

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN  
First Session – Eleventh Legislature

Thursday, March 24, 1949

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

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Buchanan:

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.

**Hon. J. H. Sturdy:** — Mr. Speaker, in order to refresh the memory of the members of the House, I would like to again read this motion: it is to the effect that the dominion government be requested to amend the Veterans' Land Act so as to obtain 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.

I realize that there is no need for me to impress upon the hon. members of this House the importance of this resolution. It affects a large number of veterans whose re-establishment has been retarded or prevented altogether. Furthermore, the implementation of the request contained in this resolution would provide an impetus to co-operative farming, and I do maintain that co-operative farming is here to stay in this province.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, in speaking to this resolution in the House, to use his own words, had this to say: "The time will come when these co-operative farms will fail." May I also be permitted to make a prophesy? It is this: co-operative farming in this province is here to stay, and it will succeed, and it will one day provide the pattern for successful and happy rural life in this and all countries. The Rochdale pioneers of England, who founded modern co-operative organizations 100 years ago, and which now boasts a membership of 10 million people in that country, those pioneers are remembered with reverence and gratitude today, while those who bitterly opposed them are forgotten people, unwept un-honoured and unsung. And if I may be permitted a further prophesy, it is this: those who are pioneering in co-operative farming in this province today will be remembered and honoured in history in this province and in the Dominion when those who oppose them, as the opposition is doing, will have long-since passed into the limbo of forgotten things.

**Mr. Tucker:** — What a prophesy.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — The hon. Leader of the Opposition, who is a lawyer and not a farmer, and is interested in farming as an investment and not as a way of life, has had the temerity to inform this House that the matador is not a properly organized co-operative.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I inform him from the authority of scores of bona fide farmers and co-operators that the Matador and other veteran co-operative farms are true co-operatives, and I think that the hon. members in this House will accept the opinion of practical farmers and scientific farmers, and those skilled in co-operative organization, rather than the opinion of the hon. Leader of the Opposition who has shown himself opposed to co-operatives, not only on this, but on other occasions.

Neither the hon. Leader of the Opposition nor I can claim to be authorities on co-operative farming, or any kind of farming for that matter. I know that the hon. Leader of the Opposition claims to be a member of the Wheat Pool. I assume that he has acquired farms, and it is no business of mine how he acquired them, or how many he has got, but the fact remains that he is not an active farmer in this province.

**An Hon. Member:** — You are not a farmer, and know nothing about farming.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Along with the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I, too, was born and brought up on a farm . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — You sure look it.

**An Hon. Member:** — A long time ago.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — . . . and I also farmed in this province after the First World War, and I have associated myself wherever opportunity afforded with the progressive farm movement and co-operatives in this province ever since I was old enough to think for myself. Nevertheless, I would not dare to trust my own judgement on farming or co-operative matters, and that is why, as far back as August, 1944, when we were anticipating the end of the war and the return of veterans, many of them to farming, that I requested a conference of farming experts and members of those organizations interested in veteran re-establishment. Now, this conference was held in Regina, August 25, 1944, and here is the complete report of the conference. It comprised 63 delegates or members of co-operatives; there were 11 representatives from the government of Canada, including such men as J. McPhail of the Experimental Station, Melfort, George Spence, P.F.R.A., Ralph Stutt of the Economics division of the University of Saskatchewan, L.B. Thompson, the present P.F.R.A. administrator, and so on. There were five from the University of Saskatchewan, including Dr. Kirk, the Dean of the College at that time, J. Mitchell of the Soils Department, Professor Van Vliet. It included five from the Saskatchewan Co-operative Producers Limited; nine from the United Farmers of Canada; three from the Co-operative Union of Saskatchewan; 15 from the government, largely from the Department of Agriculture and from the Department of Co-operatives; and 17 other experts in their various fields. Incidentally, there were three representative farm women present at that conference.

**March 24, 1949**

After very careful consideration that conference on co-operative farming passed the following resolution:

Therefore be it resolved that several alternative plans for the application of co-operative principles to the problem of agricultural production and ways and means of providing facilities for the improvement of rural living conditions be prepared by a representative committee appointed by this conference, with special reference to the needs of veterans; but the said plans be drafted in such a way as to be applicable to the needs of interested farmers generally, and in order to implement this recommendation that negotiations be undertaken with Dominion officials responsible for the administration of the Veterans' Land Act, in order that such amendments to the Act, or regulations there under, be enacted as may be necessary to facilitate the preparation and carrying out of suitable plans; and it is further recommended that the objective of any co-operative farming scheme, whether limited or comprehensive in scope, should be to encourage those participating to assume full responsibility as soon as possible in administering such a scheme on a co-operative basis.

Now that was the resolution passed by the 63 delegate farmers and agricultural experts to this conference. They further set up a consultative committee of 17 members, and under that consultative committee, which has continued to remain in existence down to the present time, they set up a research committee, and the purpose of the research committee was to investigate co-operative farming in Saskatchewan, the Dominion of Canada and elsewhere, and bring in their recommendations. Now, who comprised the members of that research committee: A.H. Turner, convenor, E.E. Eisenhower, L.B. Thompson, Professor Van Vliet of the University of Saskatchewan, R.A. Stutt of the University, G.B. Harrison, J. Harrison, J. Mitchell, Dr. Hardy of the University and H. B. Mott.

