

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session – Eleventh Legislature**

**Tuesday, March 15, 1949**

The Assembly met at 3:00 o'clock p.m.

**RESOLUTION RE TARIFF STRUCTURE**

Mr. J.W. Erb moved, seconded by Mr. Brown:

That this Assembly respectfully urge the Federal Government to revise the present tariff structure and trade policy in such a way as to facilitate the interchange of goods and services between Canada and Great Britain, in order to enable the latter to take our surpluses of agricultural products.

He said: In making this motion I wish to point out that the Assembly of 1946 had already been concerned about the anticipated agricultural surpluses that would no doubt accumulate during the post-war years as a result of a restrictive trade policy, and I am certain that in view of the fundamental importance of export markets to the western economy and to the Canadian economy generally, this House is no less concerned today than was the House in 1946 over the anticipated agricultural surpluses.

My motion therefore deals with a subject of vital concern to everyone in Saskatchewan. It concerns the producer of agricultural products primarily, but it also concerns every industrial worker, everyone directed with wholesaling or retailing of consumer goods; every office employee, and, in short, everyone in the province of Saskatchewan.

Canada is a nation of about 13 million people, and this country of ours is richly endowed with mineral, timber, fish, and agricultural soil resources. It is a nation whose living standards are surpassed by few. But Canada has not yet achieved her full standard of living, or I should probably say the possible heights of her standard of living, but by the efforts of administration, such as a C.C.F. government, the day will come, no doubt, when the living standards of this country are appreciably raised.

Canada comes by her standard of living largely through the workings of international trade. Her vast resources of timber, fish, minerals, and productive agricultural lands have yielded primary and secondary produce far in excess of our domestic requirements, but through the medium of international trade we have been able to export the surpluses of production in these fields to lands whose natural endowments are different from ours. We have received their surplus production in exchange, which supplements the products of our efforts to make up this standard of living we enjoy.

The maintenance of our standard of living, and the full realization of the provincial standard of living this nation under careful planning will one day enjoy depends to a large extent upon the trade relations that we maintain with other trading nations of the world. It is obvious that reach and every agreement, plan or policy affecting Canada's trade relations must be in the best interests not only of Canada, but also in the interests of those nations from whom we buy and to whom we sell. We must realize that we depend, to a large extent, upon these customers for our standard of living.

The Canada Year Book, an annual publication by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and another publication, Foreign Trade, edited by the Department of Trade and Commerce, and other official publications, give a complete picture of Canada's trade in value and volume. Canada's total trade in 1948 was valued at \$3,075,400,000, and that was an increase of 247.7 percent over the annual averages for the years 1935 to 1939. Imports into Canada during the past year were valued at \$2,636,900,000; an increase of 285 percent over the annual averages for the years 1935 to 1939. These sums describe Canada's overall trade in 1948; trade that has been the result of complex multilateral arrangements between Canada and almost every other country of the world. The export items, too numerous to mention in detail here, make up Canada's export trade, valued in excess of \$3,000 million. Eighty-eight percent of these items can be described as falling into the following classes: agricultural and vegetable products; animal and animal products; wood and wood products; and paper and metal products.

Canada's trade policy on exports must, of course, be so designed as to give emphasis to the commodities which I have just mentioned. If I were to deal adequately with export trade, Mr. Speaker, I would have to give consideration to each of these broad commodity headings proportionate to their importance. Such consideration, of course, would take a great deal of time and I really only intend to deal specifically with the main commodity items which I have just mentioned, and which fall under these headings: agricultural and vegetable products, and animal and animal products. These products alone, so important to the economy of Saskatchewan, warrant my full consideration and, as a matter of fact, much more consideration by the federal government than has been displayed so far, because these headings accounted for more than 35 percent of the total of all Canadian export during the last year.

In order that my remarks will pertain to Saskatchewan and to Saskatchewan's part in Canada's total export trade, I shall concentrate on items: wheat, other grains, and wheat flour under agricultural products heading, and bacon, ham and eggs found in the animal products section of the official Dominion statistics. In doing so, I shall be taking about 51 percent of the items found under agricultural products, and 25 percent of the items found in animal products division. I should probably explain that the figures which I have just mentioned represent Saskatchewan's share of the 35 percent overall picture of agricultural products surpluses. These percentages clearly indicate in what way Saskatchewan's economy depends on exports.

The total value of Saskatchewan's field crops has been the largest of any province in Canada since 1941. In 1947 the value of Saskatchewan's field crops amounted to 27.5 percent of the total value of all field crops in Canada. Saskatchewan's crop value of almost \$397 million was \$66 million greater than that of Ontario, the next most important producer of agricultural products.

On December 1, 1947, Saskatchewan ranked as Canada's third most important producer of cattle; fourth most important producer of hogs; third most important producer of sheep; and third most important poultry producer. These sum totals of production records place Saskatchewan in front among food-producing areas, and therefore make its citizens vitally concerned with world markets. It is obvious then that Saskatchewan's back agricultural production accounts for a large portion of agricultural surpluses that Canada is able to offer for sale

**March 15, 1949**

on world markets, and we in Saskatchewan are well aware of it. We have become very sensitive to world market conditions, and we have the experience of the dry and hungry thirties to help us make an intelligent appraisal of all the actions taken by the federal government which affect Canada's trading relations with the rest of the world. The advantages of multilateral trade have long been recognized, and, as a result, Canada's exports have been carried to all parts of the world.

Membership in the British Commonwealth of Nations explains in part the fact that approximately one-third of our total exports are sold in Commonwealth countries. The United Kingdom has always been Canada's most important Commonwealth customer, and in 1948 it was second only to the United States of all Canada's customers. Canada's exports to the United Kingdom in 1948 were valued at \$686,940,000; an increase of 94.3 percent over the annual averages for the years 1935 to 1939; an increase of 249.3 percent in 1944 over the annual average of the four years preceding World War II was, in a large measure, our contribution to the world war effort of which we are proud. However, it is in our interest to follow the pattern of post-war trade with the United Kingdom since it will be much more indicative of the possible pattern that will be set in this hopeful era of peace and prosperity.

The United Kingdom, before the war, was one of the most highly industrialized countries of the world. Despite the disruptions of her industry as a result of the war, Britain has made an amazing industrial recovery and has become once again one of the important industrial trading nations of the world as a result of the Labour government's efforts in planned economy.

Britain's vast industries require raw materials, and the British people depend on imports for the most part of their food requirements. In 1948 Canada was able to supply raw materials to Britain's industrial requirements to the following extent: 28 percent of timber, 32 percent of non-ferrous metal, and 45 percent of her newspaper requirements. But it has been in foodstuffs that Canada has been so eminently successful in supplying the needs of the United Kingdom, to this extent: 78 percent of her wheat requirements, 81 of her flour, 70 percent of her bacon, 80 percent of her dried eggs, and 24 percent of all over shell egg requirements. Canada supplies about one-quarter of the total volume of foodstuffs that the United Kingdom imports, and Canada is the choice of the United Kingdom as her supplier of wheat, flour, bacon and eggs. The fact is that during 1948 the United Kingdom supplied Canada with a most important market for her surplus agricultural production. It is also a fact that Saskatchewan was the outstanding producer of Canada's agricultural surplus.

