

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Eleventh Legislature**  
**5th Day**

**Wednesday, February 22, 1950.**

The House met at 3 o'clock p.m.

**DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY**

The House resumed, from Tuesday, February 21, 1950, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Wellbelove for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne, and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Tucker.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I should first like to commend the Leader of the Opposition for the very fine manner in which he delivered his speech, yesterday. I have listened to that same speech now for nine or ten times, and I think I have never heard it delivered better than he delivered it yesterday. I have listened to that speech so often now that I could prompt the hon. member when he gets stuck. I have often thought of offering my services to the Liberal Party so that if the Leader of the Opposition was ever indisposed, I could probably go out and deliver the speech for him. Although my hon. friend was a little annoyed, yesterday, that the members of this side did not applaud every time he quoted from the C.C.F. manifesto, he must remember that they have heard it quite often, and they have heard it quite often quoted by my hon. friend. While we regret that he cannot change the record at least we were very pleased, yesterday, that he had changed the needle.

The Leader of the Opposition took a good deal of consolation, apparently, out of the results of the three by-elections which have taken place in this province, and I am quite glad to let him get all the consolation he can because, as a prophet and forecaster of election results, he has had some very bad failures. He said, yesterday, that he was very pleased at the reaction of these people in these various by-elections. Well, let us look at these by-elections. The first by-election was the constituency of Cannington, a constituency where, in 1948, the Liberal candidate had a majority of 1,265, and where, in the general Federal election last June, the polls that were within the Cannington provincial riding gave the Liberal candidate a majority of 1,394 — and in the by-election, the Liberal candidate was elected with a majority of 631. In other words, his majority was cut to less than half. If my hon. friend is satisfied with that I can assure him that we are too.

In the constituency of Gull Lake, and my friends would have had some reason to crow if they had won that. When you consider all the P.F.A.A. inspectors that Mr. Gardiner put into that constituency, they should have won it. I am told that, in the last week of the campaign, they had to put pink ribbons on them to keep them from canvassing each other. In the Gull Lake constituency the Liberal vote actually went down over the previous June, and the C.C.F. vote went up by 351.

Now, yesterday, whenever the Leader of the Opposition ran out of something to say he said: no wonder the people of North Battleford did not

February 22, 1950

vote for the Government. Well, the North Battleford vote is interesting to look at. In 1948, the Liberal candidate was elected by a majority of 436, in the Federal election of last June, within the provincial riding, the Federal vote gave the Liberal candidate a majority of 759 – and in this by-election, the Liberal majority was cut to 138 so that, as compared with the 1948 election, the majority has been cut one-third, and, compared to last June, cut to about one-quarter of what it had been.

The Leader of the Opposition apparently was very pleased with the return in North Battleford, but the Liberal Press had something to say which I think is interesting. The Leader-Post said this, in its issue of February 10th: “The polls in which the C.C.F. recorded gains included a number in more remote areas which have poor highway facilities. However, the Federal Government might well ponder the results of Wednesday’s voting as it is not improbable that dissatisfaction over Federal policies may have influenced some rural voters.” The North Battleford News, which I have in my hand here, points out that the C.C.F. actually lost some ground in the city of North Battleford but that the Liberals had lost ground in the rural areas. It also points out that this was probably due to the marketing policies which were being followed by the Liberal Government at Ottawa. So, when my friend talks about these as victories – to hold a seat which he held before, but to hold it by only one-third of the majority which he had before – I don’t think there is very much consolation in that.

The Leader of the Opposition said, yesterday, that, frankly, he was apprehensive of the result in the North Battleford by-election. Well, he must have been apprehensive when he had to resort to the tactics of getting the member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald), who had gone up to help campaign for Conservatives, and who then, on the eve of the election, issued a statement, not through his own political leader, not by himself, but issued a statement through the Leader of the Liberal Party calling on the province of North Battleford to vote for the Liberal candidate.

**Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin):** — Do I understand you right, when you said that I went to The Battlefords to canvass for the Conservative candidate?

**Premier Douglas:** — That is exactly what I said, and I am prepared to say now that he double-crossed the Conservative Party. He sits in this House professing to be a Conservative and then goes out and asks the people of a constituency to vote against the Conservative candidate.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask that the hon. Premier withdraw that statement, and if there is any man in him, I think that he will.

**Premier Douglas:** — He sits in this House professing to be a Conservative and then goes out and asks the people of the constituency to vote against the Conservative candidate, and if you can find a more euphonious term than the one I have used, I shall be very glad to hear it.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, I would also like to ask that the hon. Premier also withdraw that statement.

**Premier Douglas:** — I have the floor. My hon. friend should just sit down. I have the floor. My hon. friend can have all the time he wants. My hon. friend can have all day, tomorrow.

**Mr. Tucker:** — My hon. friend has stated the position in which the member from Moosomin is sitting in this House. He has misstated it; the hon. member has the right to say how he is sitting in this House. He said he sat as a Conservative. Your Honor knows that that is not correct. He sits as a Liberal-Progressive Conservative.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I submit that he can do that in the course of the debate. I am not prepared to give way if the hon. member is trying to make his speech in the middle of my speech.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member cannot make a speech, but I am allowing him to state his position as to how he sits in this House.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, in order for me to state my position, I must tell a story.

**Some Honourable Members:** — Order! Order!

**Premier Douglas:** — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — The member from Moosomin has the floor.

**Mr. McDonald:** — When I was nominated prior to the Provincial Election in 1948, I stated at that convention that I would represent the constituency in the election as a joint candidate. After the election I announced to the Leader-Post my position: that it was the same as at the nominating convention, that I would represent the constituency as a joint Liberal-Progressive Conservative.

**Some Honourable Members:** — What are you?

**Mr. Tucker:** — I have a point of order here, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Premier retracted the statement and he gets up and deliberately makes the same statement the second time. I ask that he take that statement back.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The hon. member who was speaking withdrew that statement which I ruled was unparliamentary.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to accept the statement from the member from Moosomin that he is not here as a thoroughbred Conservative, but he is here as some form of hybrid, and if that is what he wants to be designated as, it is quite acceptable to me. I repeat that he went up to that constituency and that he who has always associated himself with the Conservative Party, went up and campaigned and asked the people of that constituency to support the Liberal candidate, and I have his statements here as recorded in the press in which he said, Mr. Speaker, this has been overdone. For fifteen minutes, Mr. Speaker, these gentlemen have taken up my time and there are no points of order at all.

**Mr. McDonald:** — I want to inform the hon. Premier that I never went up to The Battlefords by-election. If I had, we might have had over 138 majority.

**Premier Douglas:** — This is a statement handed to the press by the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Liberal Party, which statement was handed on behalf of Mr. McDonald, the member for Moosomin, in which he said

that he hoped The Battleford election would return a man of similar golden qualifications to those of the late Paul Prince whose death, last December, necessitated the by-election. Little wonder, Mr. Speaker, that after he had issued that statement that the Leader of the Conservative Party in this province issued another statement in which it described the tactics of the Liberal Party as being shoddy, and said that the Leader of the Liberal Party had taken advantage of the political immaturity of the member from Moosomin. That term – “political immaturity” – is a nice way of saying that he was still wet behind the ears.

In making his speech, yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition went back over the old ground again of seeking to confuse the people by labelling Democratic Socialism as being the forerunner of Communism. My friend talked a great deal, yesterday, about the fact that the C.C.F. was discussing Federal issues because they did not want to discuss Provincial issues. As a matter of fact, the Leader of the Opposition has never at any time discussed issues either Federal or Provincial. He has fought every Provincial and Federal campaign that I have known anything about, and I have been in political campaign ever since 1934; he fought them on the question of Communism, Socialism or something a good many miles away, that did not pertain to the issue at all. And that is what he has attempted to do in this case.

Now, ordinarily, I would not pay too much attention to statements similar to statements made by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday, but we are living in critical times and in times where there ought to be some clarification of thought on these very vital issues. I have in my hand, an issue of the ‘United Nations World’. In it is a very fine article written by A.A. Berle, who is the former United States’ Assistant Secretary of State. No one could call Mr. Berle a Socialist; as a matter of fact, in the course of the article, he points out that he is not a Socialist; but he takes the position that is increasingly being taken by thoughtful people all over the world. I do not usually weary the House with long quotations, but I think this is so apropos that I am going to quote part. Here is what Mr. Berle says:

“Outside the Iron Curtain, organized Socialism is a major non-Communist force. Either the governing party in power, as in Great Britain, or a party collaborating in a Government coalition, as in Italy and recently in France, or as principal opposition parties as in New Zealand and Australia, Socialism represents at least as many people as do non-socialist parties throughout the western world. When, therefore, any considerable body of American opinion begins to lump Socialist parties and governments with Communism, it is cause for concern. Able and sincere statesmen sometimes fall into this error. This conception, vigorously urged in some quarters, is so wide of the fact and so dangerous that it deserves an answer. We can smile a little at local American political campaigning, obviously a Conservative running for office may try to get some votes by attempting to identify a Liberal or a Socialist opponent with the Kremlin Communism. That is politics and need not be taken too seriously. When, however, effort is made to influence American foreign policy along those lines, the safety both of the United States and of the world organization is in peril. The demonstrable fact is that Socialist Governments and

parties do not lead toward a Communist state. They have, in fact, been the bitterest opponents of Stalinist Communism. There is no recorded instance in which assistance to a Socialist country has ever constructed any bridge toward Communist police-state organization. The most dangerous fact is, that if the United States assumes the view urged by Mr. Burns, America would isolate herself from much of the free western world, cutting adrift huge countries and territories which are now and will continue to be buttresses of freedom. At date of writing, one country is frankly Socialist – Great Britain – until a few days ago; two other vitally important countries, New Zealand and Australia, were likewise Socialist. During a recent shift both have elected Conservative governments. In Scandinavia, Norway is Socialist, while the Social Democrats hold power in Sweden. In Belgium, the dominant party is Christian Socialist, the second largest is old-line Socialist. The Netherlands is at present governed by a Catholic Party, but the next largest party, nearly equal in representation is the Labour Party, which is Socialist. Out of countries like those, world organization must be built. Regional defence arrangements like the Atlantic Pact must be erected and a free world defended. If we push into the Stalinist orbit every country in which Socialist parties are dominant or powerful, the United States is simply backing itself off the map.”

