine Providence that I may do so well.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Mr. A.W. Embury (A.S.V.R.): — Before the hon. gentleman takes his seat, may I ask a question?

Hon. I.C. Nollet: — Surely.

Mr. A.W. Embury (A.S.V. R.): — Does the hon. Minister see any reason why a ceiling price in a Veteran's lease option agreement will prevent that veteran from continuing to rent if he prefers to do so?

Hon. I.C. Nollet: — I see no reason at all; I do not agree with the hon. member so much on ceiling price, Mr. Speaker, but I do agree that a definite assurance should be given to the veteran that he is not going to be charged an excessive price for his land when he exercises his option. I think that the ceiling price could easily work both ways, it could work against the veteran and could work the opposite way.

Mr. A.W. Embury: — How could it work against him?

Hon. I.C. Nollet: — It could very well, with changing land values and circumstances.

Mr. A.W. Embury: — A ceiling price?

Hon. I.C. Nollet: — Yes, I understand, and the hon. member does not suggest where he wants the ceiling; if on an assessment basis, as has been pointed out by the hon. Mr. Sturdy, the assessment basis may not be the equitable ceiling.

There are other factors to be considered. I agree with the hon. member that an assessment does provide a base to work from, but the assessment plus certain other factors; I think by a formula of that kind, we can give, and should give, definite assurance to the veterans as to what the price is going to be when he exercises his option.

Mrs. B.J. Trew (Maple Creek): — I should like for a short while even at this late hour to give you in the House some of the reasons why I support the Motion.

The Speech from the Throne was – I have no hesitation in saying – the very best I have ever listened to, or read. An excellent example of putting ‘first things first’ in the truest sense. In this connection I was particularly struck by the opening remarks of a member of this House when speaking said, ‘To put first things first’ and went on to express his gratification at the wedding of Her royal Highness, Princess Elizabeth. In common with the vast majority of Canadians, I am sure all of Saskatchewan, I wish the Royal Couple well. As a woman I may say I sympathize with the Princess for having to begin her married life in such a blaze of publicity, some of which I am sure, she must have felt was in bad taste. I have as much loyalty for the British Crown as anyone, but from what we have heard of our Royal Family I am sure they would be the last to feel this event was of such transcendent importance that all else paled into insignificance. Here I am constrained to repeat – without the accent – a verse of Robbie Burns already quoted in this debate.

“Who will not sing, God Save the King
Shall hang as high as the steeple;
But while we sing, God Save the King
We’ll not forget the people”.

February 20, 1948

So that, I repeat, the Speech from the Throne put first things first when it said this, at its beginning: The peace, which force of arms secured, is jeopardized by the imminence of economic dislocations: hunger stalks the greater part of Europe and Asia – insecurity and fear are springing up in the wake of the devastation of the late war.”

The Mover of the Address in Reply, and the Seconder, dealt very ably in their addresses with this and, like others who have spoken before me, I wish to extend my congratulations to the hon. members from Canora and Hanley for their fine efforts. Out of the depths of their convictions, their sincerity and understanding, they have spoken.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, we have listened to very little discussion, in the ensuing speeches of the Opposition, of that opening paragraph in the Speech. Instead we have, when it was mentioned at all, been treated to diatribes against communism. I am unalterably opposed to the suffering children of Europe and Asia being the pawns of two rival imperialisms. It appals me to hear the statement made, as I have in this city, that we must feed the starving and clothe the naked lest Russia do it first and so make converts to Communism. That isn't practising Christianity: that is playing power politics; that is doing something worthy for less than the best reasons.

Today we have, in this city, a noted commentator who has returned to tell the people, from first hand knowledge, the plight of Europe's children. We have had the privilege of hearing briefly from him in this House today, and I may say that I was very pleased to note the high plane on which he kept his plea for the “kids”, as he called it. In addition to what he has told us, I would like to read you the following, from last night's local paper, written by Gregory Clark: “One half the children born in Europe since V.E. Day have died – the other half are referred to by their parents as the “unfortunates” “ – I am still quoting – “Outside in the Palm Room lobby of the hospital in Ortona, Italy, a young woman crouched waiting, like a dog that has been locked out. Inside a bunch of Canadian Army doctors were trying their unfamiliar hands at a transfusion of an infant. Army doctors prefer life-size material. The baby died, and they let the mother in to pick the body up, and carry it in her arms to wherever refugee mothers carry their dear children. Explain to her; the doctors told the nun who was interpreter, that it was not the wounds – the baby was starved. Out in the Palm Room, the young woman paused to take another look to make sure the baby was dead, then she spoke to us all quietly, slowly, baring her teeth: the nun hushed her and led her to the door. ‘What did the woman say?’ I asked the nun. ‘Poor soul, she doesn't know what she is saying’, replied the old nun. ‘She said she would never again give birth to a child; that she would as soon murder a child, as give one birth in this world!’ That was away back in Ortona, in January 1944. Since then, one half the children born in Europe have died. I say, Mr. Speaker, that that bereaved mother was

speaking the thoughts that must be in the minds of many mothers. These children are the innocent victims of war, brought on by the avarice and greed of heartless monopolies and cartels, which were not interested in the good of mankind but concerned only with the making of large profits for their share-holders. It matters not to them whether they sell munitions and war supplies to Adolf Hitler, or to Britain, to the U.S.S.R., or other. But now the little children of Europe are suffering, and we must be prepared to do something about their immediate need – the food, the clothing, the warmth and education; but we must not shirk our duty to eradicate the evils that have brought two major wars in our lifetime, with the resulting hunger and disease and homelessness.

I should like to commend to this House the actions of our own woman member of the House of commons, Gladys Strum, who has personally undertaken the responsibility of keeping ten children alive in Europe this year and, besides that, is working day by day, in Parliament and out of it, promoting policies designed to make a repetition of such conditions impossible.

We should, of course, all give generously to the current, and all, appeals for children, but here and in all legislatures their fate lays on us a stern obligation to build the kind of world in which that would not occur. Rather than adding to the fuel of the fire that is threatening to destroy civilization, rather than taking up our time with petty political manoeuvring, I think we should be getting on to some worthwhile discussion of things we can do, and I intend to make one concrete proposal, at least. We can make suggestions to our Federal Government that, coming to them as a considered opinion of this House, should bear some weight. Here we should be concerning ourselves with ways and means of raising more food, producing more clothing and making that food and clothing available to the needy, wherever they are.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak in this Debate, but some of the things that were said – the course which the Debate took, impelled me to say this. I have little further to add except one thing: details have been dealt with very ably by other members in this House and by Minister of the Crown, but, as I said, I have one thing I would like to say: I am proud to be on this side of the House, with a government in power that has “humanity first” as its motto, and that lives up to it. They, undoubtedly, have made some mistakes; they would be more than human if they had not; but if mistakes have been made they have not been of the heart. I say, most emphatically, that I am proud to support a Government that is too busy doing all in its power for the benefit of – say for instance, its aged people – to watch out for political traps and unscrupulous opposition may set for them. As long as its heart remains sound, and the Speech from the Throne proves it is, the people of this province will give it their continued support.

I shall support the Motion.