I do not speak of these facts in regard to the unilateral nature of marketing of Saskatchewan's products or surplus foodstuffs as paramount. It can only be one segment of Canada's total trade, and it is properly a part of a well-balanced trade that Canada has with all other countries of the world. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is of utmost importance to the people of Saskatchewan, and to the people of the rest of Canada, that trade policies determined by the federal government should be so designed as to be in the best interests of the people of Canada who produce the commodities that enter Canadian export channels. The prerequisite for a good trade policy is recognized by the people of western Canada probably more than any other section of Canada. The submission which I pointed out to the resolution which I read points this out very adequately, and I should like to read a portion therefrom.

The fundamental importance of export markets to the Canadian economy has long been recognized. It is only necessary to point out that not only do a very large proportion of the people of Canada derive their income directly from the sale of goods outside Canada, but the dominant influence of export markets also extends with substantial force to every other Canadian. The history of the period from 1930 to 1938 is ample evidence of the disaster which faces all Canadian industry when the prices of primary products are unduly depressed. Under such conditions all industry, whether protected or not, will face shrinking markets. Ability to sell in a protective market does not guarantee any industry against depression when a large proportion of its sales must be made to producers whose products are sold in world markets.

It is a long-established principle of trade that in the long run the value of goods and surpluses exported from a given country must equal the value of goods and surpluses imported into that country. In the overall picture of trade, imports into Canada have increased proportionately to exports from Canada. In my opening remarks I pointed out the value of Canadian imports in 1948 had increased to \$2,636,900,000, an increase of 285.2 percent over the annual averages for the years 1935 to 1939. This volume of imports represents a large part of the payment for our export. It is part of the long-run balancing nature of foreign trade. In 1948 Canada's favourable balance was \$473,100,000 an increase of 122.6 percent over the years 1935 to 1939.

We have prospered from the large increases in volume and value of our trade over the past decade, but there are indications arising that our export markets are already in danger of falling off. This must be our great concern today. I refer now to the United Kingdom specifically, because I submit that the maintenance and improvement of our trade-relations with the United Kingdom is of utmost importance to this country, and particularly to the primary producers of agriculture in this province. Any deterioration of our trade with the United Kingdom will be felt by the prairie producers sooner and to a greater extent than by any other section of Canada. It was natural to expect that the United Kingdom imports from Canada would fall off from the wartime peaks of \$1,032,600,000 in 1943 and \$1,235,000,000 in 1944. Canada's export to the United Kingdom during 1946 amounted to slightly more than \$597 million, and increased to \$751 million in 1947. However, during 1948 our exports to the United Kingdom declined from the post-war high in 1947 to \$687 million. This recession would not be alarming if it were not for factors that are becoming more apparent each day which foretell of even greater reduction on exports from Canada to the United Kingdom in the coming year. It is of utmost importance to give considerations to Britain's dollar problem. We must begin to realize that it is not only Britain's problem, but ours as well.

I shall endeavour to trace as briefly as possible the conditions that brought about Britain's dollar problem. Before the war, Britain was able to balance her trade, or, in other words, pay for the excessive imports over exports required, by using the proceeds of her investments abroad, and through the revenues obtained from services such as shipping and finance, and so on, which she made available to the trading nations of the world. The vast requirements of war materials that the United Kingdom imported were paid for in part through the liquidation of her foreign assets and securities, and through the retirement of outstanding debts owed to her. By the end of the war, Britain's

**March 15, 1949**

revenues from these foreign assets had disappeared and her trading service, shipping, insurance, finance and so on, had been so seriously disrupted that they no longer netted her any sizeable supply of foreign credit.

Incidentally, I might point out, too, that before lend-lease came into being, Great Britain had already spent four and one-half billion dollars in this country for war materials, all of which has placed her in the hazardous period that followed after the war. All these conditions which I have outlined caused Britain to be faced with serious economic crisis.

The Labour government's task was to rebuild Britain to an important position in trade by planning the reconstruction of her industrial might in such a way as to supply an exportable surplus from which she would derive funds to pay for her imports.

A \$4,000 million loan was negotiated in 1946 between the United States and the United Kingdom, and this loan was to provide England with sufficient dollars to last her until Britain's export industry had been more or less put in the position where she would receive the required credits to balance her trading accounts. However, the exports that had been required from the dollar area of the North American continent had been so large as to exhaust a major part of the United States' loan before Britain's industry had been able to recover to the 1938 level of production, and to those levels required to meet the intention of her recovery programme. Materials made available to the United Kingdom through the European Recovery Programme have been of further assistance to the United Kingdom, and for a short time E.R.P. will assist the flow of exports from Canada and the United States.

The United Kingdom, as everyone knows now, is faced with a dollar shortage, and this condition is further aggravated by the fact that multilateral trade in the post-war years has not functioned smoothly, which, otherwise, would have made foreign credit dollars available to England's economy. It appears that the only alternate force of action left for the United Kingdom to take is to restrict as much as possible her import requirements from the dollar area, and to seek imports from those areas which we call sterling, or non-dollar areas. This is a logical choice, because Britain's trade position in these areas has developed favourably recently.

I should like to quote from the publication The United Kingdom Information Office, No. 1, Volume 3, which indicates the position that the United Kingdom is required to face, and I quote:

Although imports from the western hemisphere are soon to be cut about 20 percent and exports there increased by 55 percent, compared with January to June, 1948, a programme of trade envisages a continuing shortage of dollars in 1952, and the deficit with the western hemisphere is put at over \$218 million. The United Kingdom hopes to save dollars by buying from other European countries increased quantities of essential food, raw materials, cereals, oils and fats, bacon, dairy products, iron ore, timber, etc.

That is substantiated by a recent pact signed with Poland; a five-year million dollar arrangement which is calculated to save the United Kingdom

dollars that she would otherwise have to spend in Canada and the US for bacon and dairy products. This policy, coupled with an increased effort in the United Kingdom to produce more foodstuffs that she requires, will be felt in Canada, Britain's main supplier of foodstuffs; and in that connection I should like to read from The Leader-Post an article which is headed by Lincoln, England, by the Minister of Agriculture of England, Tom Williams, and he says, and I quote:

Many millions of dollars more must be spent on North American wheat unless home production is increased.

That is what Mr. Williams told a farmers' meeting in England, and it indicates, too, that the fact that the British people have not the dollars available to buy our products, they are going to develop a programme whereby they can become as much self-sufficient as possible, and as I pointed out previously, it is a logical approach to her problem.

Now, in the light of the foregoing, I should like to again point out that the total value of Canadian exports to the United Kingdom had decreased from \$751.2 million in 1947 to \$686 million in 1948. It is also a fact that Canada although still the United Kingdom's main wheat supplier, has provided four percent less of the United Kingdom's wheat requirements than in 1947. Canadian bacon has had a similar percentage of decline in 1948 over 1947. Canadian shell egg exports to the United Kingdom were 20 percent less in 1948 than in 1947. Imports that the United Kingdom is able to buy from Canada and the United States must be restricted to the amount of dollars that she is able to earn through her exports to Canada and to the United States, and through returns on British investments remaining in Canada and the United States. Also, the return for the use by Canada and the United States of services such as shipping, insurance, and so on, that the United Kingdom is able to provide, and, finally, the dollars she is able to earn in her trade with countries other than the United States and Canada.

It seems to me that we are no longer in the position to drive a hard bargain with Britain. In the light of the developments and conditions I have tried to outline, the time is at hand when every effort must be made to give the United Kingdom every possible opportunity to earn dollars in trade with Canada. It is fully appreciated that the United Kingdom will continue to purchase goods in Canada in excess of imports to Canada, and it is not likely that Canada shall be in any position to balance dollar for dollar the goods and services that are exchanged between constituency and the United Kingdom, but any and every effort must be made by this country to receive British exports over and above that which we receive today, in order to contribute to Britain's dollar-earning capacity. This undoubtedly will increase the United Kingdom ability to maintain the present level of foodstuffs purchases from Canada and, indeed, improve upon it.

