

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Eleventh Legislature
38th Day

Tuesday, March 27, 1951

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

REIMPOSITION OF DUTIES

Moved by Mr. J. Walter Erb (Milestone), seconded by Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough):

“THAT this Assembly considers the reimposition of the anti-dumping duties on British-made cars to be detrimental to the marketing of Canadian agricultural products in the United Kingdom, and strongly urges the Federal Government to forgo this contemplated action.”

Mr. Erb: — Mr. Speaker, the motion before the House, though perhaps not as controversial as preceding motions have been, is nevertheless of vital importance to the people of Saskatchewan and the agricultural economy in general. I have some misgivings, this afternoon, in speaking on a resolution which is rather sympathetic to the British, and, knowing that these past resolutions or motions that we have had, have placed Britain in a spot, by the Opposition, with regard to their default, that this may lead to a bitter controversy again.

A great deal has been said in this House and outside it, during the past week about the importance of wheat, so that it would be superfluous for me to state here that wheat is the main economy of this province. But what I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, is that our wheat markets are complementary to all that has been said with regard to wheat for a stable agricultural economy. The United Kingdom, as everyone knows, has been in the past and can continue to be the best market for our agricultural surpluses, and the United Kingdom has demonstrated on many occasions a preference for Canadian agricultural products, and, indeed, has gone to great lengths in maintaining that preference.

Before World War II, as we all know, Great Britain was able to pay for her imports over exports by virtue of the money that she had invested in this country and the United States, by her vast shipping, by her financing and so on. We also know that when the war ended, Great Britain had largely liquidated her investments in this country and in the United States; that a great portion of her shipping was sunk through enemy action; that the centre of finance moved from London to New York, and, as a result, Britain was placed in a position where she had to export in order to provide for imports. I need not go into detail of how the United Kingdom accomplished this, how she overcame this great economic disaster suffered as a result of World War II in the cause of freedom. Suffice it to say that her efforts in this regard were magnificent and the result almost miraculous.

March 27, 1951

I should like to show here a pamphlet which I received from "Industry", in which it shows just how much Great Britain has done and how much she is doing. I think we very often fail to recognize the great contribution that Great Britain had made to the world before World War II, during World War II, and in the present crisis. This article is captioned, "The Quiet British." It says:

"The British people are well known as a tightlipped race. They make a practice of getting on with the job with a minimum of fanfare. Thus it was with some surprise that we came across 20 facts about Britain's armed preparedness which, although released by the United Kingdom Information Office, have not been widely publicised."

And here they are:

"Britain's armed forces are nearing the million mark; she already has 845,000 men under arms.

"Nearly half of Britain's land forces are already serving overseas in 19 countries or territories across the free world's lifelines.

"Britain has had conscription for over 10 years; the period of National service is now two years for every able-bodied man between 18 and 26, with very few exceptions. A million young men have undergone compulsory military service since 1945.

"One-third of Britain's budget is being spent on defence.

"In Korea, over 22,000 British troops and sailors are serving under MacArthur. Britain was fighting in Korea from the very first, when her Far East fleet was put under U.N. command.

"Every branch of Britain's armed service is fighting in Korea; the Army, including the new 50-ton Centurian tanks; the Navy, one light carrier, two cruisers, six destroyers, four frigates, and the Royal Marine Commandos; the Royal Air Force with Sunderland flying boats.

"In Malaya, over 17,000 British troops have been fighting the Communists for more than two years.

"Britain has developed powerful new weapons. The output of the Centurian tank has now been doubled. Her Canberra twin jet bomber is being produced by four manufacturers and also in Australia. New chemical forms of propulsion for submarines have been developed, and new warships designed for atomic warfare.

“The British housewife is in the front line. For ten years she put up with rationing so that the country could concentrate on regaining its economic strength after the crippling war losses.

“The Territorial Army is being expanded to 12 divisions; 4 Territorial divisions will be kept on an emergency basis capable of swinging into action within 30 days.

“It is planned to increase Britain’s regular army to bring it to a total strength of 11½ full-time divisions.”

And so on. This goes to show the extent to which Great Britain has put her efforts in strengthening her defences at the present time, and it has not been without sacrifice on the home front. Considering the position that she is in today, in which she has to pay for her imports over exports, it should have a tendency to make us all very sympathetic and understanding towards this gallant little nation.

Notwithstanding the great strides that the United Kingdom has made, Mr. Speaker, I reiterate again that she must pay for her imports with her exports. The motion that I speak of, the proposed dumping duties, will undoubtedly affect the British manufacturers, the Canadian consumers and the Canadian producers. Since January 1, 1951, the anti-dump law has been applied on five different categories of British export commodities, namely: confectionery, sporting goods, lawn mowers, oil cloths and chocolate preparations. The reimposition of duties on British cars is to take effect May 31, 1951, and the effect, of course, is going to be that there will be fewer British cars and, in most cases, the prices will be 5 to 8 per cent higher.

Canada is believed to be the only country with automatic dumping-duty legislation, and exemptions are only granted by order-in-council; and these exemptions were granted, as a matter of fact, on some traditional imports from the United Kingdom. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that a dumping duty is a prohibitive tax on the difference between domestic and export prices, and have the effect of barring imports into Canada on those commodities on which this duty is imposed. Britain was faced with the necessity of maintaining high internal prices in order to discourage domestic consumption at home and having to enter the export market while struggling to improve the foreign exchange position. It was in recognition of these requirements that Canada, for the time, had waived this anti-dumping law.

On January 2, 1951, Canada had withdrawn her last remaining exchange import controls, and this, presumably, would open the door to free importation of completed automobiles from the United Kingdom. The Canadian Automobile Manufacturers’ Association entered the picture, and they argued, of course, that now, being in the position where they had no protection, any country such as Czechoslovakia, Italy, France and other smaller countries could dump cars on the Canadian market below their fair market value in the country in which they were made. So in order to overcome this, the anti-dumping law would have to come into

March 27, 1951

effect. I believe that that theory is not justified, because we have not witnessed sufficient numbers of cars from Italy or Czechoslovakia or France here to upset the tranquillity of the Canadian market. The only threat, I submit, Mr. Speaker, has been the British cars. However, under the Geneva Trade Agreement, this is an automatic dumping duty and must be applied on all makes of cars or none at all.

In 1950, the shipments of British cars to Canada totalled some 80,000, and it is estimated that the dollar value was some \$75 million. The total output of Canadian cars in that year was 380,000 units. We see here by these United Kingdom exports to Canada — the source of this is the “Economic Record”, November, 1950, Volume 4, Number 11; we can see why the Automobile Association of Canada is becoming alarmed, because from 1947 to 1950 we see that British cars have been coming in in progressively great numbers. I am going to give the percentages of her total exports; that is, the percentages of new cars of the total export from Great Britain of all her commodities:

In 1947 Great Britain exported to Canada 9,614 — that is in average of thousands, Canadian dollars that would mean \$9,694,000; in 1948, \$14,467,000; in 1949, \$14,231,000. And then, in the second quarter of 1950, she exported \$15,388,000 worth. So the percentage of cars of the total export was, in 1945, 1.8 per cent of her total exports; in 1950, of the second quarter, it amounted to 30 per cent of her total exports. That certainly had the Canadian automobile manufacturers worried.