This research committee conducted an exhaustive research and personal investigation into all types of co-operatives, and a great deal of thought and time and effort went into the reports which they prepared. This is the first report, and I doubt whether any member of the opposition has read a single line of it. This was prepared in 1946, and submitted in that year. In the following year a further report on co-operative farming was submitted, and here is the report, and again, I would state that I doubt very much whether a single member of the opposition, including the Leader, has interested himself to the extent of reading a single line of those recommendations. I ask the people of this House, and the people of Saskatchewan, to decide: are the farming co-operatives set up in accordance with the recommendations in these reports true co-operatives or not? Is the hon. Leader of the Opposition right, and all these practical farmers and agricultural experts wrong? I think no, Mr. Speaker, and personally I accept the opinion of these practical farmers and these experts on constituencies organizations, rather than the opinion of one who has shown himself to be unfavourable to co-operatives, not only on this but on many other occasions.

On the basis of these recommendations, contained in these reports, six veteran co-operative farms have already been organized, and three additional co-operative farms will undoubtedly be organized in 1949. The co-operative farm schools are being held at the present time; the first one is already in

operation in Saskatoon and there are requests for enrolment of 85 veteran students in those co-operative schools. It is rather amazing that a short time ago it became known that the Matador Co-operative Farm was taking on one additional man, and 40 applications from veterans were received although it was not advertised in any way. And so you see, Mr. Speaker, in spite of misrepresentations and propaganda to the effect that these are collective farms, and not true co-operatives, the popularity of co-operative farming is growing rapidly in this province, and not all the forces of reaction and politically motivated saboteurs will prevail against them.

In accordance with the request of this conference of which I speak, I went to Ottawa in the fall of 1944 and entered into negotiations with the Department of Veterans Affairs there, particularly under the Veterans' Land Act, to have some of their recommendations implemented. Well, I did succeed in getting an agreement with the federal Department of Veterans' Affairs to advance rehabilitation grants in the amount of \$2,320 to individuals who were on provincial Crown lands. I also endeavoured, over a term of years, to have permission granted so that these rehabilitation grants could be pooled and used by veterans who wished to settle on a co-operative farm basis. I did not get very far, but eventually, in desperation, I applied for permission to appear before the parliamentary committee on Veterans' Affairs. I did appear before that committee on June 10, 1948. Now, the hon. Leader of the Opposition claims that he was very much in evidence during the first year. He was present, and believe me, he was not helpful on any occasion. His position, I imagine, was that of observer to perceive that we did not get grants for the veterans who wished to settle farms. He was Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of the time.

I had thought that I had created a pretty fair impression on that first parliamentary committee. The hon. Leader of the Opposition smiles. He seems to doubt that such was the case. Well, here are the concluding remarks of the chairman of the committee:

If there are no more questions, I think we will bring this meeting to a close. Before I do that I certainly want to express the thanks of the sub-committee to Mr. Sturdy for coming here this morning. If I may say so, and I am sure this will meet with the approval of all the members, Mr. Sturdy is one of the best witnesses that we have had in committee. As a matter of fact, after listening to many witnesses in committee, I would say that it is a knack that is not given to everybody. I might say that Mr. Sturdy qualifies very highly in that respect. His evidence has been most useful, and I am sure we are all very grateful for it.

Naturally, after that I expected a rather favourable report from that committee but I am sure it was the Leader of the Opposition who say to it that such a recommendation as this went before the parliamentary committee, and it was along this line: they objected to making these grants available to veterans settling on co-operative farms, for the reason that these were experimental venture of a different philosophy, of a new social order. What in the world that meant, I really don't know, but it served its purpose, and so we did not get co-operative grants for our veterans.

**March 24, 1949**

I was dissatisfied, naturally, so I asked permission, in correspondence with the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and permission was granted for me to appear before the special committee on veterans' affairs on July 16, 1946. The hon. Leader of the Opposition was chairman of that committee, but he saw to it, on this particular day, that he relinquished his chairmanship to the vice-chairman in order that he could sit among the members and make it very hot for the representative from Saskatchewan indeed. He proceeded to do so, and he muddied the waters, got us off the business of discussing co-operatives, and with what was going to happen to veterans in ten or 15 years time – an I will have more to say about that presently – with the result that grants were not recommended. I am sure, however, Mr. Speaker, that if the vote had been taken that day, when 25 members of that parliamentary committee were present, that it would have recommended that these rehabilitation grants be given to veterans who wished to settle co-operatively. But no, the vote was not held on that day but it was held on a subsequent date when all the other members, who had never heard the arguments, were present and, of course, it was voted down.

I am usually a good-natured type of individual, so good-natured that I am sure many of my colleagues think I am soft . . .

**Some Hon. Member:** — Hear, Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — . . .but I can be stubborn, and I was determined not to let this matter drop. I returned to the fray, and from July 16, 1946 until June, 1948, I tried every device known, in my limited powers, to get these grants through. It is significant that it was only after the Hon. Ian McKenzie became Minister of the Department of Veterans' Affairs, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition returned to Saskatchewan, that I got those grants through in June, 1948. I came to the conclusion that when the hon. Leader of the Opposition left Ottawa, what was Ottawa's gain was certainly Saskatchewan loss.

So much for those rehabilitation grants. I want to say that these rehabilitation grants were earned by our veterans by virtue of their services to this country in time of war, and they should not be the subject of political skulduggery, and so on, in having them withheld these several years.

I am sure that we are all alarmed at the relatively few numbers of our returned veterans who have been settled in agriculture, rehabilitated in agriculture, since their return at the end of the war; I mean relatively few veterans in comparison to the large numbers who wish to be rehabilitated in farming. I have come to the conclusion that veteran settlement on farms in the Dominion, and in this province, is slowing down to a snail's pace, and for very obvious reasons which I shall explain later.