“I happen not to be a Socialist myself and do not argue the case for their beliefs, but I, like any honest student can say dogmatically that Socialism has nothing in common with Communism. A cartel or a large American corporation might find common ground with the Communist Commissar more easily than with a British or a continental Socialist.”

Mr. Speaker, I venture to draw attention to these facts because there is a good deal of loose thinking about the lines that are being drawn in international affairs, today. My hon. friend, yesterday, in order to buttress his argument, pointed to Czechoslovakia. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Socialists did not bring about Communism in Czechoslovakia. Everyone knows what brought about Communism in Czechoslovakia. You had a putsch by Communists in Czechoslovakia after the war, just as you had a putsch by the Nazis there before the war. I had the privilege, while in Ottawa, of speaking to Mr. Benes and Mr. Masaryk before they returned to Czechoslovakia to take over the Government there. Both of these men were perfectly well aware of the fact that their country was in danger. They recognized that, just as the Western Nations had not been able to help them before the war, if they were threatened by the Soviet Union, the Western Powers could do very little to help them after the war; but they were going back on the gamble that Stalin would keep his word and that there would be no interference with their territorial integrity or with their freedom as a nation. When the putsch took place by sabotage within the country and by armed intimidation from without the country, my hon. friend knows that Masaryk took his own life rather than betray

February 22, 1950

the people of Czechoslovakia into the hands of a totalitarian regime, and any man who criticizes the Socialists or Czechoslovakia is doing, in my opinion, a great wrong to some of the finest fighters for freedom in the world today.

My friend, yesterday, said he found some support for his argument by saying that, when the question of the Atlantic Pact came before the Provincial Convention of the C.C.F., it had not been dealt with immediately but had been tabled. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, there are two very simple reasons for that. The first is that there were a great many resolutions before the convention, and the matter of the Atlantic Pact is not a matter for a Provincial Convention but had already been dealt with by a National Convention. I have no hesitation in saying, as every person in this House knows, that there is a good deal of division about the Atlantic Pact. The Atlantic Pact cannot be taken as a touchstone to measure whether or not a person is pro-Communist or anti-Communist, because, while I personally am prepared to subscribe to the Atlantic Pact as probably the only thing we can do in terms of realism, there are scores of my colleagues who question (and I share their grave concern) whether or not the military containment of Communism will ever bring about world peace. The military containment by pacts, military pacts, may be necessary; but I do not think anyone will suggest that they will bring about world peace. There must be something a great deal more than military containment. I venture to suggest that the Marshall Plan has probably done more in Europe to stop the westward spread of Communism than the atomic bomb or all the military pacts ever signed.

I agree with the Mover and Seconder of the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne who suggested that, if we had been able to set up a democratic Government in China and spent some of the money which we are spending in armaments, in seeing that the people of China were fed and had some measure of security, they probably would have no Communist regime there. Not just Socialists, but freedom loving people the world over are coming to recognize that bayonets and military pacts alone will not stop Communism and, in the final analysis, Communism will have to be stopped by destroying the things that breed Communism – poverty, and misery, and insecurity, and repression and exploitation.

So I suggest, in all kindness, that a public man is doing a disservice today at a time when, in the world's history, the lines are being clearly drawn, when those of us who believe in political freedom ought to be joining hands with those who believe in political freedom and economic freedom. At least we have this in common: we do believe in political freedom and in certain basic human rights. All men who love freedom and democracy, no matter what other differences they may have, ought to be standing together in this critical hour, and I submit that the line of argument put forward by my hon. friend, yesterday, only serves to defied the people into confused public thinking and to play into the hands of the very Communism which he takes on hand to attack.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I think it is worth while stopping for just a moment to remember the basic political philosophy of Democratic Socialism. Capitalism is founded by the theory that man is an economic animal; that with the profit motive as an incentive hanging before him like the carrot before the donkey, he will work hard, and that, if society is unregulated, out of economic strife and out of the economic jungle, the smart and the strong and the ruthless will ultimately survive. Communism also believes that man is an economic animal. It also believes in strife –

and in regulated strife of class against class; and believes that the proletarians must ultimately crush out all other groups and dominate society in its own interests. The thing that these two have in common is that they both look upon man as an economic animal. I submit that the fundamental difference is that a Democratic Socialist looks upon man as a co-operative being, who believes that men were made not to fight with one another, but to co-operate in group activity. We believe that, if a group of men and women were adrift on a lifeboat with only a small amount of water and a small amount of food, they would not solve their problem by cutting each other's throats or by trying to throw each other into the sea, or by spilling the water in needless warfare; but that they would meet their problem by sitting down and dealing with it as a group, in meting out the water and the food in the interests of the people who needed it most – the children, the women and the weak – and that they would try to deal rationally and intelligently with the situation. We in the C.C.F. believe that economic competition is not inevitable to society, that man was born to enter into a social partnership with his fellows by which we could work together for the good of the group, because we believe that social security is the only basis upon which ultimately you can have either equality or liberty. While it is true that with the disillusion that followed the war, there was a great sweep toward the Democratic Socialist movements, and while it is true that, in the last few years, the capitalists of various countries (including our own) have become afraid lest their special privileges should be taken from them, and have organized the press and the radios and the polls, and have spent huge sums of money trying to confuse the public mind, to convince people that anything that even smacks of Democratic Socialism means Communism, I am convinced that type of campaign has played itself out, and I believe that, as we move further into the post-war period and as capitalism fails, as it has always failed, to produce economic security and as Communism fails to produce political freedom, an increasing number of intelligent people will turn to the Democratic Socialist movements.

I want to say just a word or two, first of all about the Dominion-Provincial Conference which was held regarding constitutional matters. I think that members in all parts of this House will agree that if we are to be a self-governing nation, we ought to have the attributes of a self-governing nation. Some of us have advocated for over fifteen years that appeals to the Privy Council should be abolished, and I am sure that we are all glad that they now are abolished. Many of us have advocated, for longer than that, that we should have in Canada the right to amend our own constitution. Well, at long last, action is being taken to that end. As the hon. members know, the Canadian Parliament has now taken unto itself the right to amend the British North America Act in every respect except those matters which directly affect the province – those affairs which have to do with education and language and with reference to the life of the term of parliament.

That means that the House of Commons can amend our constitution in certain respects. It means, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out yesterday, that in other respects our constitution can still be amended by an address of both Houses of Parliament asking Westminster to make certain changes in our constitution. The Prime Minister of Canada, consequently, called the Dominion-Provincial Conference on January 10th to see how we might transfer the right to amend the rest of our constitution over to Canada, so that it might be amended from time to time by the Canadian people themselves through their elected representatives.

February 22, 1950

The position which was taken by the Saskatchewan Government, I can put very briefly. I think I can probably do no better than to just quote from the submission which we made to that conference. It says:

“The Saskatchewan representatives have repeatedly stated their opposition to the compact theory as a general proposition, but we have a great deal of sympathy for the considerations that motivate those who hold this point of view. We take it that they are concerned lest a constitution which can be too easily changed, should result in the loss of those minority rights and basic freedoms which we now enjoy. It seems to us that this difficulty can be overcome by having certain ‘entrenched’ clauses which can only be changed with the consent of the House of Commons and every Province of Canada. We believe that these entrenched clauses should include the existing protection afforded language, education, solemnization of marriage, the principle of representation by population and the maximum length of the term parliament. We would go even further and urge that the entrenched clauses should include a Bill of Rights guaranteeing to every Canadian citizen, freedom of worship, freedom from arbitrary arrest and imprisonment, and those other basic liberties which are fundamental to a free and democratic society.

Having guaranteed certain minority rights and basic human freedom against change without unanimous consent, we would then be in a position to deal dispassionately with a more flexible procedure for amending those areas of the constitution which are of joint concern to the Dominion and the provinces. Apart from these fundamental rights (which I have already mentioned) we have never subscribed nor do we now subscribe to any theory which would demand unanimity of opinion as a prior condition for constitutional amendment. If this constitution is to be that of a democracy, then it must recognize the voice of the majority as the voice of the nation. We must insist that it shall be placed beyond the power of any minority to deny the validity of a decision reached by a majority of Canadians through democratic processes. The tyranny of the majority is of course, to be guarded against and would be provided against, by the entrenched clauses, but the tyranny of the minority, exercised through any power of veto, is not only to be guarded against, but to be feared. If political institutions are vehicles for social action, then the constitution is the roadway along which we must travel in pursuing our deliberations. We must exercise the greatest care to ensure that we are making it a broad highway and not a dead-end street.”