Now, we know that Canada is close to being Great Britain’s best market for cars. Britain is now being hampered by the rising cost of production, and shortages of key materials. For example, the car industry’s steel allotment has, for the first quarter of 1951, been cut back to 60 per cent, and this means a drop of from 5 to 10 per cent in Britain’s automotive production. Other shortages of key materials such as zinc, aluminium, copper, no doubt are going to make matters considerably worse. But the United Kingdom automobile manufacturers are unanimous about one thing — that this anti-dumping duty is a direct threat to the British manufacturers, and was prompted largely by the Canadian Automobile Association — by the Canadian manufacturers. I should like to quote from the “Globe and Mail”, Mr. Speaker. They say whenever a Liberal gets into a jam he quotes the “Globe and Mail”, a Tory press, and I do not hope to get in a jam by quoting this. It is captioned, “Levy Against the Buyer”:

“Now that the British automobile industry has done everything Ottawa said it must do to gain a substantial Canadian market, its Canadian customers are to be penalized for such action. Eighteen months ago Finance Minister Abbott,” . . . (I might say this is written January 8, 1951) . . . “went to great pains to tell the British they must produce at lower costs to win a competitive position in dollar markets. Not only must prices be adjusted, but Canadian tastes be suited and deliveries assured. The British industry did these things, even to the extent of exchanging trade information between its own competitors. It invested in mass production for export; it set up service facilities in

this country; it proved to North American manufacturers that weight, bulk or fancy trimmings were not always imperative in the car buyers' eye. Canadian purchasers were under no illusions that they were getting British cars at fire-sale prices, nor did the British encourage any such illusion. Per pound of car, prices were in line with the Canadian market, and every car sold helped achieve the end so devoutly professed at Ottawa, to close Britain's dollar gap so she could buy more Canadian goods. Yet, because brisk business developed, the Canadian Government is reimposing anti-dumping duties against British cars. From now on, the Government, not the maker or the buyer, will determine what is a fair price in this country and apply the duty accordingly. This is a blatant abuse of anti-dumping provisions, which are designed to protect Canadian producers against dumping of surplus or subsidized goods from abroad. Having shown no such evidence against British car makers, Ottawa is not only reversing previous policy but betraying both British industry and its Canadian customers. The fact that the deadline is set for next May 31st does not alter or delay the principle. The Revenue Department expects the threat to be effective immediately, at the expense of Canadian purchasers. A spokesman said that price adjustments meanwhile, are expected to remove the possibility of certain British producers having to pay dumping duties. In short the Canadian buyer will pay the equivalent of the duty whether it is actually levied or not. A further effect is that even those makes which the Government now deems immune are arbitrarily prevented from any reduction in price which British ingenuity might make possible. Thus, the same Government which, in 1949, was preaching lower prices to the British as a requirement of the Canadian market, is now preaching higher prices for the privilege of staying in that market. The motive of all this is apparent. Canadian automobile manufacturers have been pressing since last April for just such action."

"In that same month as it happened, External Affairs Minister Pearson, echoing Mr. Abbott, said that in encouraging imports from Britain, each of us may have to forgo immediate advantage for the long-term general good. The principal exemption from such austerity is the Government itself. On the contrary, the higher the price of British or other cars, the greater the tax the Government collects with the 15 per cent excise and other imposts. A motor executive has estimated that taxes, most of them Federal, consume one-quarter of the retail price of a new car. And setting what it deems a fair

March 27, 1951

price for imported cars, the Government adds these levies to the manufacturer's cost. The artificial valuation is now to be further raised. If the anti-dumping provisions were to protect Canadian industry from suffering, Ottawa might at least present a fiscal excuse; but they are not to protect production, but to increase prices on a commodity which is still scarce and will become more so as military contracts, plus steel priorities, channel the motor industry more fully into the defence programme. This operation comes from a Government which professes to understand inflation and to be doing something about it. Small wonder the British say they are keenly disappointed. They must also be astounded."

It seems rather ironical, too, Mr. Speaker, that with Canadian car production being unable to keep up with the domestic demand, we should be worrying about applying these dumping duties to the importation of British cars. The interest of the farmer, of course, is directly affected in this, as I have pointed out previously, because we all know that we must sell our wheat to the British market and in turn the British must buy our goods in order to have the food that they require. It is a two-way trade, and any obstacle that is going to be placed in the way of this trade is going to make it very difficult for both the British people, the consumer here, and the producer.

It is also strange, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian automobile manufacturers should be worried about the competition that is presented by British export of automobiles when we consider the long haul and the transportation costs involved in bringing British cars to this country. And, as I stated before, both the interests of the Canadian producers and consumers are adversely affected by the reduced flow of British cars on to the Canadian market: the consumer, of course, in having to pay higher prices, and the agricultural producer, by being deprived of his traditional market. The only interests, I submit, that are being served, are those of a relatively small but very voluble and powerful pressure group. There can be no argument, Mr. Speaker, about the fact that Britain is our traditional market for our agricultural commodities. Since we know that all economies of this country are hinged and dependent upon the agricultural economy, it behooves us to make every effort to keep that economy strong and functioning smoothly. It is, therefore, highly essential that any trade barrier to a free flow of British goods to this country be removed or changed. Great Britain needs and wants Canadian agricultural products. I might quote from an article in the "Leader-Post", dated Yorkton, March 20, where Mr. Coventry was speaking, and he said this:

"The people of Great Britain wish to buy everything possible from Canada in the way of farm produce, but the amount is limited by Canadian dollars available to make those purchases."

The West, I maintain, cannot afford to lose the British market. Indeed we have lost more of the British market than we can afford, when

we consider cheese, bacon, and egg and egg-shell products. We have come a long way in losing those markets since the war. When we consider that during the war we were shipping to England almost one billion pounds of bacon while last year we were unable to fill the 60 million pound bacon contract — could only supply 20 million pounds of that contract — it certainly is a sad commentary on the efforts by the Federal Government at Ottawa to do anything about stabilizing the agricultural economy, when we know that we must maintain that traditional market. The anti-dumping duty on British cars would be just another device, Mr. Speaker, to deprive western farmers of their traditional market for their products, in favour of providing a dubious protection for a small but powerful group.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by Mr. Brown, the foregoing motion.

The question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to unanimously.

VETERAN SETTLERS ON CROWN LANDS

The Assembly resumed from Tuesday, March 20, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Benson (Last Mountain):

“THAT this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government the advisability of

(a) establishing the purchase price of all Crown Lands on which veterans are settled, at the earliest date possible;

(b) providing that all rentals paid by veterans on such lands be applied on the purchase price so established, and

(c) selling Crown Land to the veteran occupier at the established purchase price, upon his application to purchase it, provided he has proved his ability as a farmer.”

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, the motion moved by the hon. member for Last Mountain recommends three things to the Provincial Government: first, the establishment of the purchase price on Crown Lands on which veterans are settled, as soon as possible; second, providing that all rentals paid by veterans on such lands be applied on the purchase price so established; third, the selling of Crown Lands to the veteran occupier at the established price, upon his application to purchase it, provided he has proved his ability as a farmer.

March 27, 1951

I would suggest, first of all, Mr. Speaker, that due to the fact that the agreement which the veterans enter into with the Crown provides for the selling of the land to the veteran, that third part is a little bit unnecessary. I think the member might have recognized that that provision was already taken care of.