After the First Great War, 27,000 veterans settled under the Soldiers' Settlement Board. According to the December issue of the Country Guide, less than 17,000 veterans have been settled on the land in this country since the end of the present war. And remember that there are a great many more enlisted men in the World War II than there were in World War I. We have some 4,000 veteran applications for settlement under our provincial settlement scheme that we have been unable to satisfy. The Veterans' Land Act probably have an equal, or a

still greater number, but according to The Leader-Post of March 8, only 6,470 loans have been approved up to the present time in this province, and if we subtract the 1,200 grants advanced to veterans on provincial lands up to that time, and loans advanced to veterans who already owned their farms, the number of veterans settled on farms purchased on their behalf by V.L.A. is not very imposing.

Under the federal Veterans' Land Act, \$6,000 may be expended on the purchase of a farm. Anything in excess of this amount must be provided by the veterans, together with ten percent of the \$6,000, or \$600. An economic farm unit cannot be purchased in this province today for \$6,000 or for anything like it. You can scan the advertisement section in any issue of The Leader-Post, and you will find this sort of thing that I am reading to you now. Here is one recent issue: farms advertised, three of them in the Regina district; one at \$50 per acre, another at \$60 per acre, another at \$65 per acre, with the notation that it is not high priced; another at Adams \$50 an acre; one at Grand Coulee for \$60 an acre; and so on. Well, let us examine this economic farm unit of 320 acres at Grand Coulee: 320 acres at \$60 per acre, \$19,200. Of this, V.L.A. would be prepared to advance \$5,400, which would leave the veteran \$13,800 to put in himself, together with supplying himself with a full line of arm equipment. These are some of the reasons why so few veterans who wish to farm are being placed on farms today.

Here is something else revealed in any advertising section of the daily newspapers, such as the one I have before me. Many of the farms for sale are of very high acreage. Here is one at Regina: 1,120 acres at \$65 per acre. Certainly no veteran could buy that. Another one: 960 acres; another: 800 acres; one at Fillmore: 800 acres; one at Froude: 800 acres; and so on through the list. I am informed that there is a 21 section farm near Rouleau. Now, if that is owned and operated by one, large, individual owner, and I venture to say he is a bachelor, that farm of 21-sections would support on a co-operative basis, 42 families without any trouble whatsoever.

**An Hon. Member:** — Why don't you try it?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Today, as I said, it supports only one family. Under co-operative farming it could readily support 42 families.

Let me give you another classic example. This was brought so forcibly to my attention because it is located very close to the Matador Co-operative Farm, north of Swift Current. This is another example of the trend in this province toward larger and larger individually owned, and highly mechanized farms. This farm, very close to the Matador, comprises 8,000 acres. It happens to be farmed by a bachelor. Originally there were many farms comprising that large, individual farm. There were actually two schools located on that farm, and there were 18 individual farms on that farm that is now occupied by one farmer. That is not good for the district and it is not good for the province. I would like to contrast that situation with the Matador Co-operative Farm on which, at the present time, there are 17 families, between 40 and 50 people living in security and happiness, with many of the amenities of life that we want to see them enjoy, providing for the development of the community, and that is the situation. The Matador Co-operative Farm will

**March 24, 1949**

presently have a membership of over 35 and within a few years there will be from 150 to 200 souls being supported on that one farm.

Unless this trend of large, individually-owned farms is replaced by co-operative farms, we will have a sparsely populated province of very large individually-owned, grain-producing farms. If the federal Veterans' Land Act will permit veterans to pool the \$6,000 purchase loads, thousands of landless veterans can be settled co-operatively and this will be a much healthier, happier and secure province.

I say healthier because, in my humble opinion, no agricultural economy can be healthy under large, single-purpose farms. There must be mixed farming and as wide a diversification as the farm will economically permit.

I say happier because people will not longer tolerate isolation of the individual farm, and I don't blame them. Co-operative farms banish isolation, and make possible the amenities associated with community living: electric power, plumbing, running water, community centres, schools, and so on.

Women are particularly enthusiastic about the co-operative farm organization. I listened to the Leader of the Opposition shedding crocodile tears yesterday over the fate of the farm women who are deprived of the benefits of such an amenity as electricity. Well, you know, if he will join with us and we can secure the rapid expansion of co-operative farms in this province. I will guarantee to him that every decently sized co-operative farm in this province will have electricity as well as many other amenities.