Canada's imports from the United Kingdom during the last year totalled almost \$300 million. This represents an increase of 151 percent over the 1938 level of imports from the United Kingdom. The fact remains, however, that imports from the United Kingdom must increase even further if Canada is going to insure herself against any loss or reduction of British markets. I should like, in that connection. To read from the Leader Post a warning issued by

**March 15, 1949**

Graham Towers, Governor of the Bank of Canada, and he says: "A warning that Canada's foreign trade is endangered by the tendency of the United Kingdom and other dollar-short European countries to trade among themselves is contained in the 1948 report of the Foreign Exchange Control Board." The report is signed by Graham Towers, Governor of the Bank of Canada and Chairman of the Board set up in the first week of the war of 1939 to conserve foreign exchange. It fore-sees the possibility of lost European markets, especially in countries Canada has helped with loans and grants of credit. That indeed is a disturbing factor.

I should also like to quote from an article here "Bilateral pacts displease Howe", and that is dated Ottawa, March 12: "Trade and Commerce Minister, Hon. C.D. Howe, said Saturday that 'a government was not happy about Britain's bilateral trade agreements with European nations'. He said: 'The British should keep their traditional markets. We do not like that sort of an agreement, but we can understand the situation. If Britain can trade with a country that can trade in sterling but cannot trade in dollars, we understand but are not happy about it. Britain should do as we do and try to keep her traditional markets'. "The minister did not suggest any alternative Britain could take in view of its limited supply of dollars.

We are beginning to be faced, and as different authorities have told us, with looming agricultural surpluses. No effort is being made on the part of the federal government to take into consideration how we might improve upon our trade relations in order that we might have a free flow of consumer goods back and forth.

Any policy of restriction of exports is certain to bring about a fall in exports. The continuation of present policies may well prove disastrous to this country which depends in large measure upon foreign markets to absorb the major portion of its vast agricultural surpluses. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, full and complete reconsideration of Canada's trade policy with respect to the United Kingdom must be made by the federal government. All tariff structures and all other devices which make up the restrictions to trade, including duties and drawbacks must be reconsidered and redesigned in such a way as to maximize the opportunity of the United Kingdom to export to Canada, consistent with the best interests of Canada, and that means, for the most part, in the best interests of our western agricultural economy.

I trust that my motion will enable this House to add further to its contribution to the welfare of the people of Saskatchewan, to make its contribution to the people of Britain, and to the world as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Bengough, Mr. Brown:

That this Assembly respectfully urge the Federal Government to revise the present tariff structure and trade policy in such a way as to facilitate the interchange of goods and services between Canada and Great Britain, in order to enable the latter to take our surpluses of agricultural products.

**Mr. A.S. Brown (Bengough):** — Mr. Speaker, yesterday we in this House had a rather verbal spanking from the Provincial Treasurer suggesting that we were making rather long speeches in this House, and I can agree with him in that certain members of the House have attempted to set records as to the length of speeches and I am going to follow the advice of the Provincial Treasurer and attempt to set a record for the shortness of a speech.

However, if my remarks to this resolution are brief, I am in no way minimizing the importance of this resolution, for I am satisfied that all members of this House will agree that in our Canadian economy we are, to a very great extent, affected by the tariff and trade policies of the federal government. This is particularly true when we consider that Canada has a great potential production; a production which must find its markets on the world market. Our prosperity is reflected upon the extent that we are able to place our products on the market and receive in return the products of the world market. This is even more particularly true in the agricultural industry for we have here, particularly in western Canada, a small group of people who are able to produce much greater and much beyond their consuming capacity in the particular items which we produce. So I suggest that this resolution is of primary importance.

It is important, not only as it reflects in the trade, but it is important as it also suggests that we should undertake a drastic change in our trade and, of necessity, in our federal fiscal policies. A faulty trade and fiscal policy has produced many strange things in our economy. Possibly one of the strangest things which it did produce was the necessity of Canada to go on to an austerity programme, not due to under-production of goods in Canada, but rather due to the shortage of American dollars. This austerity programme is reflected in our whole economy. It did, to a certain degree at least, reduce the standard of living of every individual in Canada, and what is possibly more important, it did reduce the standard of living of those people engaged in the agricultural industry for it meant not only that the production which we were producing had less purchasing power due to that austerity programme, but it also impedes the cost of our production.

While I do not suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a drastic change in our tariff structure and our trade policy would produce Utopia here in Canada, or in western Canada particularly, I do suggest that we must undertake to gear our internal economy to match a changed trade and fiscal policy. A change to be successful in our trade policy presupposes certain things; it presupposes that as far as our agricultural products are concerned we will have closed such institutions as the Winnipeg Grain Exchange; it presupposes that we will have established an Import and Export Board so that it will be possible to regulate in an orderly and organized manner the goods from the producer to the consumer within Canada and through the Export Board to the markets of the world. It also presupposes that we in Canada are prepared to enter into bilateral, and if necessary multilateral, trade agreements with different countries of the world.

We have seen certain examples, to a certain degree, at least, of bilateral trade success. We have seen the Hon. J.G. Gardiner, Federal Minister of Agriculture, go to Great Britain in an attempt, on his part, to sell



**March 15, 1949**

our agricultural products to Great Britain, but he was more or less, literally speaking, knocking his head against a stone wall, for every attempt which he, as a member of the federal government, attempted to sell our goods in Great Britain, the fiscal policy of the federal government, of which he is a representative, made it impossible for that to be accomplished.

We have seen, in the last three or four months in particular, trade that we should have had with Great Britain being lost to us due to the fact that Britain has undertaken to trade with countries which are prepared to trade with them. We have seen her enter into bilateral agreement with such countries as Russia, Poland, and Denmark, to mention only a few, and I am satisfied that Great Britain would, if we made it possible, be just as willing to trade with us as she is to trade with the other mentioned countries. I suggest that we here in our economy in Canada need the good which Great Britain is trading with these other countries, to a degree at least of the same extent as do the other countries. We do need in Canada, indeed, a large amount of consumer goods, and we have, in Canada, a large amount of consumer goods which are needed in Great Britain, in particular. We, in Canada, must be prepared to accept the imports of countries to whom we expect to export.

A few years ago, if you asked any economist any question, he always had a stock answer for you. He said: "The law of supply and demand." If you asked anyone who was dealing with the question of prosperity of a country, if it affects their export markets, you always got a stock answer which stated as follows: "To be prosperous a country must export more than it imports." There has been no greater fallacy ever introduced into our economy than a fallacy to that extent. I suggest that if we are going to export, we must export, and I equally suggest that we must be prepared to import from those countries. To which we export. I further suggest that it is possible to work out a trade policy which is sensible and works in the interest of the common people of all of Canada, and not only in the interest of invested capital irrespective of whether that capital is Canadian, American or British. I believe that it is possible to create a tariff structure and a trade policy which will take care of an increased production in Canada, and I suggest that if we are to have prosperity that what we need is not reduced production, but rather an increased production of all consumer goods.