Both the member for Last Mountain and the member for Moosomin who seconded the motion, appealed to the members of the Legislature to keep politics out of this. Sometimes that appeal can be properly made; but when it is made, I am always a little inclined to take a second look just to see if there isn't somebody in the shelter of that curtain, trying to do a little climbing onto some political bandwagon.

What I am going to say on this motion, I say as a veteran; I say it as a member of the Legion; I say it as a farmer, and as a member of this Legislature who represents a constituency which, I believe, has more veterans settled in it on Crown Land than any other constituency in the province.

The member for Last Mountain said there were widespread demands for the setting of a price. I have been living and working with more veterans on Crown Land, I believe, than any other member, unless it is the Minister who has been looking after that work, and I certainly cannot say that there has been any widespread demand. I have received no petitions; I cannot recall having received any letters asking that the price be set now. I can recall, one or two occasions where veterans were speaking to me, and they did discuss this question and they thought probably the price should be set now, but certainly there is no widespread demand at the present time. Now that does not mean that a demand cannot be stirred up. Undoubtedly, if the mover and the seconder of the motion, with help from others, undertake to stir up a demand for that action, they can do so.

The member for Last Mountain also stated that there was no good reason for not setting the price at the present time. That may be true, or it may not be true. It may be that prices set now will be out of line with values in the term during which the veteran is trying to pay for the land. We cannot say that if we have continued inflationary tendencies, with higher prices, the veteran would gain. On the other hand, should the international situation improve, should we achieve in this world a security and a term of peace, as all of us hope for, there is certainly a very good possibility of a depression, and we would see over again happening the same things that happened to the veterans after the first world war. Then the veterans paid fairly high prices — not as high as they are now — for their land and stock and equipment. They paid \$100 to \$140 for cows, and within a couple of years they were selling 10 cattle for \$200 or less, and so there is all this to take into consideration.

I believe it was the member for Last Mountain who mentioned that one veteran whom he knew, under the V.L.A. had now all his land paid for except \$1,000, and he was pointing out what a very good situation that is — and certainly that is a good situation. I hope that every veteran — no, I wish, Mr. Speaker, that every veteran who has purchased land under the V.L.A. was in as fortunate a position. But again I cannot forget the struggle that the veterans had under the policy of settlement after the first

world war. In any case, I would point out that this veteran who was referred to, cannot get the title to his land for 10 years from the date that he settled on the land, from the Federal Government. I do not know what he is going to do in those 10 years. I suppose he will get along without any difficulty, but . . .

Mr. McDonald: — It is possible for a veteran to get his title, under V.L.A., under 10 years, and if the Minister looks into that he will find that is true — under some circumstances.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — He can get his title if he pays back the grant.

Mr. McDonald: — He does not have to pay back the grant either.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — My hon. friend made one speech on this; but that is the way I understand it is . . .

Mr. McDonald: — You are wrong.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . that a veteran does not earn that grant until he has put in the 10 years, and therefore, if he is going to get it, he has to put in the 10 years. If the hon. members want to show that the situation is different, I will be very glad to know it; but I would like them to get up and quote chapter and verse from the agreements or the law, to show that that is not correct. That is what I have understood to be the case.

Now, the member also said that here was this man who had paid off all his loan except \$1,000, and he said other veterans on the Crown Lands see this and they wonder why they cannot do it. Well, I do not think our veterans are just that dumb. Our veterans knew the agreement they were going into (I hope they did) and they knew they were taking a 33-year lease on land; they knew that was one kind of a contract, and they were satisfied to take it. So I think it is entirely unreasonable to use that kind of an argument.

He also said, “I do not think the veteran should pay rent, and then have to buy.” Well, they do not; they have a choice, and they do not have to buy if they do not want to. It is not a case of paying rent and then having to buy; but I do want to say to this House that if, after the last world war, all the veterans had been settled with the option of a 33-year lease, there would have been a lot of veterans on the land now who have been washed up.

You see, these are two different deals; and to say that any veteran has been prohibited from the privilege of buying land is a ridiculous statement, because any veteran is free to go and buy land under the Veterans’ Land Act . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Not Crown land.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . and there is lots of land for sale; but there are not so many of them doing it as there would be if

March 27, 1951

there was no Crown Land available, and if we had plenty of Crown land available, there would be very few veterans in the province of Saskatchewan buying land under the Veterans' Land Act — 90 per cent of them, I would guess, would be going for the 33-year lease.

This plan for land settlement, when it first was evolved, had the active support of a good many Legion branches — I am not sure that it did not have the support of the Provincial Command; it certainly did not have any strong opposition. If my memory serves me right, a lot of the details of this plan of land settlement was worked out by one of the Legion branches in the province of Saskatchewan, and they were very enthusiastic about this system of land settlement; and that is quite understandable, because in the Legion branches are a number of the old veterans, some of whom came through another programme of land settlement which did not work out too well.

The hon. member for Last Mountain also stated, in regard to the price, that he thought the price should be the municipal assessment, or 10 per cent lower. You know some people, Mr. Speaker, are always willing to raid somebody else's treasury. The member for Last Mountain has some land; but I will wager that he is not selling it at the municipal assessment valuation or 10 per cent higher, either — neither one!

When he makes that suggestion, what treasury is he raiding? Well, first of all, let me point out that out of probably 50,000 veterans in the province of Saskatchewan, a couple of thousand of them are on Crown lands; over half of the Crown land presently settled by veterans in the province of Saskatchewan is school land. So, when he suggests taking action like this, he is actually making the suggestion that we take out of the School Lands funds an amount of money which should be there to help with the education of all of the children (including the 50,000 veterans' children in the province), and give that to a small group of a couple of thousand veterans. I would like to know how he justifies that. I cannot. I do not think that is fair. For every veteran there is on Crown land, there would be, I think, twenty-five in the province of Saskatchewan who have not got that privilege. As I say, if we had had a lot more Crown land, we could have got rid of plenty of it.

He made the statement that, when the veterans enlisted, we promised them pretty near everything. I know that. A long time ago I got those promises too, and I got a lot of everything of all kinds — so did every other veteran, and so does every veteran now, and on that he can speak for himself; but I would point out that these promises that were made are promises that were made by the Federal Government, or certainly on behalf of the Federal Government. That is a Federal Government responsibility. We have made Crown land available in Saskatchewan which has enabled veterans to settle on Crown land, who are being successful, and who would never have had the opportunity to settle on land under the Veterans' Land Act; and I do not think that we should be expected to accept responsibilities that should be carried by the Federal Government, without any question at all.

Then on the question of the rent being applied on the purchase price of the land, again I want to point out that that would, in actual effect, be taking away the revenues from the other people in Saskatchewan, including approximately 50,000 veterans, for the sake of a couple of thousand. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that if I were talking politically, I would possibly be

arguing for this motion — if I was thinking of actually getting votes — because of the large number of veterans settled on Crown Lands in the constituency which I represent. But I am not going to buy — with other people's money, or my own either — votes to get elected to this Assembly or to any place else . . .

Mr. Tucker: — They think you do want . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, if the Leader of the Opposition says, you think they do want . . .

Mr. Tucker: — You want the vote, of course. I am trying to follow your argument, that is all.