I am sure he must have been very impressed when he went to Carrot River, not to investigate co-operative farming but to find out what he could for election purposes – this was prior to June last year. He would have found, out in the sticks, 23 miles from the nearest town . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I sat here and wondered just how long you would let the hon. member proceed. He has undertaken to say why I went to that farm. He has not right to impute the reason why I went to that farm. On a question of privilege he had no right to say that. Were it that I have nothing but contempt for his opinion when he starts abusing me, I would have raised the point long ago.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member is expressing an opinion, which is often done in this House.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, do you suggest that if a person expresses an opinion, they can express the idea such as to mention that I went to that farm to have a look at the co-operative farming. He said I went there just for political purposes. He imputed motives to me. If your Honour rules that that is correct, well, then, I assure you that what is applied to that side, we will also make use of on this side, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — If the hon. member who has just spoken disclaims he went for any other purpose than to find out how it was going, I am sure the hon. member will retract.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to do that, but I must accept facts as I find them, and I was informed — because I was there two or three days after he was — that the hon. Leader of the Opposition did not call on the co-operative farm, either at River Bend or on the Sunningdale farm, other than to get directions. He never talked to a man, woman or child on those two co-operative farms, but he went on to the headquarters where the land clearance was under operation. Then too, he had a photographer from the Star-Phoenix with him, and he was not interested in taking photographs of the very large and efficient type of land clearance equipment we have there, but he would run across a bit of broken down machinery and say: “Take a picture of this.” And one of our buildings which happened to be a bit dilapidated — he would tell him to take a picture of that.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend was not there, and what he had retailed to the House is not correct. I did not take the Star Phoenix photographer along; he road along in the same vehicle; he was interested in my movements, that is all. I had nothing to do with the pictures he took. My hon. friend, after all, is a Minister of the Crown; he should not engage in fiction on the floor of the House.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Mr. Speaker, I was almost moved to tears myself yesterday over the sad plight he pictured of the women of this province who were deprived of electricity.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I know, you don't care.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — The hon. Leader of the Opposition would find in the project up there, which has just been operating for a year or so, there was electric light and electric power provided for those people. If he had gone into some of the pioneer farms that had been established under the Liberals 30 or 40 years ago, and had been existing there under 35 years of Liberal administration, he would not have found any electricity.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, might I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Do you wish the hon. gentleman to ask a question?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I am prepared to accept a question, and I can assure the hon. gentleman of a sensible answer, something I cannot get from the opposition.

**Mr. Tucker:** — My hon. friend suggests that, with respect to rural electrification in the province, that co-operative farms is the answer. Is he in favour of having this whole province brought under a system of so-called co-operative farming?



**March 24, 1949**

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I am just advocating the very large, individual farms being brought under co-operative farming for the benefit of the land hungry veterans of this province/

Years ago I had the very great privilege of living at Fort Qu'Appelle for a number of years, in the Qu'Appelle Valley, and that was in the vicinity of Mr. Gardiner's farm at Lemberg. On one occasion I visited him on his farm, and he has every reason to be proud of that very fine farm of his; but on thing struck me — that the electric power ran by his very door, 50 yards away from the house, and yet he had a wind electric. I called this to his attention and he informed me, and gave me a lot of arguments as to why people preferred the wind electric to the electric power. He ended up his argument by saying, and I can remember it so distinctly: "It is so very much cheaper, you know."

**Mr. Tucker:** — Were you a Liberal then?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — He said: "There is a lot of wind in this province, and it is so very cheap." After listening to the Leader of the Opposition for the past six weeks, I can only say how right Mr. Gardiner was.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Do you think that is funny? Were you there to be a candidate of his?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I would suggest a slogan for the rural =electrification programme . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — On a point of order, is that dealing with the resolution?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Yes, it is. It is just a suggestion. I have a suggestion, and I offer it in all kindness . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — If it is about wind, it isn't necessary.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I suggest that in their rural electrification programme they might have a slogan something along this line: "Buy wind electrics, we will supply wind."

**Mr. Tucker:** — You mean the government? Is that what you favour? You should put that in the Bill.

**Mr. Dundas:** — Are you going to put golf courses on these farms?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I would like to ask my friend for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Dundas) why a farmer should not play golf?

**Mr. Tucker:** — Sure, that's what he wants. Especially if it is free.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — The hon. Leader of the Opposition has been invited to visit the co-operative farms. He has been invited on more than one occasion to visit the Matador Co-operative Farm, but he has never seen fit to do so.

You know, the people who are most enthusiastic about the co-operative farms are the women, and I think they would not advise the hon. Leader of the Opposition to attempt to persuade the women that co-operative farmers were not good farmers. He might find himself in an even more embarrassing position, and a more dangerous position, than the hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. McCormack) who interfered with some ladies whose homes and livelihood were in jeopardy.

**Mr. McCormack:** — He said I interfered with some ladies. I will ask the gentleman to retract that statement. After all, he is a Minister of the Crown, and there must be some restrictions upon what he can say.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I withdraw, Mr. Speaker. I understand it was the women who did the interfering with the hon. gentleman.

I say that co-operative farming affords greater security because of a greater diversity in farming. Already the Matador, as an example in farming, has made a beginning in beef cattle, dairy cattle, pigs, chickens, irrigated gardens and the irrigation of 320 acres for crop.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Who did that for them?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Come depression, or any other economic disaster, they will have the security of their homes, of food, and of a happy, well-adjusted community life. You know, my friend, the Leader of the Opposition disregards history completely when he prophesies the failure of co-operative farming.

**An Hon. Member:** — Tell us about Russia.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — The fact is that co-operative farming is centuries old, leading back to the very beginning of agricultural history, and I doubt whether he knows that. The co-operative farming of today, as of tomorrow, will be the adoption of modern, scientific agricultural methods to the social instinct for mutual aid. That is co-operation . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — It sounds like Karl Marx to me.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — My hon. friend makes a play upon words; tries to confuse people with words, calling them communal farms, collective farms. He uses words for propaganda purposes, but he does not impress anybody except himself and his willing cohorts.

**March 24, 1949**

**An Hon. Member:** — He does not know what they are.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — You know, in the villages of the old country is the most permanent organization in history. Does my hon. friend know that? Yet the long history of working together of the village community, in the lands of our forefathers — from whatever country we originate — that is one of the most astonishing facts of history. History repeats itself, Mr. Speaker, and we are gradually, painfully, and against great odds, reasserting the co-operative way of life. The individualism, the competitive system with its mad scramble for wealth, for personal aggrandizement and privilege, is on its way out, and its passing cannot be too soon for the peace, prosperity and happiness of the world.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, what is the hon. gentleman reading from — the Karl Marx Manifesto?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Shumiatcher.