I think, Mr. Speaker, that sums up pretty well, the position that will be taken by the Saskatchewan Government delegates as these conferences continue. We feel that, while our present system of amending the constitution is awkward, we would prefer having an awkward method of amending the constitution, rather than having an impossible procedure. If any one province had the right to exercise the veto power so that no change could be made in our constitution unless every province agreed, we would be putting the Canadian people in a straight-jacket that would make social and economic progress impossible. As the hon. members know, the Attorneys-General of Canada have been set up as a working committee and I know that all hon. members will agree with me that our Attorney General will represent this province very well in that committee, and I can assure the members of the House and the people of the province, that when that conference re-convenes, we will do all in our power to help to work out some satisfactory modus operandi for amending the constitution of Canada within the boundaries of Canada.

Something should be said about the proposed Dominion-Provincial Conference which the Prime Minister of Canada has promised to call, this autumn. I do not need to go over, for the members of this House, the great amount of work that has been done on this whole question of Dominion-Provincial relations. It is now some twelve years ago since a Liberal Government in Ottawa appointed a commission known as the Rowell-Sirois Commission. I have one of the volumes of their reports here on my desk. All the hon. members, I am sure, in general terms at least, are familiar with their recommendations. They pointed out, for instance, that if welfare is to be established, the national income must be better distributed and a greater measure of social and economic security must be provided for those in the low income groups. They say, again, that it is important to note that some of the provinces are quite unable to meet their obligations and at the same time provide the social and educational services which Canadians have come to look upon as essential. Such a situation cannot leave other provinces unconcerned. Investors in other provinces will suffer in the case of public or private insolvency among their neighbours. The produces in other provinces will suffer if markets are destroyed. But more important than all these considerations taken together, is the danger to national unity if the citizens of distressed provinces come to feel that their interests are completely disregarded by their more prosperous neighbours and that those who have been their full partners in better times now tell them they must bet along as best they can, and accept inferior educational and social services.

I might quote many other passages, but I do not think that there is any need. The Rowell-Sirois Commission have recognized that, by the accident of history and geography, Canada has grown up in such a way that the provinces that came later into Confederation have suffered by means of our fiscal system; that the Central Provinces, where great industries were located and paid their taxes to the provincial governments, paid taxes on wealth which they did not make entirely in those provinces where they were located, but taxes on wealth which they made right across the Dominion of Canada, and yet the provinces where the wealth was made received no benefit whatsoever from that taxation. So the Rowell-Sirois Commission recommended that these taxes ought to be redistributed not on a per capita basis, but on the basis of fiscal need. They recognized that every Canadian citizen had a right to certain inalienable standards of social security whether they lived in a wealthy province or lived in a poor province; that every Canadian child has a right to certain minimum standards of education and welfare, irrespective of whether

February 22, 1950

they live in Ontario, New Brunswick or the Province of Saskatchewan. I need not go through the long history of what happened to the recommendations of the Rowell-Sirois Commission except to say that they were never implemented.

Following the war a Dominion-Provincial Conference on Reconstruction was called by the Government of Mr. MacKenzie King. The recommendations put before that conference were not the recommendations of the Rowell-Sirois Commission. They did not propose to give aid to the provinces on the basis of fiscal need; but they did propose at least to make some redistribution of the taxation and revenue from industry and corporations in the Dominion of Canada, and to pay it out of the per capita basis, and even a little better than a per capita basis in the case of British Columbia and Prince Edward Island. But the most important part of that conference was that the Federal Government proposed then that it would accept certain responsibilities: That it would accept responsibility for all able-bodied unemployed; that it would accept responsibility for all old age pensioners 70 years of age and over and pay them a pension without a means test, and 50 per cent of the responsibility for paying pensions to people between 65 and 70 years of age; that it would accept responsibility for 60 per cent of the cost of giving complete health insurance, and, finally, would undertake to help finance a series of public works projects in the event of unemployment.

The fact is, of course, that those proposals were never implemented. The Leader of the Opposition, yesterday, said it was most unfair to criticize the Federal Government for not implementing them because, after all, Ontario and Quebec did not sign the taxation agreements and they represent 50 per cent of the people of Canada. Yet I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in 1926, when the Liberal Government introduced an Old Age Pension Act, they did not sit back and say, "Until we get eight provinces, or provinces representing 50 per cent of the population of Canada, we will not pay an old age pension." They said, "Here is old age pension legislation, and any province that is willing to come and pay its share of old age pensions, the Federal Government will contribute their share." And not all provinces came into the old age pension scheme; but gradually they did come in, as the value of those old age pensions were demonstrated and as public opinion began to demand it.

I submit that, for the last five years, there has been a lack of leadership on the part of the Federal Government with reference to Dominion-Provincial relations. Here is this province and in the province of British Columbia, the people of these two provinces are paying the entire cost of hospitalization. I venture to submit that, if the Federal Government had paid 60 per cent of the cost of that hospitalization, as their proposal would have called for, the pressure upon the provinces of Ontario and Quebec to come into the taxation agreement and to come into a general health insurance scheme would have been tremendous.

Now, a new conference is to be called, and I can only hope that the Federal Government will, at that time, renew the proposals they made in 1945 along with some improvements. I think some of the things which the provinces need, are that, first of all, the provinces should have an exclusive field of revenue. Provinces' social services have been going up steadily. The Federal Government itself has been asking the provinces, for instance, to pay a share of housing, to pay a share of irrigation programmes, to pay a share of the trans-Canada Highway, to pay a share of the hospital construction programme, if we are going to have health insurance, we are expected to put up 40 per cent

of it. If the provinces are to have an increasing burden placed upon their shoulders, then they must have fields of revenue, and I am suggesting that one of the things that we will ask them when we go to that conference is an exclusive field of revenue for the provinces. We will ask an assumption by the Federal Government of the major cost of providing certain social services, particularly pensions for old people and health insurance. We will ask for the assumption by the Federal Government of the responsibility for the able-bodied unemployed and for an extension of crop insurance, because unemployment insurance does not help the farmer and, therefore, he ought to have something as a quid pro quo. So we suggest the extension of crop insurance, and we shall certainly continue to press for the Federal Government in implementing a programme of public works to take care of periods of unemployment whether they be seasonal or whether they be permanent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some reference has been made in the course of the debate, to the matter of the marketing of agricultural commodities, and it is only proper that this should have been done because, in a province like Saskatchewan, we are very much dependent upon overseas markets and our welfare is irretrievably bound up by what happens to the price of agricultural products. It should be remembered that, in 1934, the Conservative government of Ottawa passed a Natural Products Marketing Act. Subsequently, the Supreme Court and the Privy Council held that Act was ultra vires because it was maintained that while the Federal Government has the power to deal with inter-provincial trade and international trade, under 'property and civil rights' only the province can take delivery of commodities inside of the province and carry on intra-provincial trade. That has been got around, of course, by the Wheat Board by declaring every elevator to be at work for the general advantage of Canada, and, therefore, a Dominion matter; but on other trade it was held that the Federal Government could not interfere in collecting commodities inside of the province and marketing inside the province. Therefore, the Natural Products Marketing Act went out the window. We had no Natural Products Marketing Act and got along as best we could. Then the war came along. During the war, the Government was forced into national marketing, into bulk-buying and bulk-selling, into state trading, and with a good deal of success. The Federal Minister of Agriculture, speaking at the Board of Trade here in Regina, last month, said that the farmers could never have got a better price for hogs than they got under Federal marketing. I agree. Certainly that got them the best price for hogs. But the interesting thing is, Mr. Speaker, that as long as there were markets, the Federal Government were prepared to do the marketing; as long as we were in a seller's market, the Federal Minister of Agriculture said, "Let me do it." But when the markets began to dwindle and the prices began to drop, he said, "Now you do it!"

The Federal Minister of Agriculture says he has not got the constitutional power, now that the war is over, to carry on national marketing. Yet, Mr. Speaker, again and again at the Dominion-Provincial Conference, which began on January 10th, I raised the question of the provinces and the Dominion agreeing to a delegation of powers by which a province could delegate its powers to the Federal Government or the Federal Government could delegate its powers to a province, that would enable either one of them to carry on this marketing activity. But the Federal Government were not interested in the delegation of powers. I could not get them to even discuss marketing, and Mr. Gardiner was not even there; yet they say that constitutional difficulties stand in the way of national marketing.