Not only does our trade policy here in Canada reflect in our Canadian economy, but it reflects in world economy as well. I suggest that our faulty tariff structure and trade policy has been the cause of a great deal of our goods not reaching the hungry countries of Europe. I suggest that through a sound trade policy it is to be more easily possible for us to have our foodstuffs, in particular, reach the hungry people of Europe, and, as such, that we can more greatly play our part in working towards a world peace, and world security.

I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, have great honour in seconding the resolution submitted.

## RESOLUTION RE THE VETERANS' LAND ACT

Mr. N.L. Buchanan moved, seconded by Mr. Gibbs:

That the Dominion Government be requested to amend The Veterans' Land Act so as to enable large agricultural holdings to be bought as units and resold to groups of veterans incorporated as co-operative farming associations, in order to provide for the rehabilitation of veterans who desire to farm co-operatively under the purchase agreement.

He said: In speaking to this resolution, Mr. Speaker, it becomes necessary, in order that we might understand it, to briefly give a resume of our farm economy as it has developed in this province during the past several generations; and to gradually show how our co-operative organizations came into being, and why it is necessary now to make possible the establishment of many of our young veterans on farm units under a co-operative system.

Years ago people came to these western prairies and took up homesteads. The farm units, in those days, were very small; generally a half section. They broke them up with horses, many of them with oxen; they each built buildings on their own farms, and they found it necessary, even then, to form a sort of very rough type of co-operative. They found that it was easier for four or five of them to band together to build a new home for a new settler that had just come into the district. They also found that they could band together and buy these large steam threshing outfits that were used for quite a number of years in this province to do the threshing. In various ways, without definitely organizing co-operatives, co-operatives came into being among these western farmers.

Over a period of time we see a different process taking shape. We find that after a number of years of farming, some of the farmers living on perhaps better land, or being more efficient, got ahead while their neighbours fell behind. With the discovery of the internal combustion motor and a tractor, it became possible, more and more, for individuals to farm larger units. So gradually, these more unsuccessful farm units became absorbed into larger farm holdings. The farmer found that due to weather conditions and fluctuating prices he had to do everything within his power to cut down his overhead. He had to produce as economically as he possibly could a bushel of wheat, and so he kept enlarging his farm holdings. That process speeded up during the thirties, and again during the war years. So, today, we find ourselves in the position where much of the farm land of Saskatchewan is held by one individual owner; large farm units operated from a central point, and operated with a minimum of manpower. We find, also, that there are veterans coming back; farm boys, as well as farm boys who are not veterans, want to go into agriculture as their life work. We find that they are unable to get hold of any land to operate. We find that practically all the available land is taken up either in small farms or in large holdings. Many of these farmers who have accumulated a large amount of land would be quite anxious – in fact they have signified their desire – to sell this land to a group of veterans in order to enable these men to form a co-operative and operate these farms on a

co-operative basis, but due to the limitations presently existing in The Veterans' Land Act, the veterans find it is impossible for them to do that. The province found that it had some available land at the close of the war that could be made available for veterans' co-operative farms, and so they approached the federal government, asking that the federal government give a grant of \$2,320 to the veterans and make it possible for them to pool this grant and thereby acquire one of these large farms. For three years, Mr. Speaker, representations were made from this government to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs at Ottawa, that this be done; but due largely to the ill will towards this of the chairman of the Committee who is, at the present time, the Leader of the Opposition in this House, they were unable to get such a regulation through.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely incorrect. The findings of the Committee was made without influence from myself. It was decided on by a sub-committee on which I didn't even sit, and so the statement made is absolutely incorrect, and it can only be made either without knowledge or regardless of whether it is true or not.

**Mr. Buchanan:** — Mr. Speaker, I know whereof I speak . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — I say that is absolutely incorrect. This finding was based on the findings of the sub-committee, and I wasn't even on the sub-committee, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! The hon. Leader of the Opposition is expressing his opinion exactly the same as any other member of this House.

**Mr. Tucker:** — No, no, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — If the hon. member rises to a point of privilege to make a statement that it is not true, that is perfectly all right.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Might I draw to your attention again what the hon. member said. He said this was turned down largely due to the ill will of myself, and I say that is absolutely incorrect because it was not turned down due to my ill will, but it was turned down by a sub-committee of which I wasn't even a member.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member has made his statement.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Isn't the statement of the member for Notekeu-Willowbunch simply a statement of opinion, not a factual statement. He said that in his opinion that is why it was turned down. It seems to me he has a right to express his opinion.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! I take it that the hon. Leader of the Opposition was speaking on a point of privilege, not on a point of order.

**Mr. Buchanan:** —Mr. Speaker, I had not expected such a flurry, but it is strange that after the hon. member resigned from Ottawa and came back to Saskatchewan there was no difficulty whatsoever in getting this through the Committee.

I might also say to the hon. member that if he objects to anything I have to say, he has the privilege of rising in his place when I get through speaking and offering a reply, the same as it is the privilege of every member in this House.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I would like the hon. member to say when this went through the Committee, because if it is news to me if it is so.

**Mr. Buchanan:** — The Minister in charge of this work advises me that it was on July 16, 1948.

So those are the regulations presently existing on these co-operative farms that have been set up by the Department of Co-operation in conjunction with the Department of Reconstruction. That is, each individual veteran is allowed to pool his V.L.A. credit of \$2,320 and go into a co-operative. There is a clause inserted in the lease which makes it possible for that veteran to withdraw from the co-operative without losing any of his ordinary V.L.A. grant.

This only applies on Crown lands owned by the provincial government. This resolution is asking that this be extended so that groups of veterans who are interested in farming co-operatively might come together and through the ordinary process of the Veteran's Land Act acquire large holdings and farm them co-operatively. The extent of Crown lands available is exhausted, and so our only alternative is to go to lands which are available.

Hon. members might argue as to the success of co-operative farming. It is the same argument that has been presented ever since the co-operative movement started — that it could not and that it would not succeed; that human nature was opposed to the principle of co-operation. We have proven here in Saskatchewan, and it has been proven in other parts of the world, that co-operation as a way of life is far more successful over individual enterprise in any field it chooses to enter. Why then shouldn't it be equally true of co-operative farming? Here we have the Matador Co-operative Farm which was set up under the Department of Reconstruction. It was incorporated in August, 1946, with a membership of 15 veterans. These men were brought together at a co-operative farm school held at Regina in April, 1946. Of 25 veterans who attended the school, 20 decided to take part in the organization of the co-operative farm. Three of these changed their minds before they got to the location of the co-operative farm. Two additional members withdrew because they disagreed with the provision in the lease which bound the land together as a unit. This left the 15 men who organized the co-operative farm. Two additional members were accepted the following year, and with the withdrawal of one of the members during 1948 the membership this spring will be 16.

During the first year 2,600 acres of sod were brought under cultivation. During 1947, another 1,400 acres were broken; during 1948, about 1,000 acres were brought under cultivation, making a total cultivated acreage of 5,200 acres which

is over 300 acres per veteran. The crop was almost entirely hailed out in 1947, but a very good crop was harvested in 1948. The returns from this crop have paid off all of the debts of this co-operative farm.

During 1946 four houses were constructed for the four married members and a dormitory for the single men; a barn was purchased and a machine shop and granary constructed during that year. During 1947, three additional houses were built, as well as poultry houses, a garage and an additional granary. During 1948 three more houses were built, one of which is being used as the dormitory while the old dormitory is now being used as a community hall. Additional granaries were also built during 1948. An electric lighting plant is being purchased and the buildings will be wired for electricity during the coming summer. Among the machinery owned by this co-operative farm are six old caterpillar tractors and two new caterpillar tractors purchased about two weeks ago; six eight-foot tiller combines; four 28-run seed drills; two 23-foot self-propelled harvesting combines; two 20-foot harvest combines which are not self-propelled.