**Mr. Kuziak:** — You wouldn't know.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, when he cannot find any logical refutation of argument, he trots out communism and Karl Marx.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, what are you reading from?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — The hon. Leader of the Opposition has certainly had a lot to say, not only on our veteran co-operatives but on our veterans land settlement generally. The facts are that this government has settled more veterans on farms than has any other provincial government across the dominion of Canada. Here is a statement from the Country Guide, December, 1948. It is this: "2,625 veterans have been settled on provincial lands in the four western provinces, 90 percent of these in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan." In Saskatchewan, this government has allocated farms to some 1,700 veterans, so it appears that Saskatchewan has settled some 800 more veterans than the other three western provinces put together.

Now the members on your left, Mr. Speaker, and their political cohorts, have endeavoured to stir up dissatisfaction amongst our veteran settlers, stating that they should be granted ownership of their land, deeds to their lands, and so on. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has set himself up as the great champion of the veteran. Well, what is his record in getting ownership to veterans in this province and in the Dominion of Canada? You know, I am quoting from a press dispatch, Ottawa, dated June 18, 1948, just last year; "commons committee on Veterans' Affairs heard a delegation ask clear title for the 2,879 veterans of the First World War who still owe the government a total of \$3,124,000 for lands on which they were established as soldier settlers nearly three decades ago." What is the story? That almost three . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is going to go into this question, which is out of order on this debate, I must ask your Honour to have the right to reply to it.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Mr. Speaker, this matter is dealing with veterans . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The hon. member, as I understand it, has not spoken on this resolution yet, have you?

**Mr. Tucker:** — Yes.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Then someone else on your side can reply.

**Mr. Tucker:** — But, Mr. Speaker, I am just rising to a question of order. The hon. member is proposing now to deal with the question of giving clear title to veterans under the Soldiers' Settlement Act. I submit that this is not in order in this debate.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member who is speaking is relating this to his appeal for co-operative farms, and I think it is perfectly in order.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I am endeavouring, under considerable difficulty, to prove to the satisfaction of this House that our veterans have greater security, a greater degree of security in the tenure of their land that they ever had under the old system. It is an amazing thing, is it not, Mr. Speaker, that of the 27,000 veterans who settled on farms after the last war, that 16,000 were compelled to abandon their homes through debts, mortgages, and so on. That is a very bad record indeed, and that is the sort of thing we want to avoid under any policy which this province inaugurates. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition had been concerned about title to land for veterans, surely he would have seen to it that these 3,000-odd veterans, who had slaved on their farms for a period of 30 years, would have been granted title to those farms.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I think the hon. member is out of order now.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Continuing with this article, Mr. Speaker. The President and the Secretary of the Soldier Settlers Association . . .

**Some Hon. Member:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Mr. Speaker, am I going to be subjected to this type of interruption?

**Mr. Tucker:** — You have just been ruled out of order, that's all.

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, no I was just . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — On a point of order. First of all, I think you are quite able, your Honour, to keep order without the hon. gentleman opposite shouting order. I understood

**March 24, 1949**

your Honour to say that the reference to the question of the 2,700 veterans was departing from this, but the reading of this article, and the whole question of relative value and security under a co-operative, as compared with the Soldier Settlement Board, is a matter for proper discussion.

**Mr. Speaker:** — That was my ruling. My ruling was that what he was dealing with just at that moment was out of order.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I shall proceed.

“These two gentleman, officers of the Soldier Settlers Association, presented their case to the parliamentary committee and recalled droughts, depression, plague, financial vicissitudes, said that the settlers had been pursued with savage vindictiveness by the Soldiers’ Settlement Board.” And they went on to state: “At no time should the Board have been empowered to collect from the settlers until his food, shelter, fuel and other necessities had been provided for.” But it was so empowered, and left behind a trail of destruction, broken homes, hearts and untimely deaths. When these old veterans were endeavouring to get titles to their farms, after 30 years of effort, and a resolution was brought up in the House of Commons, who was the filibusterer on that particular occasion? It was determined that that resolution would be ‘talked out’, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition was selected as the filibusterer, and he carried on during the entire period of the debate, not providing for any vote whatsoever.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has again made a charge which he cannot substantiate. He could not make it in the House of Commons. Surely he has no right to make it against me here. That could have been brought up later. Mr. Speaker, on that question — I am speaking on a question of privilege — the hon. member has now made a statement that I engaged in a filibuster in the House of Commons. I spoke on that resolution and pointed out that the matter had been referred to a standing committee and would be dealt with there.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — I am speaking on a point of privilege.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Tucker:** — I am speaking on a question of privilege, and I have the floor, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — You are speaking on a point of privilege, and the hon. Premier rose on a point of order. Will you state your point of order?

**Premier Douglas:** — I am stating, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member now is seeking to enter into an argument rather than to state a question of privilege. The question has to be stated, and not debated.

**An Hon. Member:** — What are you doing?

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition is quite right if he is denying what the speaker has quoted.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. Minister said that I engaged in a filibuster in the House of Commons and prevented a vote on this question. I was asked, on behalf of the government, to speak on this question and to explain that this matter was going to go before a committee where it would be dealt with by the committee. There was nothing to prevent that matter being brought up again and ultimately reaching a vote had it been the desire.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Do I understand that your point of privilege is that you were not guilty of a filibuster? If so, the hon. member will have to withdraw.