Premier Douglas: — You mean you are trying to interrupt.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — If we decided to make a distribution of some moneys that was approved by this Legislature and was within the law, the Leader of the Opposition, if he were outside of this Legislature, would accept it, undoubtedly. I want to say, too, that if you say to all the people of the province of Saskatchewan, "you won't have to pay any taxes next year," they would approve of that; and there are people who, particularly when they are in opposition (as are the members opposite and the member from Last Mountain), are willing to cut down the revenue of the Government, cut down the revenue in the Education fund, and at the same time shout and cry for more to be paid for education.

Now, I am not going to fool people. I am not going to tell them that that kind of thing can be done. I will leave that to the members of the Opposition — they can do a good job on it; and anyway . . .

Mr. Lundas: — We cannot do as good as you!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . our friends across the floor have not yet suggested, as was suggested, I think, by question in debate the other day, that the Federal Government, in leasing their veterans; houses to veterans for several years, and now they come along and they say to the veteran, "You will have to buy it or get out." Has anybody suggested, among them, that they should apply the rent on the purchase price? I do not think so, and certainly the Federal Government is not doing it. I am sure of that.

The statement was made by the member for Moosomin that the average young veteran who has his land paid for must feel more secure than on a rented farm. That may be so; but what about the veteran who has not got his land paid for? What about the thousands of veterans after the last war? They did not have much security . . .

Mr. Lopton: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to correct my hon. friend on that housing. I understand that the rent that the veteran has paid . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, that is no point of order. That is just a difference of opinion. If he wanted to ask a question, I would let him ask a question.

March 27, 1951

Mr. Loptson: — I wanted to correct a fact.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Now what about all the veterans after the last world war who did not have their farms paid for? What security did they have? They did not have much security. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the man on a long-term lease — the veterans' lease — has just as much security as the man who has his land paid for, and he will be just as secure. They do not have to worry about paying for that land — they have that security. Security is not put on the auction block at a price, and that you can get that security provided you can put up a certain amount of money. They can get that security anyway, without having to put up that money.

Then I point out, too, to everybody in this Legislature, that whenever my hon. friends think of a lease, they think of the good old capitalist relationship between landlord and tenant, which has been a pretty ruthless relationship where the private irresponsible company or landlord, responsible to no one but himself, has it in his power to do what he likes with the tenant — to charge any amount of rent, or put him off, or do anything else. That situation was so bad that legislatures all over the world practically have had to set up quite a code of laws for the protection of those tenants, and if you think of a tenant and a lease, related to that kind of a situation, well, I want to say that is entirely different from the present situation. Here you have a lease from the Crown, which is in the same nature as a title from the Crown, which is a different proposition altogether — the Crown, in the right of the Province, which has the responsibility for its citizens. The ordinary landlord, the mortgage company, the C.P.R., the Hudson's Bay — they put a tenant off their farm; they have no responsibility; they don't have to take care of them; they don't have to see to it that he makes a living for his family. But the Province has a responsibility, and the Province cannot help, even if we had a Liberal Government (which is impossible) but be a far different and a better kind of a landlord than a private, irresponsible landlord interested in nothing but the profits he makes out of his land. The situation is different altogether.

The question was raised — what about a widow of a veteran? I could tell you some of the stories about the widows of the veterans after the last world war. They did not get too much of a chance. A widow of a veteran who has one of these leases will be able to carry on — to farm or to sell or transfer the lease, sell the improvements, to actually sell the lease, which will have a value, and get her money out of it. It does not prejudice the case of dependants of a deceased veteran.

The member from Moosomin said all farmers have had the privilege of buying farms, and he said a vote against this motion would deny that right to veterans. No, it does not! A vote against this motion will not deny the right of the veterans to get land. Any veteran in the province is just as free as any member in this Legislature to go out and buy land, just as free as any other farmer, and in addition, he has had an extra privilege which I am very glad to say he got — and that is of getting land without having to put up that price, on a long-term lease, and getting security that way. So it is just ridiculous to say that a vote against this motion is a vote to deny the right to veterans to purchase land. All veterans had the right to purchase, but some have had a lot of difficulty paying for it. He said, "I don't think the 33-year lease with option to purchase is good enough." Well, nobody has

to take it — no veteran is compelled to take it. As I say, there has been all kinds of land for sale in the province. All you have to do is look in the newspapers and it is advertised. Sure, the price is high; but they can go ahead and buy. This is another choice that they have, which is a very good thing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are some things in the motion to which I am agreeable. I am not opposed to all of it. I do not think that many veterans will want to establish the price of their Crown Land now. The veterans have, in their agreement, a clause to purchase. Clause 7 says: “After the expiration of the first 10 years of the term of this lease, the lessee may, at any time during the remainder of the said term, give the lessor a written notice of his desire to purchase the said land.” And then the clause states: “The lessor will offer to sell the said land to the lessee at a price and under terms based on fair productive value” — and provision will be made for having competent people do that valuation.

The veteran has the chance to purchase at any time after ten years. Why would a veteran want, now, to have the price set at the inflated prices that we have today? I do not believe many of them will ask for it; but if some do ask for it, I am willing to see that the price is fixed now so that he knows when he puts in the 10 years on that land, the price that he will have to pay, but it will have to be a fixed price; you cannot play this game both ways. The veteran who applies to have the price fixed now — if there is a depression and deflation of the dollar, the result would be that he would be paying a bigger price at that time than he would have been paying had he left the valuation until then. If veterans want to take a chance on that question, and want to have it valued now, I say we should give them that chance. I certainly cannot agree, however, that the rentals payable should be credited against the purchase price. Again, that is, in my opinion, just trying to buy the support of a group of people with a deal far beyond what the Province can afford, if it is going to be put into effect generally in regard to all other rentals and leases. It just cannot be afforded.

So I am going to move an amendment, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Sturdy:

THAT all the words after the words “advisability of” be struck out and the following substituted therefore:

“establishing the purchase price of Crown Lands on which veterans are settled on request of the veteran and in the manner provided in the agreement, and that this Assembly re-affirm the policy of selling Crown Lands to the veteran occupants or their continuing under lease as provided in the agreements with such veterans.”

Now that gives the veteran a choice, and we are quite happy to give them that choice; and it is certainly a choice that I wish veterans had had during the previous scheme.

You will notice that that cuts out clause (b), or the reference to clause (b), and it cuts out the last part of (c), “provided he has proved his ability as a farmer”. I do not think we want to put ourselves in the position

March 27, 1951

of being judges on that question. If they go on that farm and stay on it and make their living there, certainly I do not want to question their ability as farmers.

I would move this amendment, seconded by the hon. Mr. Sturdy.

Mr. Speaker: — The debate is now on the amendment.

Hon. J.H. Sturdy (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I do express my appreciation for an excellent explanation of this subject. I shall certainly try not to duplicate what he has said, but it does occur to me that the Saskatchewan Rehabilitation Land Settlement Scheme is quite the best rehabilitation scheme that exists in any province in the Dominion of Canada or in the Dominion itself. It is a popular scheme.

The Hon. member for Moosomin seemed to doubt that. Well, let me inform him that if we had had 10,000 farms we could have settled 10,000 veterans. At one time we had over 2,000 applications from veterans on hand. There have been as many as 65 veterans to apply for a single farm under this plan. Applications continue to come to my office and to the office of the man who is in charge of the rehabilitation plan, Mr. Campbell, and into the Department of Agriculture, for additional land, although it has been known for some time now that we have come almost to the end of available land.