Work has been organized to quite a high degree to provide regular hours of labour for each member, and holidays with pay. Last July each of the members had a week's holiday, and during this winter each of the members is receiving a month's holiday. During the summer the members take turns in doing chores on Sundays. This, every seventeenth Sunday each of the members has to stay on the farm and be responsible for the chores.

The members are also specializing in the types of work for which they are trained, and in which they are most interested. A baseball team has provided one of the important activities of this co-operative farm and brings out some of the social possibilities through this type of organization.

The Matador Co-operative Farm deals with the Kyle Credit Union, and three of the members are on the Board of Directors of the Kyle Co-operative Store. It has obtained loans from the Saskatchewan Co-operative Credit Society during the past two years.

Here is another co-operative farm which is not a veterans' farm. It was incorporated in January, 1946. It has 12 members, 7 men and 5 women. It controls 3,000 acres, of which 2,200 acres are under cultivation. The members grouped their buildings immediately after organization, and have been operating from their community centre for three years. Investment in machinery on this co-operative farm is approximately \$5 per cultivated acres, and a Wincharger and Delco plant provide electricity for all the buildings. This co-operative farm illustrates a method of establishing your men on farms in this province. This co-operative farm has specialized in growing registered wheat and Argentine Red.

I could go on reading the successful achievements of other co-operative farms. To date in the province we have three veterans' co-operative farms; one of them Matador No. 1, Riverbend and Sunnyvale. We have five that are organized and will be operating this year in addition to those three, and they are: Pasqua Hills, Sturdy, Spruce Home, Fairview, and Matador No. 2.

You can see from the few sentences that I read regarding the Matador Co-operative Farm that in the field of co-operative farming lies the answer to

many of our problems in Saskatchewan today. It gives us the answer to disappearing community life that we have on our farms. It gives the answer more efficiently than in any other way, I believe, to rural electrification; to education; to community life in all its phases, and it also makes possible for farmers, instead of having to be 'jacks of all trades' to specialize in that particular line of farming that they are mainly interested in. It will make possible the bringing back of the swine population to this province. Also, the establishment of dairy herds on farms where people no longer have dairy herds, and so on down the line.

I come now to the question of whether we know what we are talking about when we say there are large amounts of land available for veterans' co-operative farming. I have here a report submitted to the Minister in which it is claimed:

I have investigated a farm located about 17 miles north-east of Saskatoon and found there are several thousand acres of grazing and cultivated land, as well as a very complete set of buildings and excellent water facilities. The pooled grants of about seven veterans could purchase this farm, and since it is a going concern at the present time, they could just move in and carry on its present operations.

I also visited another farm at Lashburn which is for sale for \$40,000. It consists of three sections of land, 900 acres of which is under cultivation and practically all the remainder is arid. It has an excellent set of buildings, well adapted for living in and for livestock production. The water facilities are very good. If seven veterans pooled their grants they would be able to purchase this farm and carry on its operations as a going concern.

I have also a considerable amount of information with regard to a farm for sale about ten miles south of Allen. This farm contains four sections with over 2,000 acres under cultivation. It has an excellent set of buildings, including four houses and barns built for carrying on large livestock enterprises.

There is another large area of land for sale near Hanley. Since a considerable amount of this is grazing land, it would provide an excellent basis for a large mixed farming enterprise if a group of veterans were permitted to pool their grants to purchase the farm. There are several on which a brief report has been submitted.

Here are letters from farmers, writing in asking that some facility be made whereby they could sell their holdings to veterans, and I quote:

The information we gave you in our last letter was, of course, very meagre, and from it you could not be expected to make a full and accurate appraisal of the situation.

What we should have mentioned is that these two farms are very highly developed. Both have a large number of very good buildings . . .

and he explains how this would be a suitable farm for veterans' settlement on a co-operative basis.

Now, are the veterans interested in co-operative farming? Here are some letters that I have from veterans who have signified their desire to go into co-operative farming, and I quote:

I am interested in co-operative farming and have been following the co-operative farm activities at Matador, and am inclined to think that they may be our solution here. I am a veteran, set up under the Veterans' Land Act on a good farm. I might add, that I am well satisfied in every respect with it, except I find I am too isolated in the winter time; also the fact that I am two and one-half miles from the nearest school which is not opened. I farm a section and one-half that is all good land. There is a school section adjoining me on the east and the veteran farming it is thirty miles away, and he is getting disgusted with it because he has no building there nor school facilities. There is also some other prairie land reasonably close that could be broken up, but the kind of farmers we need are resident farmers, and then we could have a community.

We are eight and one-half miles from the nearest town. We have good land, but if we could just interest a group in settling close together I am sure we could build up a real community centre. Including my own, there would be three sections in a block available immediately, and a good deal more, I believe, if the idea materialized.

I would appreciate very much if we could get some literature on this. If we could start a co-operative farm here, I am for the idea 100 percent . . .

That is one of many letters that are on file from veterans signifying their desire to go into co-operative farming.

From the remarks that I have made, I would not want anyone to think that it is my opinion that the Veterans' Land Act has not served a useful purpose. I believe that it has, and I certainly think that it has done very well as far as it has gone. But my resolution asks for an extension of this Act which will make possible the seeing up of veterans' co-operative farms in this province, formed by a group of young men who have joined together in the past, who worked together, lived together and had a common objective in time of war. Now this would make possible for them to do the same thing in time of peace.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Gibbs:

That the Dominion Government be requested to amend the Veterans' Land Act so as to enable large agricultural holdings to be bought as units and resold to groups of veterans incorporated as co-operative farming associations, in order to provide for the rehabilitation of veterans who desire to farm co-operatively under the purchase agreement.

**Mr. Gibbs (Swift Current):** — Mr. Speaker, I heartily concur in what the hon. friend for Notekeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Buchanan) has said in regard to this resolution on co-operative farms. I am no going to speak very long, but I would just like to draw to the attention

of this House that when the idea of the co-operative movement was first mooted, away back in 1844, in the town of Rochdale, Lancashire, England, they had quite a hard row to hoe, and the powers that be in those times, that is, the capitalists and private enterprise and the ruling power, were all against the co-operative movement. It was a movement that was born of necessity, like most of the movements that have emanated since that time were labour, and the working classes in general, have had to struggle for their very existence.

I do believe, as the hon. member has pointed out, that to our young people of this age, especially the young veterans who anticipate making a career and livelihood from farming, I say in all sincerity, I do not think there is a better system than going into a system like the co-operative farming. I would advise our young people to go into that class of farming because it has great advantages, and there is no doubt about it that by collective working and getting together in common ideas, under co-operation, they will be far better off than what, possibly, the farmers who homesteaded back in the old days, who have come through the trials and troubles of capitalization and free enterprise and everything that goes with it. I think that will be banished if the youths of the future look to that day of full co-operation.

The Rochdale pioneers first started back in 1844, and if the hon. members of this House have read the history of that wonderful movement, they will realize that from the very start, when those 28 weavers first decided to do something for themselves with regard to bettering their conditions, they were maligned all over the country. Every obstacle to frustrate that movement was thrown in their direction in those days. Even in our present age, today, nothing else can survive, so as far as the ideology is concerned to some people it has not changed from 1844 to 1949

However, our own political movement, Mr. Speaker, with this government of ours represented today in the province of Saskatchewan, the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, the words alone intimate and show what we stand for: a progressive government under co-operative methods.