Some criticism was made, yesterday, of the fact that the

Provincial Government passed a National Products Marketing Act in 1945, and that we had never set up a Board. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the facts are obvious. In 1945, we passed a Natural Products Marketing Act. It provided for the setting up of a Board to pass upon any producers' agencies that wanted to market their own products, and not one producers' organization in the province asked to be set up under the Act. Why? Well, because, what powers had they under this Act? They had the powers to accept delivery of goods and market them inside the province. Practically all of the farm commodities we produce had to be marketed, in major part, outside the province, we have no power to market outside the province, and there was no Federal enabling legislation and there was no Federal marketing board to which we could deliver and, therefore, not one producers' organization in the province of Saskatchewan was willing to set up a marketing agency. It was only when, this fall, with the collapse of the price of eggs, that the producers' organizations for poultry and for honey began to evince an interest and say, "Well, we are doubtful even yet as to whether this legislation, Federal and Provincial, can be of any value, but let us set it up and have a look at it." Mr. Speaker, we have to keep the records straight with reference to marketing. When we talk about a Natural Products Marketing Act, it should be remembered that, for 20 years in this country, the farmers, speaking through the Federation of Agriculture, have asked for a Natural Products Marketing Act which would set up national marketing boards, with the provinces passing enabling legislation to give those boards all the power a provincial board would have and from the Federal Government, they would get all the powers which a Federal board would have. Last year, on the eve of a general election, Mr. Gardiner gave the farmers an Agricultural Products Marketing Act, 1949, but he did not tell them what it meant. He did not tell them that it was not providing for the setting up of a national marketing board and asking the provinces to pass enabling legislation. What he did was to simply pass an Act which constituted enabling legislation giving the Federal powers to the Provincial boards, so that now, and I shall quote from the Act – Section 2 subsection (1) says:

“The Governor General in Council may by order grant authority to any board or agency authorized under the law of any province to exercise powers of regulation in relation to the marketing of any agricultural product locally within the province, to regulate the marketing of such agricultural product outside the province in inter-provincial and export trade.”

Now what are the producers faced with? We have had meetings with the farmer and co-operative and producers' organizations, and they say very frankly that these powers given to provincial boards and producers' organizations under the Federal legislation, leave them in an impossible position: eight or nine provincial boards, each setting up producers' marketing agencies, each of them having power to market inter-provincially or internationally. While it is true that if the provinces could get one board to act for several provinces it would cut down on the number of boards, surely, Mr. Speaker, it was never envisaged that producers' marketing agencies should take the place of the Federal Department of Agriculture and the Federal Department of Trade and Commerce! Surely the thing that the farmers are asking for is the thing that ought to be done and it is that there ought to be national marketing boards and that these marketing boards would get their power from the Federal Government plus power through provincial enabling legislation which would enable them to adequately market the products of the farmers of Canada. So we are greatly concerned about this problem, Mr. Speaker, as I am sure every person is who is

interested in the welfare of Saskatchewan and of Western Canada. We in the Government shall continue to press for the Federal Minister of Agriculture to convene an Agricultural Marketing Conference, because I have no doubt at all, from the things that have transpired at the Niagara Conference, as to what kind of marketing legislation the organized farm movement wants in this country. We think there should be a conference on marketing of farm products between the Federal authorities, the provincial authorities and the co-operative and farmers' organizations right across the Dominion. The second thing we think is that, in addition to these national marketing boards, marketing farm commodities, the Federal Government should implement as a permanent feature, without any further delay, their price support legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn for a few minutes to the question of the development of the natural resources of this province. As I said a few moments ago, the C.C.F. believe that life is a social partnership. We do not believe that life is an economic jungle. We believe that the people of any society can co-operate together to produce the things they need for a better life, to share and distribute them fairly, to provide work for those who want to work and security for those who, due to some misfortune, are unable to work. For that reason we, therefore, believe in the social development of our natural resources. We believe that our resources should belong to the people of the community, whether it be the province or the nation, and we believe that in the development of natural resources, the people should be the main beneficiaries of that development.

There has been some criticism by the Leader of the Opposition of the Government's policy with reference to the development of natural resources. One moment he quotes the Regina Manifesto and the next moment he criticizes the actions of the Government. The first thing to keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, what my hon. friend has apparently forgotten, is that a provincial government has a very limited field of jurisdiction, that there are things which you can put in a national manifesto for a federal government to do, but they are not applicable in the case of a provincial government. A provincial government, for instance, has only two sources of revenue; it can either tax the people for money or it can borrow money. It has not the power which a federal government has of issuing currency and credit through its own central bank. Therefore, when we look at policy of developing natural resources, we must keep in mind the natural limitations which are placed upon any provincial government.

Now, a provincial government has three alternatives with reference to the development of natural resources. The first is that they can alienate all the resources by turning them over to private enterprise and saying, "You go ahead, explore for them; if you can find them and develop them they are yours." Now, that policy, this Government will not follow. Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition said the big oil company that discovered the Leduc Field was driven out of this province by the C.C.F.

**Opposition Members:** — That is correct.

**Premier Douglas:** — All right, we will see how correct it was. They were not driven out of this province, but they left this province because we were not prepared to give things away to them as they had been given to them by the Liberal Government. They were getting a much better deal from the Liberal Government than any company has ever been able to get in

this province since this Government came in. After these people had left, they finally decided that they would like to come back, and they came and they offered an agreement, and I have a copy of that agreement here. They offered an agreement to this Government, an agreement which was immeasurable better than they had ever had to sign under a Liberal Government, but an agreement which would have paid the people of this province on a pro-rate basis, less than one-tenth of what we are getting under the agreements signed by others who have come in to look for minerals in this province, and an agreement in which they wanted it stipulated that they did not have to drill. The plain facts are, Mr. Speaker, that the particular oil company of which my friend speaks, having found two large oil fields in Alberta, did not need any more oil.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Now that he has referred to this agreement, I suppose that he is going to table it.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to give my friend a copy, but there is no need for me to table it because it was never signed. We would not sign such agreement and, therefore, it is not an official document; but I shall be very glad to give my hon. friend a copy of it. He will be very welcome to it and, as a matter of fact, he can get one from his friends, I am sure, in this oil company.

**Mr. Tucker:** — There are no more friends of mine than these American companies are of yours.

**Premier Douglas:** — If my friend will just sit still for a while. I listened to him for an hour and a half, yesterday, without interrupting him more than once. If he will just sit still, I will be glad to enlighten him to the best of my ability. The fact is that this oil company, having two large oil fields in Albert, does not want to find oil in Saskatchewan, because oil in Saskatchewan will be several hundred miles closer to market than where their other fields are. My friend talks about them being driven out. They were not driven out, but this Government is not going to give things away as was done by the previous administrations.

The second alternative which faces a provincial government in the development of natural resources, is for the provincial government to develop those resources themselves. And that, Mr. Speaker, we believe in doing insofar as the financial capacity of this province will permit. That is why we are spending money in development of power in this province, why we are spending money in developing sodium sulphate resources and the clay resources. I will tell my friend about the sodium resources. Sometimes there is a lot of laughter and it certainly betrays ignorance, Mr. Speaker, but I don't intend to sit here and be the laughing-stock. The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has pushed to the very ultimate of the financial capacity of this province the development of natural resources by the people through their provincial government.

Now, we recognize that there are limitations to what a provincial government can find the necessary capital to develop. It would take probably fifty to one hundred million dollars to carry on an exploration programme and even a partial development programme for oil and minerals in this province, and, before a complete development programme could be carried out, much more than that. That would mean not only taking a terrific debt upon the people of Saskatchewan, but it would also mean asking them to invest risk

capital, not just to develop resources, but in some cases even to find out if we have resources. We do not know how much oil there is, and we do not know whether there is any oil of a high gravity. We have to find out; and so we have taken the position that for a government in this province to take huge sums of money and invest it in looking for oil and looking for minerals would put this province into a financial position which would jeopardize its security.

The third alternative, Mr. Speaker, is to combine one and two. The third alternative is to say that we will allow private interests to come in here and look for minerals, that if they come in we will give them security on two points: One, that if they find certain resources, they will be allowed to develop them, and secondly, that if they set up the machinery for developing them, they will not be expropriated. Those two categorical assurances have been given and I repeat them here, this afternoon. We have said that, while we are allowing these people to look for these things and, if they find them, to develop them, the interest of the people of the province must be safeguarded and looked after. So we have said that 25 per cent shall be reserved to the Crown if an area is proved a field; up to 15 per cent of oil shall come back as a royalty. Between those two, it means that in any oil field discovered in this province, one-third of it will belong to the people of Saskatchewan. Now, I grant you, the scheme will stand or fall by what we do with that one-third. I think it is too early yet to make any statement, but I am sure the people of this province will accept my statement when I say that they can be absolutely certain that, in the event of oil being discovered in this province, that third which by law belongs to the people of Saskatchewan will be used in such a way as to protect the interests of the people of Saskatchewan and particularly the consumers of Saskatchewan.

My hon. friend criticized this policy, yesterday. He is very hard to satisfy. Other years, when he made his speech in this House, he complained that nobody was coming into the province, that nobody would come in; they took one look at my face and then ran away. Now he is complaining because they are all coming in. Here they are coming in from the United States, spending their money; here they are pouring in from all over. A year ago it was a joke because I was going down to New York to see these people; now it is a terrible thing that these people are coming in from outside! My friend has a very difficult time with his logic. One moment he says, "Why, you're giving everything away," and the next minute he says, "Why, these things you are giving away, you can take them all back again." Now, we cannot have it both ways. My friend had better make up his mind which side he is on. We cannot be taking it away from the people with one hand and going to take it away from the capitalists with the other. My friend, yesterday, did his very best to create doubt in the minds of the people who want to invest money in this province. My friend talks about the C.C.F. scaring away capital. I want to say that it is the irresponsible and rash statements that have been made by him and some of his colleagues that has tended to keep capital out of this province.

Then he stood up, yesterday, and said, "The Premier is responsible to a convention and whatever the convention tells him to do, he has to do." Well, that is right, because the convention elected me – just as my friend has to do what Mr. Gardiner does, because Mr. Gardiner made him the Leader.