I want to say too, Mr. Speaker, that this scheme is so popular that many veterans have turned down or surrendered their V.L.A. rights in order to take up land under this plan. I am sure, also that the veterans have confidence in this Government to carry out the terms of the agreements that have been entered into. That has become increasingly evident because, during the past year or two, there have been requests from very few veterans for the purchase price on their lands to be stated.

Now, as I have searched for reasons for the resolution which has been introduced by the Opposition — and I regret that I must include the hon. member for Last Mountain in the Opposition — I am reluctantly forced to the conclusion that politics has a great deal to do with it. When the hon. member for Moosomin devoted about a half of his speech protesting that politics had nothing to do with it and he hoped it would not be brought in, then in the words of Shakespeare I do think that the “lady doth protest too much”. And there is a reason for this. The Opposition has had a bad experience during the past year, and they have had a bad experience particularly during this Session, and they seem to realize that the C.C.F. is now riding the crest of the political wave. Mr. Speaker, it threatens to be a tidal wave that will sweep those gentlemen out of the seats opposite, come the next election. Not only that, but their Liberal confreres at Ottawa have hopelessly muddled every issue on the political calendar, particularly as they affect the West, and particularly the Western farmer.

Government Member: — They are in the dog house.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — The Opposition is jittery in the extreme, and so they are grasping at straws — and this is one of the straws. You know,

it amazed me that a couple of weeks ago, in spite of the fact that Parliament was in Session, a tense international situation and all the other difficulties, that four Cabinet Ministers came to this province from Ottawa, hurried West to compose the fears of their political offspring, the Leader of the Opposition . . . I withdraw that — but I can hear, Mr. Speaker, those four political foster-mothers composing the fears of their child. It reminded me of that English mother who soothed her child at the Siege of Jedburgh in Scotland, many, many years ago, by crooning to her child:

“Hush ye, hush ye, do not fret ye,
The Black Douglas will not get ye!”

Well, Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Black Douglas — the contemporary Douglas, the Premier of this province — has really got the Opposition across a barrel. The Opposition is undoubtedly on the run and even poor Mr. Gardiner is, according to the “Leader-Post”, booked for the Senate, the refuge of weary, discredited politicians . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I must ask the Minister to keep to the point.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I’m keeping to the point, Mr. Speaker, Let us examine this resolution that is supposed to restore the waning fortunes of the members opposite. Or let us examine the land policy, and this is what we find. The Saskatchewan Veteran Land Settlement Plan provides for many excellent things. It was determined, as the hon. Minister of Natural Resources stated, by veterans, in the interests of veterans, for the safety and security and well-being of veterans. First, it was designed to settle veterans without debt. Isn’t that a good thing? Now, if you contrast that with the experience of veterans under the Soldier Settlement Board — I have stated in this House before that out of 24,000 veterans settled in Canada, 14,000 of them had to give up their farms, left their farms in despair under an impossible burden of debt. Let us tell you that already under the V.L.A. scheme in this province, there are certain veterans in arrears. Moreover, we have settled many poor veterans, whose parents could not afford to put up an additional \$1,500, or \$3,000, or \$5,000, which is necessary, in many cases, under the V.L.A. scheme.

The V.L.A. put up \$4,800 as the purchase price of land. Well, many veterans purchased land up to \$10,000 or \$12,000, but their parents paid the difference. There are men right in this House (the Government Whip is one of them) who had to put up additional money on behalf of their sons. I say this settlement plan of ours was designed to keep the veterans out of debt, and it has accomplished that. Even the members opposite will admit that the allocation of these 2,000 farms was fair, just and equitable in contrast to what happened to Federal land that was leased north of Melfort and elsewhere in the province. The terms of the agreement include a 33-year renewable lease. It is a perpetual lease held by the lessor during his life, and by his children and his children’s children as long as they want to keep it.

Mr. Tucker: — Will the hon. member permit a question? I presume from what he says he has the agreement there. Would he read the clause that provides for renewal?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — That is provided for in the lease regulations.

March 27, 1951

Mr. Tucker: — Well, would you read the clause that provides for that?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Nevertheless, that is a 33-year . . .

Mr. Tucker: — No, no, the lease. Where is it?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Clause 23 provides for the legacy feature, where the veteran may will that land to his son or his widow.

Mr. Tucker: — For the balance of the lease.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Oh, no, not for the balance of the lease, but in perpetuity.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, read the renewable clause.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — The lessee may purchase any time after 10 years, not at a set price, but at an arbitrated price and a price that is based on the productive value of that land; and if the lessee and the lessor cannot agree then the Saskatchewan Arbitration Act applies and the judge of the District Court is chairman of that board. Rentals are one-sixth to one-eighth of the crop produced. The only criticism is that the rentals are too low. Well, frankly, I don't think they are too low, but the hon. members opposite are accustomed to the rentals charged by mortgage companies and absentee landlords, and in contrast these rentals to veterans appear to be very low. It probably would surprise you (couldn't it?) and it would be a matter of great concern if we were to lower them still more.

I want to point out also that this lease provides that a portion of the rent — one-sixth to one-eighth, or all of the rent — can be waived over a period of years to enable the veteran to pay for development. If he brings new land under cultivation by land clearance and so on, we waive the payment of rentals up to an amount of \$25 per acre. This is also an excellent feature. And in spite of what the hon. member for Last Mountain states, the veteran is protected from crop failure under The Farm Security Act. That Act applies not only to the veteran farmers, but it applies to all farmers in the province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal specifically with some of the arguments advanced by the mover and seconder of the resolution. The hon. member for Last Mountain — I am quoting from his speech and I'll deal with it for a few minutes. He said:

“There has been widespread demand, I am given to understand, from the veterans of the province to bring about a stated price in regard to the lease they have signed.”

Well, I have visited a great number of veterans. The staff of the Rehabilitation Branch cover all veterans in the province, every year. Mr. Campbell has informed me that he has not had a single request come to his office for many months, that the price be stated on the land. It is true, at the beginning of this plan back in 1946 and early 1947, there were quite a number of requests received, and for that reason, and on the advice of the veteran members of this House, we set up a Land Tenure Committee. Now this Committee was under the chairmanship of Dr. Britnell. Included in that

Committee were Dr. Foulks; Professor Van Vliet, an eminent farm manager; Mr. M.E. Harding, who is a noted agricultural economist — he has since gone to Ottawa in the employ of the Federal Government there; and Mr. Ewert. These gentlemen, who are authorities, agricultural economists, farm managers, agricultural technicians, agricultural scientists, investigated our scheme, and I will point out presently what they recommended. The hon. member also stated — I have dealt with the crop failure clause. “I would like to ask” he says, “Why the price should not be set now. Is there any reason why it should not be set now?” And then I’ll quote another statement of his: “I remember in the past that when land companies sold land, if you did not have enough money to buy it you could always buy it on what was called a ‘lease-option’.” Well, now what has this Committee, in the lengthy report which they submitted in 1947, to say about that. This is what the Committee has to say:

“Commonly, where private lease agreements contain a purchase option clause, the option must be exercised within a relatively short time.”