**Mr. Culliton:** — C.C.F. aye.

**Mr. Gibbs:** — Yes, that is the C.C.F., if you didn't know.

As I said to the hon. members of this House, if they could only take a trip over to the Old Country and those that believe in co-operation could go and see right there in Rochdale the first place they ever started up, 1844; it is a museum today. It is only a small, two-storey building, and they use that as a museum, and about a block away from this small place where they first started, the birthplace of co-operation, they have a large pioneers' building that possibly takes up about an area of two blocks, where you can buy anything from a pin to household furniture. Back in the old museum, they show you the penny scribblers, their first ledgers, and everything that went with it. It just shows the development and the expansion. Not only that, but co-operatives and co-operation has expanded all over the known world as I know it today. We have the Scandinavian countries and other countries that are possibly away ahead of this country of ours. Nevertheless, I think that as time goes on



**March 15, 1949**

our friends that do not believe in co-operation, surely something will snap and they will come to realize that we have and will line in an age of co-operation.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You had better snap out of it.

**Mr. Gibbs:** — It would do some of you good to go over there. Especially you, because it has gone with the wind as far as you are concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is no new system as far as farming co-operatively is concerned because we find that the idea of co-operative communal farms is not a new enterprise. The Mennonites and the Doukhobors have maintained this way of life on a communal basis for a good number of years, and we all know that. Most of us have lived in these communities and we are trying to further the idea. Although my friends across the way may laugh, possibly some of them do not know what co-operation is but if they don't I would say to them to get down and really study the principles of co-operation, and co-operative farming in particular.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I have a great pleasure in seconding the motion.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I do not intend to say more than a very few words on this matter, so far as I am concerned myself. I did not intend to enter this debate if it had not been for the words of the gentleman who moved it. He has seen fit to attack me, and the position I have taken in some of these matters having to do with veterans' affairs, and I judged when he was speaking, for example, that the reason this proposal, that the Dominion buy land in order to have it settled by veterans co-operatively, had not gone through was due to the hostility of myself. I, naturally, assume, Mr. Speaker, that he is talking about the motion which was moved, and, of course, I said that that had been referred, by the committee of which I was chairman, to a sub-committee, which was right. I gathered then, from his further remarks, that he wasn't referring to his own motion, but he was referring to something else because he said it had been done after I left Ottawa. In view of the fact that the proposal made in his motion has not been done, they he presumably must have been referring to something else altogether. This confusion is the reason I thought I should rise and try to clear this thing up a little bit.

When Mr. Sturdy came before the sub-committee, as I remember it — I have not checked it up for, as I say, I didn't intend to take part in this debate but I felt I should say a few words on it in view of the fact I was so intimately concerned with it at one time — his submission was to the effect he was wanting two things done: one was the proposal which has been made in this resolution, and the other was that the \$2,320 grants should be made available to the veterans on co-operative farms like the Matador. Those were two different propositions. In regard to the grants to the boys on the co-operative farms like Matador, that was one matter, and then the matter of getting the government to buy blocks of land upon which veterans would settle as a co-operative farm, that was another matter. Two distinct matters, and I think

The hon. member who moved this motion was confusing them because the one proposal that the dominion government, instead of buying land which it would, in turn, sell to veterans individually, should also buy lots of land on which it would settle veterans as a co-operative enterprise, has not been agreed to, but the other matter of allowing veterans on co-operative farms to receive grants has been agreed to. I think, the hon. member who moved this motion must have been confusing the two together.

In regard to the proposition of paying these to the returned soldiers on the Matador, the difficulty was that the Veterans' Land Act provides that a person must have, personally, some interest in the land on which he is settled. At one time the interest he had to have in the land had to be an agreement to buy the land himself. Then, because the amount of money the veteran could get in the way of assistance was \$6,000 maximum, which wasn't enough to buy the land in some of the better parts of the province, and because we knew some of our most successful farmers got their start as renters in the first place, I suggested some scheme whereby a veteran could get assistance even if he had only a lease of land. A very satisfactory scheme along this line was worked out and agreed to. The necessary change was made to the law, whereby a veteran who had a lease of land could get help up to the extent of \$2,400 to buy stock and implements, with a write-off of \$1,200, with the right later on, to get the balance of \$6,000 to buy land with a write-off of \$1,120. That has been one of the most successful features of the Veterans' Land Act because it has enabled veterans to get started in some of the better farming areas of the province, where the amount they could get to buy land was not enough to get started under the original Act. I mention that because it was one change that enabled the usefulness of the Act to be expanded quite considerably.

With regard to the veterans on the Matador, the administrators of the Act were confronted with this: they had to find that the individual veteran either had to have an agreement to buy land or, in view of the later amendment, he at least had to have a lease to himself in respect of an individual parcel of land. Unless he could present some such evidence of an individual interest in land, then the Veterans' Land Act administration could not make him any advance whatever. In other words, the Department of Justice and the law officers of the Crown had ruled that that wouldn't be within the terms of the Act. Various suggestions were made by the hon. Mr. Sturdy to the administration in Ottawa in that regard. He said that the veterans on the Matador felt they had a very good proposition, they wanted to farm that way, and they wanted to get the same help as other veterans were getting. To the suggestion that it wasn't within the Veterans' Land Act, Mr. Sturdy made the suggestion that he would try to work out some change in the lease which would meet the requirements of the Veterans' Land Act. One of the suggestions made was a lease should be made with the individual veterans. They might agree they would farm the land as part of a co-operative. One of the difficulties that then arose was this: under their co-operative rules a two-thirds majority could expel a man from the co-operative, and the purpose of the Veterans' Land Act, was to make sure once a man got whatever he was going to get under the Veterans' Land Act, he would be settled in his home as well as could be done, because there is no provision for a second chance under the Act. There was the possibility that when you put a group of young fellows together, they would all draw their grant under the Veterans' Land Act, and then one might find himself incompatible with the rest, and the

March 15, 1949

two-thirds majority would expel him. He would then be in the position where he had put his grant from the dominion government into the co-operative venture, and he would be out on the road without any rights except such as he might have as against the co-operative.

Mr. Sturdy, on behalf of the government here, then took the attitude that they would guarantee the position of that man. If a man were expelled like that he was entitled to be paid his equity in that co-operative. But the question came up, trouble was liable to develop in days of difficulty and his right to get repaid from the co-operative might not be worth very much. So, Mr. Sturdy, on behalf of the government here, took the attitude that the provincial government, if a man were expelled, would guarantee reimbursement to that man, if he were expelled by his fellows. Then, also, the question of the settlement of the value of his share came up, and it was finally agreed to that that would be settled by arbitration.

When all of these items were finally agreed to – and I may say, Mr. Speaker, that my attitude towards this thing all along was that these boys were on that farm and were returned soldiers, they wanted to farm that way, and if by meeting the requirements, in the different ways I have mentioned, they could be given this grant, the, of course, there should be no undue clinging to the letter of the law. If a grant could be put through that the officers of the Crown would agree to, then it should be done. On June 10, 1948, all these different problems I have mentioned were settled to the satisfaction of the law officers of the Department of Justice, and the lease which had been amended to suit the requirements of the Department of Justice, with almost a whole page of amendments, was finally arranged. On that basis, Mr. Sturdy was advised that the grants would be made to these veterans on the Matador Farm.