February 22, 1950

**Mr. Tucker:** — If my friend is trying to be funny as usual, of course, I shall pas sit over; but after all, Mr. Speaker, we are in a serious Assembly here and when my hon. friend makes a statement like that I want to tell him that he states what he knows to be false, and he knows what I am calling him when I say that, and I ask that he withdraw it.

**Premier Douglas:** — I have nothing to withdraw, Mr. Speaker. the hon. member knows the facts as well as I do. Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend here tried to create the impression that these people who were coming into the province to look for resources . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I asked my hon. friend to withdraw that unequivocally.

**Premier Douglas:** — I will not withdraw it, Mr. Speaker, I have no reason why I should withdraw it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, it is the same statement; he takes the responsibility for exactly the same as you made the statement in regards to him taking orders from some other authority.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I deny taking orders form anybody at all outside of the party in this province and my following here, and my hon. friend has no right to make that aspersion against me, and I ask that he withdraw it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member has perfect right to make a statement on his own behalf.

**Premier Douglas:** — My hon. friend tried to create doubt in the minds of the people who are investing money in seeking to find resources in this province and develop them for the benefit of the people of this province.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I pointed to your own legislation.

**Premier Douglas:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, when he points to the fact that I take my orders from a convention, I want to remind him, and want to remind the people who are interested in putting money into this province, that when I and my colleagues gave a categorical assurance to them that if they came and spent their money in looking for resources here an dif they found them in the development of those resources, we would give them security. We gave them that assurance with full backing of the C.C.F. movement, and the C.C.F. movement will never ask us to withdraw the pledge which we have made in full honour.

My friend, yesterday for the first time, has told us what his policy is with reference to the development of these resources. Up until now we have never found out; but yesterday the Provincial Treasurer asked him, "What would you do?" And he gave his answer. He said that he would do just what we are doing! — with one exception. He would give, he said, twenty-five per cent Crown reserve; he would reserve twenty-five per cent for the Crown and he said a 12½ royalty — I imagine that means the average of royalties up to 15, but it is an average of 12½ per cent. Now that is interesting, because he spent a good bit of his speech saying, "Why, the Manifesto said you should take over all the resources, now you are just going to hold 25 per cent of the resources, so you are just one-quarter Socialists." But when we ask him what



he will do, he said, "I would do just the same. I would reserve 25 per cent for the Crown." Therefore, my hon. friend must be a quarter-Socialist – but I do not know which quarter. I strongly suspect it may be the hind quarter, and that would be a lot of Socialism. The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend made one statement that I think the oil companies and investors of this country will do very well to notice. He said he agreed with us about the 25 per cent reserve; he agreed with us about the royalty: "But I would not give out rights to other people that they could turn around and sell to somebody else at a big profit." Is my hon. friend saying now that the Liberal Party are opposed to those who have permits or those who have leases being allowed to sell them with the consent of the Minister? Does my hon. friend mean that he is going to interfere with the free right to enter into contract?

**Mr. Tucker:** — I said I would not make a deal without calling for tenders.

**Premier Douglas:** — My hon. friend said he would not give these people the right to turn around and sell them. In other words, here is a man who comes along, gets a permit; he spends \$50,000 doing the geophysical work and the seismographic work and runs out of capital. He can do one of two things, if my friend had his way; he can either just walk off and lose his investments, or he can just sit there and get no further developments. Surely that man has a right, in view of the fact he put \$50,000 in there, to come to the Minister and say, "I've got a chance of a larger firm who are prepared to buy out my equity and to continue the development of the resource, which we have every reason to believe is there," and the right to retain part of the investment which he put into it and also to get further exploration and further development. I want to say there is not a Provincial Government in Canada that does not give to the investors the right to sell, with the consent of the Government, any of their permits or any of the leases which they hold.

**Mr. Tucker:** — The hon. gentleman knows the deal I was referring to, very well.

**Premier Douglas:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about another form of social partnership. A little while ago when I talked about the fact that the Government believed in the development of the resources by the people themselves, through their Provincial or municipal government, some of my friends across the way laughed. I want to say that this Government has a record of developing our natural resources through public investment of which it need not be ashamed. Our Crown Corporations over the last year have continue to make steady progress. I was perfectly frank with the House, last year, and perfectly frank with the country, in saying that it is no easy task to develop resources or to build up industries in this province. If it had been easy, I am sure the Liberals during the 34 years they were in office would have done some of it; but it is not easy. As a matter of fact they did make a couple of tries. They put a quarter of a million dollars, along with the Manitoba and the Federal Governments, who also put in a considerable amount, into a briquetting plant at Bienfait, and then sold the whole thing for a dollar. They set up a Power Corporation which after 16 years, still had an accumulated deficit when we came into office. So I am quite willing to admit that the development of industries in this province is fraught with difficulties; but we have never suggested that everything we tackle would be a success, that it would be very easy to get these industries under way. What we have said is that if this province is ever to have any variety, if our economy is not to continue to be a one-commodity economy, then we must start to develop some of the resources of the province.

Last year, I pointed out to the members of the House that there were two or three of these industries that were giving us a good deal of concern. I am glad to be able to report that some of them show an improved position. There are still two that are going to take a good deal of work to make a success of. The first is the Woollen Industry: the amount of sales is up, and production is, we believe more efficient. We are now getting into the cutting trade in Winnipeg, and I am sure the members of the House have seen in the press that, the other day, one firm in the cutting trade from Winnipeg had established a business in Moose Jaw for the purpose of using the product of our Woollen Mill. Now, that does not mean that it is on the road to success. The woollen trade is a highly competitive industry, and we are up against many hazards – we are far from markets, we have to break into markets; but the fact has remained that when the Leader of the Opposition, head of a party that did nothing about industrial development, comes and waves the whole thing aside and says, “These wasteful and extravagant experiments,” well, Mr. Speaker, it will be interesting to tell the people of Moose Jaw, who are hoping, as we all are, that we will have in Moose Jaw eventually a clothing industry built around that mill, that it is an extravagant experiment.

The other industry that is giving us, and will continue to give us, some worry is the Clay Products. Our sales for the production of bricks is going up steadily, but, very frankly, the cost of so much hand-labour makes it a difficult proposition and there is need for installation of more up-to-date and time-saving machinery. That is one of the things that will probably be discussed in the Crown Corporations Committee. But again I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, we have in this province not unlimited natural resources. We have not got big timber stands; we have practically no hydro-electric power except in the far north where it is inaccessible, but we have in Saskatchewan very large clay deposits, clay deposits which for years have been going to Alberta and other parts of this continent to go into the ceramics industry. Surely then it is worthwhile for the people of this province for us to do everything we can to develop a ceramics industry here if we are going, in that way to be able to dispose of some of our natural resources, give employment to the people, and add to the wealth of the people of this province.

Some of my friends laughed a little while ago, when I mentioned the Sodium Sulphate Plant. The Sodium Sulphate Plant just started into operations a little over a year ago. Every time it has to close down for an overhaul because it works 24 hours a day, the Liberal Party have a celebration all over the province.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Not as great a celebration as at the opening.

**Premier Douglas:** — The fact remains that the Sodium Sulphate Plant is today producing the finest grade of sodium sulphate that has ever been shipped out of this province. We have letters from those who use it, from various parts of Canada, to that effect. In the early part of the year sales fell off. They fell off for the very obvious reason that the paper companies which use sodium sulphate in the manufacture of paper stocked piles of sodium sulphate because they expected a shortage. There was a bit of a depression in the paper industry and, for quite a while, paper companies were not buying sodium sulphate; but in the latter part of this year orders have been picking up. A number of long-term contracts have been sold and the sales

are over those of the preceding year. I think we are not in the place where the Sodium Sulphate Plant is definitely past the experimental stage and is a definite economic asset. I may say that for the first time in the history of Canada, sodium sulphate from Saskatchewan is now getting into the Pacific market not only in the province of British Columbia but in the northwestern states of the United States and that despite of the fact that we have a very discriminatory freight rate against us. If that freight rate could be ironed out (and we are hoping it will be) we shall most definitely be into that field, and we are the only company that so far has been able to go into the Pacific Coast field in competition with the big monopoly sodium sulphate producers from California.

I am not going to go over each of the Crown Corporations although some mention was made, yesterday, of the Transportation Company and probably I should say a word in explanation. When I was at North Battleford somebody asked me, as my hon. friend said yesterday, whether or not the Transportation Company had lost money. Now, my hon. friends know perfectly well that any of these Crown Corporations, like any other business, take off monthly statements and take off quarterly interim audited statements. I quoted an audited statement for the last quarter which was about August, 1949, which showed at that time that the Company had made something in the neighbourhood of \$100,000. That was not at all inconsistent, but my statement to the hon. member, the other day was that the final statement had not been audited. The final statement has not been audited, but I can tell my hon. friend that, from the interim statement that has been taken off, there is every indication that the Transportation Company for this last year will show a surplus in the neighbourhood of \$120,000.