Was yours three years, may I ask?

Mr. Benson: — Three years.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Yes, three years. Now you can predict pretty well what the price will be three years hence, but you cannot predict the price of land five years hence, or ten years hence or fifteen years hence. Remember, the veteran can exercise his option to purchase this land any time after he has been on it for a period of ten years. To go on with what the Committee advises:

“The purchase price is fixed by agreement and the option takes effect as a deferred state with rental payments credited towards the purchase price with the privilege of taking up the option limited to a short period of time. Few difficulties can arise over these prices.”

Now that is with respect to the lease option. But, this is what the Committee goes on to state with respect to a stated price for veterans’ farms:

“The situation differs greatly under the Crown Lease Option clause. Since this option may not be exercised, in many cases, in less than ten years from the drawing up of the lease agreement, and since it may be exercised any time thereafter during the continuance of the lease, fluctuations of land values render it impossible to estimate with any degree of confidence what a particular farm may be worth in 10, 12, 15 or more years’ time. No matter what care is exercised in establishing the option price it would in all likelihood be either too high or too low in relation to land current or values current at the time the purchase privilege became effective”

and so on . . .

March 27, 1951

Well, those are the reasons why we haven't set these prices, or one of the reasons. The hon. member for Last Mountain stated this:

“Now I maintain that the veteran should know what he has to pay. He should have some definite price to shoot at, so that he might save his money and get in a position to purchase the land.”

Well, the Director of the Rehabilitation Division has told me that he has discussed this with many veterans and his staff has discussed it with veterans and many of them are of the opinion that, if they succeed in saving up five or ten thousand dollars at the end of 10 years, they have no intention of purchasing this provincial land. They have children growing up, or they need additional land in order to secure a real economic farm unit. So they intend to purchase additional land. Under this provincial lease agreement they have absolute security. They feel therefore that, if they have security on it, can occupy it as long as they want and deed it to their children, then, certainly it is the only reasonable thing to suppose that if they have money saved up they will purchase additional land for the use of their children. However, Mr. Speaker, that is a matter for the veteran to decide. The veteran may purchase the land, he may leave the land — and neither the hon. gentleman opposite or myself will determine what the veteran does in that regard. Again, quoting from the speech, the hon. member said in regard to veteran's land:

“I think that the price should be set and the basis of the price be on municipal assessment.”

The Minister of Natural Resources dealt with that. I am not going to amplify it. But I would ask any gentleman in the House honestly, would he be prepared to sell his home on the basis of its assessment? Would he be prepared to sell his farm on the basis of its assessment? Would he be prepared to sell his store on the basis of its assessment? Let us be realistic about these things.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — That's almost childish.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Frankly, it does come very close to being in that category. Then the motion suggests that the veteran should be able to buy his farm if he has proven his ability as a farmer. That has already been decided. That was decided by the Committee who determined the qualifications of the veteran and on that Committee is represented V.L.A. members as well as members from my Department. Surely, if a man farms for a period of ten years, then if he wants to he should have the right to buy that farm or to continue to lease, and it should not be determined by any 'Gestapo' committee, political committee or otherwise as to whether that veteran has the ability to farm. That also is ridiculous.

I would like to turn now to the speech of the hon. member from Moosomin. He says this. He sets before us the fact that it will be many years before the veteran can own his land. Now I share with him his concern in that. He said that it would take a veteran between 45 and 50 years of age before he could own his farm under our scheme. Well, I can quite appreciate his concern because my Department is paying old-age pensions to

veterans settled under the Liberals after the first war, and they still have not got title to their land. Would that surprise you? Nevertheless, it is so. And when in Ottawa the C.C.F. and the Social Credit and even the Tories supported the granting of titles to veterans who had striven for over 30 years to get title to their land, not a single Liberal in this province voted for it. So I can quite understand the concern of the hon. member for Moosomin that these veterans should get their land before they are old-age pensioners: but why in the world does he not do something about it in respect to those who are the direct responsibility of the Liberals? I pass to another statement here. He says:

“I think that they should be given every opportunity to purchase their land immediately.”

Well, that shows a very serious lack of knowledge of the plan. We are under agreement with Ottawa — and we are inclined to cherish the sanctity of any agreement; and the agreement is that we cannot sell that land until the veteran has been on it for a period of ten years. Then he wishes to know what would happen if the veteran died — what would happen to his wife and children? He says:

“What would happen, Mr. Speaker, to the tenant on one of these farm Crown lands in this province if the veteran were to die?”

Well, again, may I point out that the hon. member knows very little about what is happening under this plan. I will deal with three veterans who have died within the past three years. One in the R.M. No. 48, a veteran who was killed May 31, 1949, leaving a widow and a 7-year-old daughter. A notarial copy from Letters Probate were received in December of that year. The lease is now vested in the widow and she is carrying on in exactly the same way as her husband carried on, and not doing too badly either. I see that in 1950 under her direction, they cleared and broke 80 acres. She is receiving crop remission, and has the credit of \$2,583 with the Department. She won't have to pay any rent for several years to come. She had a total of 926 bushels of crop this year. Unfortunately it was badly frozen.

Here is one from R.M. No. 74 and here again the veteran was killed by accident, leaving a widow with three small sons. The lease was turned over to the widow; the land is worked by the brothers of the deceased. It is the function of the staff of the Rehabilitation Branch of my Department to make such arrangements, and to make it easy for the widow to carry on, and in this case the land is being worked by the brothers. Taxes have been paid to date, the land has been well farmed, V.L.A. equipment well taken care of. From 170 acres in wheat in 1950, she threshed 2,975 bushels. That is quite an estate that will yield something around over \$5,000. That was her income for this year. Are you satisfied now that the widows of veterans are being taken care of under this plan? To have an income of \$5,000 you would need over \$100,000 invested nowadays; also that widow has no debts. She has the income from that farm, assistance is being granted to her and arrangements made to enable her to carry on and she is doing so successfully.

Here is another one in R.M. No. 259. The veteran died during the past year, 1950. There they threshed 2,476 bushels of wheat that graded

March 27, 1951

tough. The lease also has been transferred to the widow, and she operates the farm under the exact terms and conditions as her husband did. Yes, I can assure you that the widows of veterans who may die will be well taken care of and the security of their family safeguarded.

Now, in connection with any veterans' rehabilitation the most essential feature of rehabilitation is a home where he has a roof over the head of his wife and family. In his speech, the hon. gentleman advocates that the rent which the veteran has paid be applied on the purchase price of the farm. But when I asked him quite innocently the other day would he be favourable — this is the question I asked him: "Since you are in agreement that all rentals paid by veterans on such lands should be applied on the purchase price so established, I presume that you would agree that the rentals paid by veteran tenants on veterans' housing which they had been required by the Federal Government to purchase, that should also be applied on the purchase price." Did I get an answer in the affirmative from the hon. member opposite? No, he turned a couple of political somersaults and he said, "Mr. Speaker, that has nothing to do with it." Now, I claim that it has a great deal to do with this motion. I claim that a home, a veterans' home, is just as essential to his rehabilitation as a farm or anything else . . .

Mr. Tucker: — I want to tell my hon. friend that it is different.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — You can have the opportunity later. Let us deal with this because the two are so closely related. Let us see the Federal policy, and see if the Opposition are in agreement with that Federal policy. Now, as you know, veterans' basementless houses, — I am dealing with the houses which were built by C.M.H.C. for veterans. The veterans who originally wished to purchase those . . .