**Premier Douglas:** — Hansard proves the opposite, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Tucker:** — You've no right to say that. The hon. Premier must withdraw that.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The hon. member stated on his own responsibility and if so we must accept his responsibility.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I withdraw, Mr. Speaker, at your behest. The fact remains that the hon. Leader of the Opposition spoke on this resolution, and he spoke at great length . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Not as long as your are speaking now.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** —In order to 'talk out' a resolution, they always select someone who is capable of speaking at great length without saying anything, and that is exactly what happened in this case.

**Mr. Tucker:** — It is happening now, too.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — When the hon. members of the House of Commons were asking for the hon. member to sit down and quit speaking, in order that a vote would be taken, he continued to speak until the bell rang, and so a vote was prevented, with the result that 3,000 'old sweats' continue without the deed to their land.

**Mr. Tucker:** — That is not right. Mr. Speaker, again that is not right. Had a vote been reached it would have just asked that the government give consideration to giving title, and they were giving that consideration anyway.

**March 24, 1949**

**Premier Douglas:** — That is all they'll ever get — consideration.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Yes, it has been under consideration for some 30 years, Mr. Speaker.

I am not going to belabour the question further. I think I have made my position clear, and I want to warn the members of the opposition that it will avail them little to try to undermine confidence in the policy under which veterans are settled in this province, because these young veterans are the sons of veterans who settled on farms after the First Great War.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take advantage of this occasion to express my appreciation to the present Minister of the federal Department of Veterans' Affairs, and to Brigadier Rutherford who is administering the Veterans' Land Act. They are very fine administrators and are doing an excellent job, and I really do like doing business with them. I am confident that if this resolution receives the support of the hon. members of the opposition we will have many of these very large, individually-owned farms taken over on a co-operative basis by the young veterans of our province.

I would like to sum up with these remarks: that the full implementation of the recommendations contained in this resolution would accomplish, first, the settlement of thousands of land-hungry veterans over a term of years in this province; secondly, it would provide for the gradual replacement of very large, individually-owned, highly-mechanized, highly-diversified co-operative farms, owned by our young veterans. And this would provide for a much larger rural population, a much happier and much more secure rural population. I don't know of anything that would serve to stimulate rural life than the establishment of a large number of co-operative farms in this province, and may I again emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that co-operative farming today is the application of modern, scientific agricultural methods to the age-old social instinct of mutual aid, for mutual well-being. I would like to express my gratitude and admiration to these young Saskatchewan veterans who are pioneering in this co-operative field.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister a question? You said that the members of the opposition did not read any of the reports that were issued and did not go into the history of co-operatives, or the kind of co-operative that you are trying to set up in the province. There is a report here . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — What is the question?

**Mr. Korchinski:** — I am going to ask the question right away.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Are you speaking to the motion?

**Mr. Korchinski:** — Yes, I will speak to the motion.

I have a report here on the research on co-operative and group farming, and this was conducted in the United States, and in quite a few other countries outside of the United States. As you said, co-operative farming, or communal farming as you are trying to start in Saskatchewan, is not a new thing. This report gives a history of communal farming in the United States, and the hundreds of attempts that were made in communal farming. Here are some of the examples. These are the names of some of the farms which were started in the United States, which later turned out to be failure: Friedham Farm lasted for one year; Fountain Grove Community Farm lasted for 25 years; Harris Spiritualistic Community Farm 49 years; Hopedale communities 17 years; House of Israel Community Farm 3 years. All these farms, and there are hundred of these, failed.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. This entire debate has been on co-operative farms and not communal farms.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — As was pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition, there is quite a difference between a co-operative farm and a communal farm. Co-operative farms are those where individuals own their own property and enter freely into an agreement to farm co-operatively; the kind of farm, as I understand it, you start is where the land is not owned individually but co-operatively, and the profits are shared so it is a communal farm.

**Premier Douglas:** — Oh, no.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — In the United States they tried this on a large scale. I would like to read from the Congressional Record of something that happened in the United States when they finally wound up some of these communal farms. This was by the Hon. J. Harry McGregor, and here is what he said: “Not even a whimper is heard from Washington as one of the New Deal’s . . .

**Mr. Buchanan:** — Mr. Speaker, I understood that the gentleman now speaking is speaking to a point of order and asking questions. After he got to his feet he started to make a speech. I was exercising my privilege as the mover of this motion to close the debate. After asking the question he proceeds to make a speech. I would like to know what his question is.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Your point of order is not well taken. I was just warning the House, and the hon. member had the opportunity and privilege to change his mind until you started your address.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — I would like to continue, Mr. Speaker, from the Congressional Record: “. . . free spending experiment into a more abundant life goes by the board with the auctioning off in Indiana of the remnants of the 600,000 experiment in co-operative communal farming. Deshee Farm was started in 1937 by the Farm Security Administration, which invested \$500,000 plus, and then \$100,000 more. It may get back now about 50 percent of the investment. The whistle blew . . .



**March 24, 1949**

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — May I ask a question, Mr. Speaker

**Mr. Korchinski:** — . . . for Deshee farms when Congress cut off further outlay, which was nit surprising in view of the report of the Coolidge Committee to the House describing some of the Deshee goings on that marked this effort to amend the folkways of a few handfuls of American farm families.” This is what the Committee said: “The co-operative or communal farm projects which were created, financed and operated by F.S.A., the committee said, had all been dismal failures. Any single witness familiar with the record admitted that such undertakings had been a great financial disappointment.”