Something was said yesterday, too, about the Power Corporation. I often wonder, when I listen to the Leader of the Opposition talking about the need for rural electrification, where he has been for the last twenty-five years, because we had a Liberal Government in Saskatchewan for thirty-four years, and when they went out of office in 1944 there were 135 farms electrified by the Power Commission. Yet my friend gets up, yesterday, and makes a statement about the need for the many things in the farm home, the need for power, the fact that the farmers have a right to power! We all know they have a right to power, but what was the Liberal Party doing for thirty-four years about getting them power? Doing absolutely nothing. As a matter of fact there was not any proper power system in this Province until this Government came in and bought out the Canadian Utilities and Dominion Electric and the Prairie Power company and welded them into a power system. As my colleague, the Minister of Public Works, (Hon. J.A. Darling) pointed out last year, even after you buy out these companies, that does not mean that you can start rural electrification. There are hundreds of miles of heavy transmission lines that have to be built to take the power out to these places before you can start casting it off to the farmers. Yet, in spite of the fact that that work had to be done and is being done, and as there were only 135 farms electrified when we took office, today you have over 2,600 electrified, 1,200 of them electrified during this past year, and that programme will be continued. You have now customers for the Power Commission running up towards 60,000, and you have, in the last year, 47 more towns and villages given power and over 400 miles of transmission line that has been built.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, there is not any need for anyone to apologize for what this Government has done about developing the resources of the people of this province, or developing services for the people of this

province, such as through the Insurance Company or the Telephone Company or through the Saskatchewan Air Ambulance. We are giving services to the people, we are developing our natural resources, we are giving employment to our people and; incidentally, last year, taking even the losses, including the losses of the Fish Board, which was largely a relief proposition, our interim statement will show, and I think it will not be far out in the final audited statement, that these Crown Corporations, after depreciation and reserves have been set aside, will show a return of over \$3,000,000 in surpluses, or about 7½ per cent on the capital invested.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say that there is one other form of social partnership in which this Government believes. Not only do we believe that the people wherever possible ought to develop their own resources federally, provincially, municipally, but we believe in social partnership through the co-operative movement and, certainly, there is not any province in Canada where producers and consumers alike have done more to mitigate the unfavourable economic conditions under which they live by co-operative action than have the people of the province of Saskatchewan. I want to say to the members of the House that I think one of the most thrilling experiences I have ever had was attending the first annual conference on Co-operative Farms that was held in Saskatoon, this fall. It is just five years since a group of returned men, along with my friend the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. J.H. Sturdy), some representatives of the D.V.A. and the University people and Farm movements, gathered together to talk about the possibility of co-operative farms. In those days it was a dream; but it is no longer a dream. As we sat there in the Agricultural Building at the University, representatives from the Federal Government, from the University, from the farm organizations, from the co-operative movement, heard young men and women from these co-operative farms and from the co-operatives for the use of farm implements discuss what they had done. Seventeen organized co-operative farms now operating in the province, put their books before the agricultural experts, demonstrated the fact that they are producing more cheaply and more efficiently, that they are enjoying more of the amenities of life, that they are able to have social contacts that otherwise would have been impossible. But more important in my opinion, they are helping to develop and devise a new way of life, a way of co-operative living by which people learn to live together and several for the old-timers who were at the conference came to me afterwards and said, "I wish I were in my twenties again." These boys are the pioneers of the twentieth century; they are pioneering in a new way of living.

I was particularly interested in the co-operative use of farm implements. I think they are going to be particularly useful in the area of the province where we have small farms, where the farmers cannot afford the expensive and heavy machinery usually used on big farms; if they work co-operatively they will be able to buy that kind of machinery. Figures were produced to show that they could produce more efficiently, could produce more cheaply and could get the work more speedily done and what was of most interest to me was that there were a number of cases where men had been ill and by simply paying the Co-operative so much per acre their crop was put in and taken off. I came across one or two cases where a man had died and his wife and family were continuing to run the farm by simply paying the Co-operative to come in and put in their crop and take it off. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that our people in this province, co-operatively minded and co-operatively conscious as they are, are probably doing much to lay the groundwork of a new pattern for co-operative living to which, some day, people all across the Dominion of Canada will look back as being one of the great pioneer steps of the twentieth century.

Mr. Speaker, there is just one other thing I want to say about this question of social partnership and it is that social partnership also expresses itself in social services and in social welfare; that when a society works together for the common good it rewards people for their labour or ought to reward them for their labour according to what they produce, for the service they render. Yet there are people who cannot produce; there are people who are unfortunate and who are the responsibility of society. No one has ever suggested, although one hears it often said, that we in the C.C.F. believe that there are unlimited resources to go towards looking after the needy. Not at all. But we have said that the community has a social responsibility toward the unfortunate. We cannot spend money that we have not got; we cannot distribute wealth that is not created, and the amount of social welfare that we can distribute will depend upon production; but we are saying that out of production society has a responsibility to take a part of production to look after the needs of the people who cannot look after themselves. That has been the policy of this Government for the last five years. We have gone into almost every field of social welfare and raised the standards for the benefit of the people of this province.

My friend, yesterday, tried to make some comparisons about what we had done with the extra money we received under the Dominion-Provincial grant, or Dominion-Provincial subsidies, or taxation agreement. He said, "why we are getting an extra seven million dollars. Why", he said, "in Manitoba they give three million of it to the municipalities!" Well, Mr. Speaker, it was very unfortunate he selected Manitoba. We have given a great deal more than three million dollars to the municipalities. Let me give a few illustrations for my friend as to what has been given to the municipalities in this province.

Since this Government took office, the grants to schools have been increased by over two million dollars; the care for old age pensioners, blind pensioners and mothers under the mothers' allowance scheme costs the Provincial Treasury over one million dollars a year. That is not paid in Manitoba. In Manitoba that service has to be given to the people by the municipalities. This province provides a bonus to old age pensioners over and above the pension they are entitled to from the Federal and Provincial Governments; that is not paid in Manitoba. As a matter of fact in Manitoba, up until a very short time ago, they charged part of the old age pension back to the municipality, something which has never been done in this province. Our expenditures for social welfare for neglected children increased by more than a million dollars. I want to remind hon. members that our annual payment, each year, to the Federal Government for the seed grain advances made to farmers and municipalities by this Provincial Government is \$700,000 a year. There are annual payments on treasury bills for relief owing by farmers and municipalities of \$1,200,000 a year, but this year, it is anticipated that we will have to spend \$500,000 in paying the Federal Government for 1938 seed grain payments which farmers and municipalities will be unable to pay because they have had no crop. I want to remind the hon. members that when we cancelled the 1935, the 1936 and 1937 seed grain we took \$21,833,000 of debts off the municipalities and off the province, that the total amount of seed grain advances for 1938, \$9,973,000 was cancelled, and the old seed grain debts running back to 1717 amounted to \$7,381,000. We have paid the banks for seed grain which the municipalities owed – a total bill of four and a half million and we paid \$3,600,000 of it, and it is expected we will be able to pay the \$900,000 this year. Those were debts not only by the Provincial Government, but owing by municipalities and farmers.

My friend talks about Manitoba. We have paid out to the municipalities of this province over a million dollars to help them build hospitals; he did not tell us what Manitoba has paid – they have not paid construction grants on hospitals. We have paid out to the hospitals of this province under the Hospital Services Plan ten million dollars a year. Half of that or less came from the Hospital Tax, the other half came out of the consolidated revenue fund. What has it meant to the municipalities? It has meant two things. It has meant, first of all, that the municipalities are able to run their hospitals without deficits. Right here in the city of Regina it was quite customary, in days gone by, to levy for \$75,000 of a subsidy to the General Hospital each year. That was the normal thing. Last year, the Regina General Hospital had a surplus. Yet my hon. friends probably saw in last night's paper that in Brandon, Manitoba, they are talking about closing their general hospital because it cannot finance. You don't hear the hospitals in Saskatchewan talking about closing because out of the Provincial Treasury, in addition to the hospital taxes, has gone four or five million dollars a year to help to keep these hospitals operating. Another thing that it has done for the municipality is that the Hospitalization Plan has enabled them to have their indigents taken care of simply by paying the Hospital Tax. I know that, in the city of Regina alone, when the Hospital Services Plan came in, there were twenty-eight bedridden patients, who were charges of the city of Regina, lying in the hospital here. They had to pay the entire bill every day in the week for a year. The next year, they simply paid the Provincial Government \$5.00 and they were from then on taken care of under the Hospital Services Plan. Now then, my friend comes along and starts to make a comparison with Manitoba giving up three million dollars and the millions of dollars which this Government has paid, year in and year out, to the municipalities for seed grain, to cancel old relief debts which our hon. friends left on our doorstep, to take care of old age pensioners., to provide health services, to build hospitals, to build schools and in educational grants my friend has chosen a very poor province to make a comparison with, I can assure you.

**Mr. Tucker:** — The people in Manitoba did not think so.

**Premier Douglas:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I must apologize for taking so long. I am almost through; but I just want to say a word about highways. My hon. friend referred, yesterday, to the amount of money which is collected for highways and the amount spent. I just want to remind him that, if he looks up the accounts for 1948-49, he will find that the gas tax receipts, were \$6,641,000 (I am not giving the odd dollars) and the licence fees, \$3,342,000, making a total in that year of \$9,984,000. If you look at the expenditure you will find that the highway expenditure on current account was \$5,453,000, on capital account \$2,400,000, but the debt charges for the money which was borrowed in days gone by to build highways is \$2,240,000, so therefore, the expenditures are \$11,093,000 as against \$9,984,000 income. When my friend talks about highways I just want to give him one little secret – want to remind him that in 1943-44, the last year before we came in, the expenditure for highways was \$2,820,000 and this last year they were \$8,800,000, nearly four times as much.