Mr. Trippe: — On a point of order. Is he speaking on this amendment or housing, Federal Government housing?

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member is using this argument as an illustration and will tie it up to the amendment.

Mr. Trippe: — It is not in the amendment.

Gov't. Member: — You do not want to hear it, eh?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Now the veterans originally wished to purchase these houses. When they came back from overseas and took over these veterans' houses, many of them wished to purchase them. They had money; they had rehabilitation grants and so on — but they were denied the opportunity of purchasing the houses. It was not Federal policy, and I am not quarrelling with Federal policy. The veteran was told at that time that he could be assured of renting these houses for a period of 10 years, and many of them, because they felt that they were going to be in those homes for a period of 10 years, spent considerable money in improving them. I do not know whether the hon. members opposite have been in the basementless veterans' houses or not, but I have been in several of them, and I know that many of them required a good deal of improvement. Well, that was all right; but in January of this year, this is what the veteran tenant received. A letter from C.M.H.C., which reads as follows:

“As you have been previously informed through the medium of the press and by letters from this office, the dwelling in which you reside is in a sales position and you, as the occupying tenant, have top priority to purchase. You have already been advised the selling price.” (The selling price was not arbitrated).

They were suddenly told, “You do not have an option to continue to lease or to purchase, you have got to purchase or else.” To read further from this letter:

“Having made its decision, the Government” . . . (that is the Federal Government) . . . “is now determined that all houses placed in a sales position must be sold.”

Again would I point out that no option is given to the veteran, as an option is given to the veteran under our land settlement policy. He may either continue under lease agreement or he may purchase, but the Veteran tenant has no such option. Let me read further from this letter:

“It is also not unreasonable to expect that rents will take a sharp incline upwards. Should instructions be received from Ottawa eliminating tenant priority, they will come with such devastating suddenness that you will not be given a second opportunity to purchase your house.”

Is that ever putting it on the line? If that isn't putting the veteran on the spot, I do not know what is.

Hon. Member: — Why don't you look after that?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — If you are concerned about the rehabilitation of veterans, for goodness' sake clean out your own Augean stables. To go on:

“Such sales will be carried out in a surprisingly short time, as we have a ratio of eager applicants exceeding two-to-one of saleable houses. I would, therefore, strongly urge that you make every effort to raise the down payment required, even if you have to borrow it” . . . (that is in the letter) . . . “and get it in our office at the earliest possible moment.”

And the gentlemen opposite, including the hon. member for Last Mountain, shed crocodile tears over the eventual fate of veterans on Provincial lands, when this sort of thing is going on right under their noses. The veterans wrote to the hon. Mr. Winters; there have been several letters. They have a very strong organization of some 450 members, and the veterans requested that, if they had to purchase the homes, the rents which they had paid should be applied on the purchase price. The gentlemen opposite are not interested, evidently, and yet their request and the resolution are one and the same thing.

March 27, 1951

If ever the hypocrisy of a governmental opposition was exposed, it is on this occasion.

Mr. Tucker: — I do not care what the Minister says at all, personally; but I just wonder if Your Honour thinks that it is in order to say that if ever the hypocrisy of the opposition to the government is exposed — he said “the governmental opposition is exposed, it is today.” Now, I just want to know if Your Honour thinks that is parliamentary.

Mr. Speaker: — If he had made a personal reference, I would have ruled it out of order.

Mr. Tucker: — When the Minister refers to the Opposition, he is referring to the Opposition here, to us all. Now, is that parliamentary?

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, so far.

Mr. Tucker: — All right, Mr. Speaker, all right . . . (interruptions) . . . Do not bother withdrawing if it is parliamentary. We can use the same language. (Further interruptions)

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Now the veterans have seen the resolution introduced by the Opposition in this House, that the rentals paid on farms be applied on the purchase price, and they wrote in to the Hon. Mr. Winters with the same request, that the rents which they had paid on houses be applied on the purchase price, and also that they be given some consideration for depreciation on the houses. I am reading now from the letter which Mr. Winters wrote to the Veterans' Association, and this is what is stated, in part:

“You request an express reply to the offer contained in the resolution. I presume you refer to item (b), the resolution which accompanied the letter dated January 31st, to the effect that rentals paid be credited to the sale price.”

Now, this is the opinion of the Hon. Mr. Winters. I am not finding fault with him, but I think the gentleman opposite should find fault with him. He says this:

“The express answer you request is that the Federal Government is opposed to accepting, in theory or principle, a proposal which so manifestly is not in the public interest.”

That is what he said; those were his exact words. Now, if you find fault with this Government, are you going to find fault with the Federal policy?

I did not realize, Mr. Speaker, that I had spoken so long. I am greatly interested in the rehabilitation of veterans. I speak as one who has been associated with two generations of Canadian soldiers overseas in two world wars, and so has the man who is in charge, the director of the Rehabilitation Branch of my Department. He, too, is a veteran of two world wars, having served pretty close to ten years, and naturally he is concerned with the welfare of veterans if anyone is.

I have been happy to second this amendment in the knowledge and the conviction that some veterans undoubtedly will apply to have the purchase price stated, and it will be done, as provided for in the lease agreement. We make an agreement — we live up to that agreement! I know veterans, and I know that the veterans also will live up to their agreements. So let there be no mistake as far as that is concerned. Should they ask for it, it will be granted. But I am very much concerned about land values being established at the present time under these inflated prices which exist, and, as far as I am concerned in the protection of the veterans, if it is, I would like to see that stated price related to, or translated into, bushels of wheat. As an example: if a half-section of land is quoted at \$15,000 it should be translated into the only thing that the veteran can pay that off in — namely wheat, if it is a wheat farm. That should be 7,000 or 8,000 bushels of wheat. And that is the manner in which the veteran should be protected. I do not want to see land prices set now at these inflated prices and a depression overwhelm the veterans in the future and they have to pay for their land with 30- or 40- or 50-cent wheat, as was the situation back in the 'thirties under the Liberals. I want to give this assurance to the House: we on this side are very much concerned over the welfare of the veterans, and as long as we are on your right, Mr. Speaker — which, I predict, will be for many years to come — the veterans will be justly taken care of.

March 27, 1951

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to follow the Minister in his flight of imagination and fancy about how long they expect to occupy those seats over there, and so on. I think that all that sort of thing is pretty fruitless, because none of us know what the electors are going to do with us when they get a chance . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — You should know.

Mr. Tucker: — . . . Well, my experience has been quite good. I think that I have been elected more often than the hon. Minister; but I still recognize that that is no sign I will be re-elected, and I do not think it is any sign that the Minister will be re-elected. All these boastings and vauntings about what is going to happen when the election comes along rather amuses me, and so I am not impressed at all.

Gov't Member: — You have changed your tune from last year.