Well, it did not work. Mr. Baldwin, who used to run the farm, is now Sidney Hillmans’ No. 1 boy in the C.I.O.’s Political Action Committee. I wonder if our Minister of Co-operatives will also be some No., 1 boy for a political action committee after this thing is over.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I will be very happy to answer that question, Mr. Speaker. In the first place the hon. member was not dealing with co-operative farms, he was dealing with communal farms. He said there were 600,000 of such farms. I would like to see that record of 600,000 farms. I challenge that statement.

**An Hon. Member:** — He meant \$600,000.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — I did not say 600,000 farms. I said \$600,000.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear! You weren’t listening.

**Mr. Speaker:** — He is now correcting himself.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — Mr. Speaker, it will be necessary for me to read over the report: “Not even a whimper is heard from Washington as one of the New Deal’s free-spending experiment in a more abundant life goes by the board by auctioning off the Indiana remnant of a \$600,000 experiment in co-operative farming.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — \$600,000 is not 600,000 farms.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Korchinski:** — “Deshee Farm, which cost \$600,000, was started in 1947 under the Farm Security Administration which invested half a million dollars plus, and \$100,000 more. It may get back now about 50 percent of the investment. The whistle blew for Deshee Farm when Congress cut off further outlay, which is not surprising in view of the report of the Coolidge Committee to the House describing some of the bizarre goings on that marked this effort to amend the folkways of a few hundred handfuls of American farm families. The co-operative farms, which were credited, financed and operated by F.S.A., have all been dismal failures. Every single witness familiar with the record admitted that such undertakings had been great financial disappointments. Well, it did not work, and Mr. Baldwin who used to run the F.S.A. is now Sidney Hillman’s No. 1 boy in the C.I.O.”

I may say that if Karl Marx had heard the remarks made by the Minister of Co-operatives, I think his bones would have turned in his grave, they would have been so happy.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Korchinski:** — The whole speech was nothing else but a further explanation of socialist and communistic propaganda, introducing collective farms into Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I would ask that those statements be withdrawn, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Tucker:** — They are his opinions and he has a right to them.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — Mr. Speaker, I am expressing my own opinion, that what the Minister is now proposing to do is to introduce collective farms into Saskatchewan on a large scale, and he is praising their merits, saying that life would be much more abundant in Saskatchewan if such was the case in Saskatchewan. We know what happened in Russia: millions of people starved when the Russian government introduced communal farms.

**Mr. Speaker:** — You mean that that is your opinion?

**Mr. Korchinski:** — That is true. It is a record of history. The Minister has not made the point clear of the difference between co-operative farms and communal farms. We advance the point that the farms he is trying to organize are communal farms, and he has not dealt with that subject at all.

**Mr. Tucker:** — He can't.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — Where the people own their own parcels of land and enter on a voluntary basis to co-operate to produce, that is a co-operative farm, but when the whole parcel is owned by the co-operative farm, it is a communal farm, similar to those now run in Russia.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Will the hon. gentleman permit a question? Would the hon. member tell the House what percentage of the farmers in Saskatchewan, at the present time, own their farms?

**Mr. Korchinski:** — I think nearly all of them.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — You think.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Kuziak:** — What about the mortgage companies?

**March 24, 1949**

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Let the hon. gentleman continue.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — In his speech, the Minister made attacks on the Liberal opposition. He spoke about things that had no reference at all to the resolution before the House. I think it is quite improper. Besides that, I wonder why there are so many resolutions introduced by the members on the opposite side on this type of legislation? I believe it is always the custom of the opposition to introduce resolutions, and for the other side to introduce Bills. Seeing that the federal election is likely to be held this year, the C.C.F. group is trying to make political hay by introducing all kinds of impertinent resolutions so that they would have something to bellyache about when the election comes around.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I think you had better keep to the resolution.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, has the hon. member introduced a regulation? There is nothing to stop him. He has been here six weeks.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — I may tell the Premier there was one sensible regulation introduced by the hon. member for Turtleford (Mr. Trippe).

**Premier Douglas:** — Why couldn't you think up a sensible one?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Please allow the hon. gentleman to continue.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — I don't think Mr. Speaker, there is very much to criticize in the speech of the Minister of Co-operatives because very little was said about co-operatives. It was mostly a political speech that he should have made under the speech from the throne, but he was late, and tried to do it right here.

**Mr. N. L. Buchanan (Notekeu-Willowbunch):** — Mr. Speaker, I had no idea, when I introduced this regulation that it was going to cause such a controversy. I felt that the idea of co-operation had been so well expressed by the people of Saskatchewan that the opposition, regardless of what political stripe it might be in this province, would support any co-operative idea, but the first speaker in the opposition, the hon. Leader of the Opposition at the very first, and throughout his entire speech, tried to confuse the issue, and possibly I did not express myself as well as I might have in trying to illustrate what I wanted in this resolution. He tried to confuse the issue, and he tried to suggest that what I was asking for in the regulation was the same thing as what had already been granted by the Department of Veterans' Affairs, under the V.L.A.

Let me reiterate what I said then, in order to verify what I intended to say at that particular time when I introduced that regulation. Under the present set-up of the Veterans' Land Act we have been able, since the Leader of the Opposition has no longer been the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs

Committee at Ottawa, to get the grant of \$2,320, given to veterans settling on Crown lands in the province of Saskatchewan, under the co-operative set-up. My resolution, as it was worded, was to so amend the Veterans' Land Act that by purchase agreements veterans who wanted to enter or form a co-operative farm could have the V.L.A. purchase this farm under purchase agreement and buy it from the V.L.A. under a co-operative organization. The two things are totally different. The \$2,320 is the amount which the federal government, under the Veterans' Land Act, forgives the veteran after ten years of farming under purchase agreement. Our Department of Reconstruction convinced the Department of Veteran's affairs that, if their idea was good, then this \$2,320 should be forgiven to the veterans settling on Crown lands in the province of Saskatchewan. Eventually, after the Leader of the Opposition relinquished his post of chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee at Ottawa, V.L.A. agreed to do this in the province of Saskatchewan on Crown lands.