**Mr. Loptson:** — And what results are we getting?

**Mr. Tucker:** — We were at war then, of course.

**Premier Douglas:** — Well, you'll get more results, don't worry about that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my friend also said in reference to rent control: “everybody knows that rent control comes under provincial jurisdiction.” Well, maybe he knows, but apparently the Federal Government does not know because they are spending thousands of dollars referring the matter to the Supreme Court, and right now highly-paid counsel are arguing the matter before the Supreme Court as to whether or not it should come under provincial jurisdiction.

**Mr. Tucker:** — That is not the question at all.

**Premier Douglas:** — The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government is morally bound to stay in the field of rent control as long as there is a housing shortage and, until they have done something about the housing shortage, this is a burden that never should have been thrown on the provincial governments at all. The only reason that this provincial government went into the field of rent controls was because we were not prepared to stand by and watch the Federal Government carelessly increase the rents on thousands of people who would have had no alternative but take it out of their bread and milk and the food that their children ought to be receiving.

The Leader of the Opposition, yesterday, wanted to know something about the Coal Commission report. He spoke very long and loud over some alleged price-fixing in the Estevan coalfields and he asked whether or not the Royal Commission had investigated this alleged price-fixing. Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that he should have spoken in a whisper and prayed that they had not looked into the question of price-fixing, because, as a matter of fact there is not any need for investigation into this matter. The history of price-fixing is of long standing in this province. It is on the public records and has been on the statute books of this province ever since 1935, and price-fixing was put there by a Liberal Government. My friend ought to brush up on the statutes of this province.

**Mr. Tucker:** — What part did you have in it? Tell us that.

**Premier Douglas:** — I will tell him about it. My friend will get all he wants to hear – and some more – about this.

Now, as a matter of fact, this is what the Royal Commission had to say with reference to the mechanism of price-fixing, because that price fixing, as I said, was placed on the statute book at the suggestion of the Turgeon Commission which sat in 1934, and the Act which was placed on the Statute books in 1935 was The Coal Mining Industry Act. This is what the Royal Commission said . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Is this report tabled yet?

**Premier Douglas:** — If my hon. friend will just sit still and try to mind his manners I will be very glad to answer his questions.

**Mr. Tucker:** — This is another outrageous thing. Here is the Premier reading from a public document which he has not tabled yet, and I am asking if he is going to table this report of the Royal Commission and I am surely entitled to a civil answer, instead of a gibe such as he just made.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend wants to ask a question; he is an

February 22, 1950

old enough parliamentarian to know how to ask it. He is to rise to his feet and ask if he may ask a question, without sitting on his seat and bawling across the floor.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Premier will answer my question: is he going to table this Royal Commission report which he is purporting to read from?

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, that is much better. I am glad to tell my hon. friend, the report is being printed. It will be laid on the table as soon as it comes from the printer, and I shall be very glad to arrange with my hon. friend to have a full-dress debate on that report. I hope that will satisfy my hon. friend.

Well, this is what the Royal Commission said:

“Certain recommendations of the Commission (speaking of the Turgeon Commission) related to the establishment of price and production quote agreements between the Saskatchewan producers. Agreements of this nature were subsequently developed within the industry and appear to have aided in maintaining more stabilized conditions in the field. By 1939 however, competition between the deep seam operators and the Truax-Traer Company were becoming intense and the outbreak of war greatly increased the demand for coal and the activities of the Federal Government in subsidizing the higher cost sections of the industry prevented any serious dislocation for the duration of hostilities.”

That is the statement made by the Commission which I have told my hon. friend I will be glad to table.

Referring to Section 8, sub-section (1) of the Coal Mining Industry Act of 1935 passed by Liberal administration – here is what it says:

“The Lieutenant Governor in Council may by regulation, from time to time and if deemed necessary after consultation with the operators and the employees, make orders, formulate codes and set up standards of ethics, methods, practices and systems applicable to the coal mining industry within the province, with the object of establishing standards of prices below which no product of the coal mining industry shall be sold whether by wholesale or retail.”

**Mr. Tucker:** — That is nothing new to me.

**Premier Douglas:** — My friend says this is nothing new to him. He stood up here, yesterday and said, “Why does not the Attorney-General sue these people under the Combines Investigation Act?” – and the Liberal Government gave them power to fix prices in this province. Why did not my hon. friend tell the members of the House that! Here are the facts, Mr. Speaker; first of all that a Liberal Government, under The Coal Industry Act



provided for price-fixing. Now, my hon. friend has twice in this House, stood up and said that we got these companies together and made them fix the price. I denied it. My hon. friend, in spite of that denial, has repeated the statement, yesterday, and I told him again it was not true.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Did you pass an Order-in-Council?

**Premier Douglas:** — There was no Order-in-Council passed; there was, at no time, any coercion brought upon any company with reference to fixing prices.

My hon. friend made the statement last year, and I am calling him right now. When the Royal Commission met, if my hon. friend thought the Government had fixed the price or coerced any company into setting a price, why didn't he appear before the Royal Commission as a witness, why didn't he come to give evidence?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — He doesn't make a good witness.

**Mr. Tucker:** — If my hon. friend is asking me a question, I will answer it. I said, last year, in the Session here that I understood that this had been done by you and I expected you to appear and give the evidence on it. You are the one that knew what you did, not me.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, there was no reason for me to appear. My friend did not suggest that I should appear at all. He asked me, last year, if the Commission would look into it, and the Commission did. I want to point out to him that the Commission took no action at all under The Coal Industry Act; we had the power to, power given by a Liberal Government; we did not use that power. We passed no Order-in-Council. As a matter of fact, if my friend will take the trouble to look up the facts he will find that the coal companies in the Estevan field on January 11, 1949, raised the price 20 cents. Now, if the Government had forced them to raise the price by an Order-in-Council how is it that, on May 15, they reduced it by 20 cents, which they did and on both occasions without any consultation with the Government or any knowledge of the Government?

**Mr. Tucker:** — Would the hon. Premier say that he did not consult the managers of these coal companies before they raised that price?

**Mr. Speaker:** — May I remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition that it is the prerogative of the member speaking to answer a question.

**Premier Douglas:** — As I said before, I must apologize for talking so long but I am now just about through. I want to deal with the amendment which has been proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, and this is probably the most fantastic amendment that was ever introduced in parliamentary debate. Here is an amendment which says the speech of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor should be accepted and so on, but "regrets that Your Honour's present advisers have, as their ultimate objective, the socialization of our economy as laid down in the Regina Manifesto."

**Mr. Tucker:** — Do you deny it?

**Premier Douglas:** — The Leader of the Opposition wants to condemn the Government

because it believes in socialization as laid out in the Regina Manifesto and, yesterday, he spent two-thirds of his speech trying to prove that we did not believe in socialization and had departed from the Regina Manifesto. Now, Mr. Speaker, he had better make up his mind which side he is on.

**Mr. Tucker:** — This is just a temporary move.

**Premier Douglas:** — Well, I grant it is probably just a temporary move all right. The Leader of the Opposition directed attention to the Regina Manifesto. I have it here, as he had a copy of it yesterday, and I do not think there is any member on this side of the House but what will be very pleased to be associated with this; and if my hon. friend suggested we should stand up and be counted, well, we are prepared to stand for something – at least we know what we stand for. What does Liberalism stand for? Does anybody know? Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I can tell you: It stands for high tariffs in eastern Canada and free trade in the west; it stands for labour in the city and against labour out in the country; it stands for Roman Catholicism in Quebec and the Orangemen in Ontario; it stands for free money when being described by ‘Jerry’ McGeer and the Leader of the Opposition and for orthodox finance when it is being described by Douglas Abbott and C.D. Howe. The Liberal Party stands for being all things to all men until you get in, and then doing nothing at all so you can stay in.

At least we know what we stand for, and I am going to read to the members of the Legislative Assembly, so that their memories will be refreshed, this Manifesto; but I want to point out first of all that the amendment is not accurate. It says that they have as “their ultimate objective the socialization of our economy.” This Manifesto does not call for the socialization of our economy; it calls for the setting up of a Co-operative Commonwealth in which there will be the socialization of certain key industries and certain principal means of production and exchange. It calls for a partnership of free enterprise, public enterprise and co-operative enterprise for the general good of the people of Canada.

**Opposition Members:** — Read It!

**Premier Douglas:** — I am going to read it – if my friends will just sit still. I know they are uncomfortable. About two-thirds of them have never read an intelligent political document in their lives, and even those who have read it could only dimly understand it. This is the Regina Manifesto adopted at the first National Convention held at Regina, Saskatchewan, 1933. It says:

“The C.C.F. is a federation of organizations whose purpose is the establishment in Canada of a Co-operative Commonwealth in which the principal regulating production, distribution and exchange will be the supplying of human needs and not the making of profit. We aim to replace the present capitalist system with its inherent injustice and inhumanity by a social order from which the domination and exploitation of one class by another will be eliminated, in which economic planning will supersede unregulated private enterprise and competition, and in which genuine democratic self-government based upon economic equality will be possible.