I do not understand this apparent desire on the part of some hon. members to try to make out that in some way I was hostile to the veteran. Mr. Speaker, I do not think there was any other single member in the House of Commons that received the honour of being elected three times in succession to be Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Commons. That, surely, wasn't based upon any idea that I was hostile to the veteran. I think Mr. Sturdy himself has some knowledge of the tremendous amount of work done by the Veterans' Affairs Committee with myself as Chairman, in the fall of 1945, and again in the session of 1946, in putting through the Veterans' Charter, and trying to extend the provisions in order to look after returned soldiers. I think he has some conception of the tremendous amount of work that was done by that committee and myself as its chairman. I think he has some conception too of the work I did as Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister, working in close conjunction with the Canadian Legion particularly, and the other service organizations, in going before the sub-committee and the Cabinet on these matters, trying to get some of these things expanded and improved.

Perhaps I am regarded by your Honour, when I am being accused of being hostile to returned soldiers, on the floor of this House, as being probably getting unduly upset about it. Well, I submit, Mr. Speaker

...

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Has there been any intimation, coming from this side of the House, that you were hostile to veterans? Was it not that you were hostile to co-operative farming?

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the hon. Minister says because it puts a more charitable picture on this thing. I have seen pamphlets put out during the election campaign, and so on, and I wish I could believe they had that charitable interpretation; but, however, that is politics, Mr. Speaker. I just want to draw to your attention that in all these things, my object was to try to assist the veteran to get all he could under the legislation. The Minister, however, brings out another question where he and I had an honest difference of opinion, and we still have. I do not want to detain the House, but one of the things that came up, which was raised by both C.C.F. members, Social Credit and Liberal members, was this question of the cost of heavy implements in connection with farming, and the suggestion that returned soldiers should be permitted to go together and pool their grants in order to buy heavy machinery together. So that if they owned or leased their lands they could get their grants, but they could pool them in order to buy machinery, and perhaps if they wished to farm together.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, a perusal of the records will show that the chairman of the Committee was more than sympathetic to that suggestion. In every way I could I promoted it, and the change was actually made when I was Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister. This provided that soldiers — as I remember it — up to the number of ten could pool their grants in order to buy machinery and farm their land co-operatively. The basis was they would have land themselves, personally, either under lease or under an agreement for sale. That change was made, as I say, as a result of the recommendations of our committee, and certainly with all the co-operation and assistance I could give as chairman and Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister. So that change was made to assist men who wanted to farm co-operatively.

I think that covers the question of the Matador farm — perhaps I should probably entirely complete the review of that situation. On June 10, Mr. Sturdy was advised the Department of Justice was satisfied with the lease as amended — that these boys had sufficient individual interest in the land, and were protected by the guarantee of the Saskatchewan government, so they would say that assistance under the Veterans' Land Act would be under the terms of the Veterans' Land Act. When the objections were met the grants were authorized. I think it was that which the hon. member who moved this motion had in mind; for this decision did not go through until I left Ottawa. It must have been that he had in mind. If it was the he had in mind, all I can say is, if he will consult the Minister himself and look at the file and the records, he will find, as these different objections were raised and all finally met, the Department of Justice ruled the grants could be made under the Act, and they were made. There is not a thing in the record, Mr. Speaker, to indicate other than that I was favourable to that being done. My attitude in regard to grants, so they could get their money to buy machinery together and farm co-operatively, shows I was favourable to that idea. My position, to say the least, was somewhat misrepresented on that question. However, the election is all over, and let that be; but I don't want misrepresentation to go on being made, Mr. Speaker. After all, we have to associate here together, and we should try to be a little bit fair to one another.

To carry the matter a step further, on the question of whether we should ask the dominion government to go further and buy tracts of land, and give them to a group of veterans, not as individuals but as a co-operative organization. The reasons why that hasn't been done up to now is that the Veterans' Land Act has been a project for settling individual veterans, where they have an interest individually in their own land and have a home there themselves, where they would not be under the thumb of any one person or group of people. That was the whole idea of it, where they would be settled as individuals. An attempt was made to preserve that set-up, as much as possible, in the Matador, even if they were farming as co-operatives.

The whole original Veterans' land Act was based on the idea of individual settlement of veterans as individuals. If they wish, after they are settled as individuals, to go together and farm their land co-operatively that is their own business. We provided, as I say, they could get their grants, and draw them, and buy machinery together. That was quite a departure from the original terms of the Act in itself, but it was done by regulation because it was desired to meet the wish of anybody wanting to farm co-operatively.

Now to go a step further, Mr. Speaker. In my judgement – in this I might be wrong – there is a great deal of difference between a man owning his own farm and perhaps farming in co-operation with his neighbours, and his going in with nine or ten other fellows, and having no individual ownership of his land or his home; where he only is there because he is a member of that organization and does not stay there any longer than that organization wants him to be there. Under the rules of the co-operative farms, if you were to buy a tract of land and settle a group of veterans on it, as suggested by this motion, two-thirds of the veterans could decide to put any individual off. I am doubtful about that sort of thing. I think there is a great deal of difference between a co-operative enterprise and communal enterprise or collective enterprise.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Here we go.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I say, quite frankly, here is where the Minister and I part company. I believe in co-operation; he believes in some form of collectivism. I want to explain, Mr. Speaker, why I say that. I don't say it in any attempt to be quarrelsome or anything else, for to me it is fundamental. On one of these co-operative farms, the man doesn't own any land; he has no interest in the land; he does not own any machinery, a common purse; everything is in common, and nothing is owned by anybody until a profit is made and something is paid out of the common purse to the people taking part in it. I say that that is not co-operation. Co-operation is based upon the individual going together voluntarily with a neighbour, and perhaps working together, working their land together, using their machinery together, but always being in a position where each one is able to have a share, as an individual, in the machinery, land, and so on. The other scheme would be in the nature of a collective farm. That is the difference.

I felt in Ottawa, and the other members of the committee felt, with the exception of the C.C.F. members, here was the Veterans' Land Act which tries

to settle people as individuals upon land. It has gone quite a distance in providing them with help to buy their machinery together, and work the land together . . .

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Is it your opinion that, shall we say the Matador Co-operative Farm, based on co-operative principles, or is it collective?

**Mr. Tucker:** — My own opinion about the Matador is this: that it is not a genuine co-operative. That is my own opinion. I think the time will come when these farms, so organized, will not be a success. That is my own opinion, and I am entitled to it. It is based upon this, Mr. Speaker: my hon. friend for Swift Current has spoken about these collective farms where people pool all their resources, as having worked successfully in regard to various things. As far as I know, there is no place where such a group have worked together successfully on that basis, except the Hutterites in Manitoba and Alberta. It was tried by the Mennonites when they came to Canada, and ultimately the time came, Mr. Speaker, when they had to break up their farms, and go on individual farms.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Am I to understand that the farm organizations of the Mennonites, Doukhobors and Hutterites are, in your opinion, co-operative farms?