This resolution asks that this principle be extended further, and that veterans desirous of forming co-operatives be given the same consideration on co-operative farms that they were given under the purchase agreement, on co-operative farms that were owned by the Crown in the province of Saskatchewan.

The Leader of the Opposition refers to these farms as communal enterprises, and he tries to draw a comparison between them and different religious sects. Now, these religious organizations that set up either communal or collective farms in western Canada were sects that had the idea that the entire world was opposed to them, and they were going to form a community, a province or a state apart from all the ills of the rest of the world. These veterans, on the other hand, realize the ills of the world, and they realize the type of country, the type of economic condition they are going to have to deal with. They approach things from a far different angle. They approach the thing from the fact that they have to sell their products the same as anyone else, and they have to buy the things they need in the same manner that everybody else in this country has to buy their things. In other words, they approach it in an intelligent manner. Who are we to decide whether they are right or whether they are wrong. If they want something in this way; if they have signified their desire, as I pointed out in no uncertain terms when I introduced this resolution, who are we to decide whether they shall have it or shall not have it? It is up to us to provide the way for them to achieve the things that they believe will work to the advantage of themselves and their families, so I introduced this resolution, being a veteran myself, and having worked with men who believed in collective work, who believed that in co-operation lay the answer to the things that they desire.

I introduced this resolution for another reason. I was born on a farm in the United States. I was raised on a farm only 40 miles south of Moose Jaw. I saw my parents struggle with conditions just the same as any other farmer in Saskatchewan. I saw them try to get ahead, to build a home for themselves, to educate their children, to build security for the future, and I saw in farming, such as we know it today, the difficulties that we have in building for the present and in planning for the future. From correspondence and contacts that I have had from men and women, not only veterans but civilians as well, I see in co-operative farming a possibility that we may be able to build a better life in that way on the farms of Saskatchewan; a more secure life than we have had in the past; and so I would like to see established at different points in

**March 24, 1949**

the province of Saskatchewan, co-operative farms that would serve as a lesson, whether it is good or bad, to the other people of Saskatchewan. I believe it will be good. The hon. Leader of the Opposition thinks it will be bad, but who are we to judge. Let us provide the opportunity for individuals, and if they want to try it, let us provide the opportunity to try it. Let us not forejudge the scheme to failure. Let us give them all the opportunity in the world, and make provision that if the thing is a failure they will have lost nothing by it. That is all this resolution asks for; that is all the by-laws of the various co-operative enterprises established under the Department of Rehabilitation in this province has provided for.

A co-operative farm, as we have established them in various parts, is not enough. I would like to see co-operative farms established in the various soil areas in the province of Saskatchewan. We have proven in this province that co-operatives in the various fields of endeavour have proven to be a success. Since making my initial speech on this resolution in the legislature I have received a number of letters, some of them from veterans and some of them from civilians. I would like to read one of these typical letters, for the record of the House:

Dear Mr. Buchanan:

I have listened to your broadcast today, and was very interested in your speech. Why just veterans in your co-operative farms? We were blown up in 1934 and have had nothing but poverty and hard work ever since. We are slowly getting a little better off, but I still wash clothes over a scrubbing board and tub, and my husband farms with horses. We bought the quarter-section we are living on, and now only owe \$1,300. It might not sound much, but we have raised four children, and we came up here destitute, and we have no debts. My husband works all the hours God gives him, and I try to do my share, but oh how we would like things a little easier.

Would it be possible for us to sell our land, and join in on a co-op farm? There are four or five of us around here very interested in it. We live 13 miles from town and in the winter community life is at a standstill. My husband's cousin belongs to a co-operative farm near Meskanaw, and says it is one of the best ideas on farming yet.

Thanking you in advance, I remain,

and so on. This person is not a veteran, but a civilian. I have received a number of letters from civilians and a number from veterans. I would like to make it clear to any civilian who might hear what I am now saying that I am definitely not opposed to civilian co-operatives, but I believe that through the V.L.A. we have an opportunity to set up co-operative farms which might be something of a lesson, or of an experience for civilians to follow in the future; something of an experiment that we can guide our experience by. We talked about rural electrification; we talked about community life; we see our school houses closing; we see our farmers going into the city and into the towns; we see rural life dying. I think, and I sincerely believe that co-operative

farming is the answer to many of these problems. That, Mr. Speaker, is the reason why I sincerely moved this resolution on veterans' co-operative farming.

The motion was carried on the following division:

**YEAS — 28**

Douglas (Weyburn)	Thair	Heming
Wellbelove	Darling	Dewhurst
Benson	Nollet	Stone
McIntosh	Howe	Erb
Brockelbank	Sturdy	Kuziak
Fines	Douglas (Rosetown)	Denike
Lloyd	Williams	Swallow
Brown	Gibbs	Willis
Gibson		Buchanan
Murray		Larsen

**NAYS — 19**

Tucker	Danielson	Loehr
Marion	Dundas	Banks
Loptson	Woods	McDonald
Prince	Trippe	Deshaye
Culliton	Egnatoff	McCormack
Patterson	Korchinski	Blanchard
	Cameron	

The Assembly adjourned at 10:55 o'clock p.m.