The present order is marked by glaring inequalities of wealth and opportunity, by chaotic waste and instability and, in an age of plenty, it condemns the great mass of the people to poverty and insecurity. The power has become more and more concentrated in the hands of a small irresponsible minority of financiers and industrialists and to their predatory interest the majority are habitually sacrificed. When private profit is the main stimulus to economic effort our society oscillates between periods of prosperity, feverish prosperity in which the main benefits go to speculators and profiteers, and of catastrophic depressions in which the common man's normal state of insecurity and hardship is accentuated. We believe that these evils can be removed only in a planned and socialized economy in which our natural resources and the principal means of production and distribution are owned, controlled and operated by the people. The new social order at which we aim is not one in which individuality will be crushed out by a system of regimentation, nor shall we interfere with cultural rights of racial or religious minorities. What we seek is a proper collective organization of our economic resources, such as will make possible a much greater degree of leisure and much richer individual life for every citizen. This social and economic transformation can be brought about by political action, through the election of a Government inspired by the ideal of a Co-operative Commonwealth and supported by a majority of the people. We do not believe in change by violence. We consider that both old parties in Canada are the instruments of capitalist interests and cannot serve as agents of social reconstruction and that, whatever the superficial differences between them, they are bound to carry on government in accordance with the dictates of big business interests who finance them. The C.C.F. aims at political power in order to put an end to this capitalist domination of our political life. It is a democratic movement; a federation of farmer, labour and socialist organizations, financed by its own members and seeking to achieve its ends solely by constitutional methods. It appeals for support to all who believe that the time has come for a far-reaching reconstruction of our economic and political institutions and who are willing to work together for the carrying out of the following policies."

Then it gives the policies – I shall just read the heading of each one of them.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Read it all.

**Premier Douglas:** — My friend can read it all tomorrow – he usually talks for four or five hours and he will have a lot more time than I

will. I shall be very glad to send him the book.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Plank No. 1 says the Estate Planning: The establishment of a planned socialized economic order in order to make possible the most efficient development of the natural resources and the most equitable distribution of the national income.

2. **Socialization of Finance:** The socialization of all financial machinery – banking, currency, credits and insurance – to make possible the effective control of currency, credit and prices and to supply a new productive equipment for socially desirable purposes. (The Leader of the Opposition used to believe in that at some time.)

3. **Social Ownership:** Socialization – Provincial, Dominion or Municipal – of transportation, communication, electric power and all other industries and services essential to social planning and their operation under the general direction of the Planning Commission by competent management, free from day to day political interference.

4. **Agriculture:** Security of tenure for the farmer upon his farm on conditions to be laid down by individual provinces. Insurance against unavoidable crop failure. Removal of the tariff burden from the operations of agriculture. Encouragement of producers' and consumers' co-operatives. The restoration and maintenance of an equitable relationship between prices of agricultural products and those of other commodities and services, and improving the efficiency of export trade in farm products.

5. **External Trade:** The regulation in accordance with the National Plan of external trade through import and export boards.

6. **Co-operative Institutions:** The encouragement by the public authority of both producers' and consumers' co-operative institutions.

7. **Labour Problem:** The National Labour Code to secure for the worker maximum income and leisure, insurance covering illness, accident, old age and unemployment. Freedom of association and effective participation in the management of the industry or profession.

8. **Socialized Health Services:** Publicly organized health, hospital and medical services.

9. **B.N.A. Act:** The amendment of the Canadian Constitution without infringement upon racial or religious minority rights or upon provincial claims to dominate, so as to give the Dominion Government adequate powers to deal effectively with the urgent economic problems which are essentially national in scope, and the abolition of the Senate.

10. **External Relations:** A foreign policy designed to obtain international economic co-operation and to promote disarmament and world peace.

11. **Taxation and Public Finance:** A new taxation policy designed not only to raise public revenue but also to lessen the glaring inequalities of income and to provide funds for social service and the socialization of industry. The cessation of the debt-creating system of public finance.

12. **Freedom:** Freedom of speech and assembly for all. Repeal of Section 98 of the Criminal Code. Amendment to the Immigration Act to prevent the present inhuman policy of deportation. Equal treatment before the law of all residents of Canada irrespective of race, nationality, or religious or political beliefs.

13. **Social Justice:** The establishment of a commission composed of psychiatrists, psychologists, socially-minded jurists and socially-minded workers to deal with all matters pertaining to crime and punishment, and the general administration of law in order to humanize the law and to bring it into harmony with the needs of the people.

14. **An Emergency Programme:** The assumption by the Dominion Government of direct responsibility for dealing with the present critical unemployment situation and for tendering suitable work for adequate maintenance. The adoption of measures to relieve the extremity of the crisis such as a programme of public spending on housing and other enterprises that will increase the real wealth of Canada, to be financed by the issue of credit based on the national wealth." That, Mr. Speaker, is the Manifesto . . .

(interrupted)

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Premier read the last, the summing-up section?

**Premier Douglas:** — Oh! why certainly, if the hon. gentleman wishes me to read all this back I will be glad to. The last part — I'll not read all of it because that is not what anyone wants — but an explanation for those who are not as familiar with it as the Leader of the Opposition. Under each of these sections there is an explanatory note, I should mention. Under "Emergency Programme", they go on to point out that while they believe in housing and public works projects and the building of skating rinks and recreation centres to solve the problem of unemployment, it is only a temporary measure and we actually will never have permanent employment and permanent security unless you change your whole economic system under a planned basis. And, having said that, they then end up by saying:

"Emergency measures, however, have only temporary value, for the present depression (Remember this was written in 1933, 17 years ago) is a sign of the mortal sickness of the whole capitalistic system, and this sickness cannot be cured by the application of salves, these attacks of cancer, which is eating at the heart of our society, namely the economic system in which our natural resources and our principal means of production and distribution are owned, controlled and operated for the private profit of a small proportion of our population. No. C.C.F. Government will rest content until it has eradicated capitalism and put into operation the full programme of socialized planning which will lead to the establishment in Canada of a Co-operative Commonwealth."

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition has made the issue in this vote the Regina Manifesto. My hon. friend says that he wants us to stand up and be counted. I was prepared to stand up and be counted in 1933 when there were not enough people in my constituency who believed in this to count on

February 22, 1950

all the fingers on your two hands and I am still prepared to stand up and be counted anywhere and anytime. I would like to say this to my friends, no matter how hard it is to say . . .

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Getting harder and harder.

**Premier Douglas:** — I would tell my hon. friend that I will come to his town and say it any day in the week. I would like him to be on the platform with me.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I will.

**Premier Douglas:** — No, I'll bet you won't; there isn't any doubt about the fact you won't. My hon. friend does not understand something, and I don't suppose anyone could convey it, and that is that we have not made a programme that changes every week or every year or changes for each province or each part of the province or depending what racial minority we are talking to. We have a policy here to which some men and women have openly dedicated their lives. Whether we be in office or out of office, whether it be in victory defeat, whether it be in Eastern Canada or Western Canada, we stand by the principle enunciated in that Manifesto. My friends say, "Stand up and be counted!" We are prepared to stand up and be counted, not only here, but in the country, anywhere. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that, if this Regina Manifesto is to be the issue when we come to a vote every member of this House who believes in equality, liberty and social security will stand with me and vote for it.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

### DEATH OF BISHOP FULLER

I would like to inform the House that the Rt. Rev. W.E. Fuller, Lord Bishop of Saskatoon, has passed away. Now, I am sure that quite a few of the members here were friends of his Lordship, or were at least familiar with him, and I feel that it would be in order, as we have done on other occasions, for the Legislation Assembly to take some note of his passing, express our deep sympathy to his family and to pass on to the Anglican Church, of which he was a distinguished leader, our sorrow at the great loss which they have sustained. Therefore, I move and I would ask the Leader of the Opposition if he would agree to second, the following motion:

“That this Assembly learns with deepest regret of the death, this morning, of the Right Reverend W.E. Fuller Lord Bishop of Saskatoon, and records its acute sense of the great loss his Church, his Diocese and his Province has suffered in the passing of this beloved and distinguished Churchman and revered and respected citizen;

And, further, in paying tribute to his works and memory, this Assembly extends its most profound sympathies to the members of the bereaved family.”

**Mr. Tucker:** — I wish to second the motion which has just been moved by the Premier. It is a very sad thing to think that it was only October 18th of last year that Bishop Fuller was consecrated into the service of his Church as the Bishop at Saskatoon, and that now, just a few months later he should be called from this earth. Surely, in view of the fact that he had such a short period to serve in the position of Bishop of his Church, it is a matter of sympathy to the Church, and we do sincerely extend it and also to members of his bereaved family.

**Hon. J.H. Sturdy:** — Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege to have been a close personal friend of Bishop Fuller. Our friendship has gone back over a period of some thirty years and it began in the trenches in the first World War, when we were ‘buddies’ together for many months. Bishop Fuller was a fine soldier and I can say that in respect to myself I never had a finer comrade than Bishop Fuller. He enlisted at a very early age – I think it was at the age of 17 – and I have no doubt the rigours of his service in the trenches for a period of two or three years contributed in part to his early passing. I would say, also, that no country ever had a more loyal, a more brave or a more conscientious soldier than Canada had in Bishop Fuller. On his discharge, on his return to Canada, he entered a theological college and in due course he was ordained as an Anglican clergyman. And the Anglican communion will, of course, greatly grieve his passing because no communion ever had a more conscientious, a more gifted, a more loyal worker than in the person of Bishop Fuller. I attended his consecration to the Bishopric of the Saskatoon Diocese, last fall, and he seemed to be still a young man, a little over 50 years of age, in the very vigour of life, and indeed his passing is greatly to be mourned by the Anglican communion, by his host of friends, by his country and by the City of Saskatoon whose people knew him best. I would associate myself with the expression of condolence and sympathy to his widow and his three children.

Motion agreed to unanimously, by standing vote.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:35 o'clock p.m.