**Mr. Tucker:** — I was going to say, in my opinion — and I tried to make it plain — that where land is held by a group in a unit where there is common ownership of the land, a common ownership of the machinery and a common ownership of everything else, and a common purse, I do not think that is a co-operative. I think it is a collective.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — You haven't answered my question.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Just wait if you want me to answer.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion those are not true co-operatives. They hold within themselves the seeds of their own destruction. That has been proved by history. They tried them in the United States and there is not one, as far as I know, which succeeded. The Mennonites tried farming on that basis in various parts of this country when they came here. The last attempt was following the first war, and, so far as I know, there is not a single one of those farms in existence today. They chose, as free people, to get on a basis where they were in charge of their own affairs, and not under the control of other people. As I say, the only group I know of carrying on on that basis is the Hutterite group in Manitoba and Alberta. Of course I do not suggest the way they carry on is a co-operative. It is the very thing I object to. There is a common ownership of land, a common ownership of the means of production, a common purse. Certainly it is not a co-operative, and that is why I am against it, because I do not believe in collectivism. I don't believe it will succeed for the returned soldiers of this country any more than it succeeded with the Doukhobors, the Mennonites, or any other of these groups that tried it and with whom it failed. That is the difference between some people, even in the C.C.F. party, who believe in co-operatives and don't believe socialism, and those who believe in socialism and pretend to themselves and others that it is co-operation.

Among my hon. friends opposite, Mr. Speaker, there are those who believe in the common ownership of the means of wealth production that all such should be owned by the state. All the means of wealth production. That is what a socialist believes in; but all the co-operative writers say that the real foundation of co-operation is the individual ownership of the means of production, and then working together in different respects; but all that is based on the idea of partnership, willing, voluntary partnership. That is where the hon. Minister of Reconstruction and I part company. He is a socialist, and so he believes, not in co-operation, he believes in common ownership, Mr. Speaker. I am not a socialist; I don't believe in it, but I do believe, Mr. Speaker, in true co-operation, which is based upon individual enterprise and the willing co-operation of the people, not a form of being under the control of a group of people to whom they must submit or run the risk of being cast upon their own. That is not real, individual liberty, freedom, or co-operation. Take the Wheat Pool, for example, of which I have been a member since 1927; I doubt if there is a member of the House who has been a member of the Wheat Pool as long as I have, Mr. Speaker, and yet I am told by our friends opposite and by the Minister of Reconstruction who never was a member of the Wheat Pool . . .

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Was he a member when the communistic influence, referred to by the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson), were in control?

**Mr. Tucker:** — That is another question. I will let the hon. member for Saltcoats answer that.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I am not a member of the Wheat Pool. I have not farmed for a number of years. My profession has been that of a teacher. I want to make my position clear.

**Mr. Tucker:** — The reason I said that, Mr. Speaker, is because it is so readily said by the members across the aisle that I do not believe in co-operatives, without any foundation in fact.

There again, somebody interferes again. The hon. Minister of Agriculture, without any reason whatever, Mr. Speaker, gives one some sort of an idea that he feels if you say something like that often enough, without any foundation in fact, some of the smear will stick. I want to say that that sort of thing is not fitting in a province like ours, based upon the idea, a loathsome idea, which comes to us from Europe, form a dictatorship, not of argument but of endeavouring to smear and to try to win without argument. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is not going to succeed here. This sort of attempt to carry on like that is being more and more reprobated by the people of Saskatchewan. They do not believe in those tactics.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Who indulges in them?

**Mr. Tucker:** — You just said a moment ago that I did not believe in co-operatives. There is not reason for saying that at all. Ever since I had anything to do with my own affairs, I have been a member of a co-operative. The hon. member has no right to say that whatever. It is just the very thing I mentioned.

If I may go on and conclude my remarks – I have already gone on much longer than I expected. The question we are asked is this: whether we are going to ask the dominion government to depart from the basis which it has been operating up until now, settling people on individual farms, assisting veterans whose rights are on provincial farms to hold leases, and whose rights are protected sufficiently to warrant grants from the Veterans' Land Act, veterans who have leases or purchase agreements and who can go together up to the number of ten, pool their resources, buy machinery together, whether we shall go on a step further now and have the federal government buy tracts of lands and say to veterans: "Now we are going to settle you on these lands on the basis suggested by the hon. member." The land will be owned by the co-operative, people who go in it will be farming that land without any right of ownership in it, or in the machinery used to farm it, with a common purse and the right to be expelled whenever the co-operative decided they do not like him. They may have a great deal of disagreement with me, Mr. Speaker, but I do not see that that sort of thing will work in Canada. I do not believe it will work particularly in western Canada. It never has, except in such a tightly-knit religious group as the Hutterites. I do not think, when it would not apply to even religious groups like the Doukhobors and Mennonites, when it has not worked in the United States wherever it has been tried, then I do not think we should ask the federal government to embark on a scheme like that. If it does not work, then the federal government, which has sensibly re-established individuals, should not embark on it. If the thing is unsound, the people accepting help under it will have lost all they might get out of the legislation for re-establishment; they will have probably put the best years of their lives into trying to make the thing work. It has never worked in the United States and Canada to date, and we are suggesting to those people that we believe that it is a sound thing.

Mr. Speaker, I, for one, do not believe in collectivism; I do not believe in communism; I do not believe in this formula suggested by the C.C.F. in their basic programme, that all the means of wealth production, all the natural resources, should be owned, not by the people as individuals, but by the people, operated by the people and controlled by the people – obviously, in most cases operating through their government. I do not believe that produced the great development we of the Anglo-Saxon countries have experienced. I think, wherever it has been tried, it has led to stagnation – is bound to lead to stagnation. I believe Mr. Speaker, in controlled private enterprise. I am not dogmatic about it. Different things have been mentioned, such as farmers going together and marketing their grain.

Then the state where the overwhelming majority want the State to assist, putting its facilities at their disposal. I believe in this being done only because the individuals, as individuals, want it in overwhelming numbers, and only so long as those people continue to want it. That is why I say there is a difference between the Wheat Board and the Fish Board. The fishermen have indicated they do not want this thing, and so their wishes in a free country should be respected; but the farmers have indicated in every way they can that they do want their wheat handled by the Wheat Board. So far as coarse grains, as the hon. members know, I fought for it in Ottawa, for the Bill to be put through by the federal government, and when you were meeting here a year ago, I said in the House of Commons, to the C.C.F. members – I do not know whether it was recorded in Hansard or not: "Why do you not tell your friends in



**March 15, 1949**

Saskatchewan to pass a supplementary Bill as fast as possible.” You did, and I find no fault with it, Mr. Speaker. I am glad Saskatchewan did, and I wish the other prairie provinces had done likewise.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, in these things, the difference between the Liberal Party and the C.C.F. is that they are not doctrinaire about these approaches. If it seems it is a good thing for the state, as such, to handle anything, such as, for example, the C.B.C., Trans-Canada, or taking over the Canadian National, if it seems to be in the best interests of the people, they do it; but the socialists say if a little bit is a good thing, let us have it wholesale. If it is a good thing to own the C.N.R., let us get hold of the C.P.R. and have complete monopoly, or if it is a good thing to have the Trans-Canada, let us get hold of all the feeder lines and have complete monopoly; if it is a good thing to have the C.B.C., let us get hold of the other stations and have complete monopoly. Mr. Speaker, that is where we differ. We believe in preserving individual enterprise and all it has meant in the development of our country and our Commonwealth; the contribution it has made to the welfare of mankind; and this collectivism, wherever it has been tried, has done nothing but harm to mankind.

So, in this very thing, this matter again comes to a head. So far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I will support anything that will help the veterans, but I do not think putting them on a co-operative farm of this nature will, in the long run, help them. I think it will prove to be a delusion and a snare, and I think it would be wrong to try and put our good fellow-Canadian veterans onto propositions like this, and I do not feel I should support it.

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