Mr. Tucker: — I must say that if I listen to what I hear, of course I would think that the time of the hon. members is only set by the length of time they take in calling the election, but I am not sure about that. It is something we will have to see when the time does come. Also, in regard to the Federal Government, the Minister is always very anxious to talk a great deal about that. I will only deal with that to this extent — that following the first Great War, the government of the day embarked on a soldier settlement policy. I think the people who were engaging in it were people who were quite sincere about desiring to satisfactorily re-establish the veterans and to serve them as best they could. This desire to serve the veterans, as the Minister professes, I do not think the C.C.F. have a monopoly on it. I have known many people besides the Minister, who wanted to serve the veteran. All that suggestion that the people, following the first war, did not care about the veteran or were not trying to serve him — I do not think personally, that that sounds very good coming from a Minister of the Crown. But I will say, Mr. Speaker, that there was no experience at that time with this sort of work and, naturally, there were mistakes made. In addition to that there was the policy, which failed, of letting farm prices rise, and there has been a real attempt to prevent that following this war by different agricultural products agreements, stabilization agreements and so on. An attempt has been made to prevent that inflationary movement developing, after World War II, which cost not only returned soldiers, but other farmers, heavily after World War I. They went into debt on the basis of prices which prevailed immediately following the war, and then, when those prices collapsed, they were left in a very bad position. That applies not only to returned soldiers, but to other people. But again, the fact remains that people in those days were just as sincere in their desire to serve their fellowmen as they are today. The only thing is they did not have the advantage that we have had, of seeing what did follow a great war.

Now we have had that advantage and tried to avoid some of the results which followed the first war. We have not altogether succeeded in avoiding those results. For one thing, there has not been the period of stability following the war that we hoped for, or that followed the first war. In other words, the war ended less than six years ago, and now we have a tremendous re-armament programme in order to defend ourselves against a possible further aggression. Now, nobody ever foresaw that at the end of

the second great war, and that certainly is helping to throw things out of joint not only here, but in other countries of the world, including Great Britain where they have a socialist government. These things happen, and they are beyond the ability of man to foresee; and to pretend that people have not tried to wrestle with these things, with complete devotion to the people they were trying to serve from time to time — I do not think, myself, that that sort of thing goes down with people very well. I would never suggest that the Minister is not sincere in his desire to serve the ex-servicemen, but I do suggest, Mr. Speaker, that others are equally anxious to serve their best interests, and all this beating of breasts and suggesting that what he is going to do, and what he feels, and so on, and the suggestion that others do not feel the same way . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — On a point of order, I . . .

Mr. Tucker: — . . . it just sounds amusing from a man who suggested that we were hypocrites, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Does the Minister have a point of order?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I am fully aware that there have been a great number of patriotic people right across the Dominion who have done a very great deal for the veterans . . .

Mr. Tucker: — What is the point of order, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — . . . but my remarks were directed entirely to the members opposite.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, that is very interesting, Mr. Speaker. The point of order is raised by the hon. Minister and he says that it was not applied to anyone else except the people across here — that we are the hypocrites and we are the people who do not have the high motives and devotion to our fellowmen that the Minister has. Well, I must say that it must be a wonderful thing to have such a high opinion of oneself. The Minister surely is to be congratulated if he lives in a world like that, that he may thank God that he is not as bad as other people are. Whenever I hear anyone talking like that, I cannot help but think of the bible, which I studied closely in my youth, where a reference is made to that kind of a man — what kind of a man he really is. I suggest to the Minister, so that I will not be unparliamentary, that he go and have a look at the Bible, and he will know then exactly what I am referring to.

Now, coming to this amendment, I may say, in regard to the Veterans' Land Act legislation, that I think it is pretty good legislation — that is, the legislation following the second war; and it is the work of people belonging to all parties in the House of Commons. Everybody had a share in framing that legislation, and that is as it should be, Mr. Speaker. I had the great honour and privilege of being chairman of Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Commons on three successive occasions. It was a great honour and a privilege to serve with men of all parties who were trying to work out a system of rehabilitating the veteran, and to endeavour to have their views accepted by the Government, as most of them were, in working out a very good system of veterans' legislation. I see across from me my friend, the Minister of Public Health (Hon. Mr. Bentley) who sat on

March 27, 1951

one of the Committees of which I had the privilege of being chairman and who took part in making suggestions, and personally I think everybody who served on those Committees is proud of the work we did, Mr. Speaker. We were not always able to get the Government of the day to accept everything we wanted, but I think, on the whole, many of the things that were suggested were accepted.

One of the things that I felt about the Veterans' Land Act contract was a weak point, was the fact that there was no provision against crop failure, and before I left Ottawa I inaugurated the suggestion by memorandum to the Minister and the Director of the Veterans' Land Act, that an auxiliary contract would be entered into providing for that situation. It was actually adopted, and that covered one of the weaknesses, I thought, in the contract; and I think the V.L.A. set-up today is very, very good.

Now, in regard to the present motion and the amendment. First of all, I would like to read to Your Honour the programme we of the Liberal Party have in the matter. This was passed last November, but it represents pretty well the same attitude as has been our programme for well over four years now:

“Veterans to be permitted to buy provincial Crown lands and thus own their farms and homes, present leases, at the option of the veterans, to be converted into purchase agreements, with all payments made on the leases credited as payment on the purchase agreement. Assistance in clearing vacant land for settlement by veterans.”

The amendment moved by the Minister of Natural Resources strikes out certain items in the resolution before us which, of course, we should support if we believe in our programme, and we do believe in it. It accepts the establishing of a purchasing price of land on which veterans are settled, at the earliest date possible; it accepts that view and, of course, that is the view which I have advocated in a humble way ever since I have taken part in provincial politics, and I am glad that the Government is now ready to accept that view point. I am glad to see that they are ready to go that far, and we appreciate that; and if the amendment is carried, of course it will be embodied in the main motion, and for that step ahead which this motion has brought about, I think that it is worthy of our support for that alone.

But it strikes out this part of the original motion: “providing that all rentals paid by the veterans on such lands be applied on the purchase price so established.” That is to be struck out, and so I do not see how we can support that; and, incidentally, I was very much surprised to see the attitude to it, particularly, of the Minister of Social Welfare. The attitude taken by the hon. member for Last Mountain in this House has been quite clear. He is sitting as an Independent here. He introduces this resolution, and it is his resolution. Now why that should be made the basis of a political attack upon us by the Minister of Social Welfare, suggesting that we are hypocrites and so on, I am sure I do not know, Mr. Speaker. One would probably have to understand the devious workings of the mind of the Minister to really know the reason. Having read lots of books, recently, on psychology and psychiatry and so on, I realize that to do anything like probing the mind is a pretty technical and very difficult question, so I

will not attempt to go into that either; but there must be some connection, which I am not aware of.

Now, in regard to this matter, there is nothing unusual about it, for us to take an interest in it. The Minister says, "Why don't we go after Ottawa?" We do not sit in the Ottawa House, Mr. Speaker. The Minister seemed to be confused as to where he was, this afternoon. He said, "Why don't you go after them on this Federal policy?" And, "Why don't you go after them on that Federal policy?" Well, I assure the Minister (and I think the Minister of Public Health will probably agree with me) that if he and I were down in Ottawa we would be going after the Federal Government about some of these matters and trying to improve them and make them better.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — What about your people who are down there now?

Mr. Tucker: — But we are not down there. We are in the Provincial House, and we are dealing with provincial matters, and that is what we are trying to deal with this afternoon. The Minister would like to take us down to Ottawa and get us embroiled with the Federal Government down there; but we are quite satisfied at the moment to deal with the provincial policy in this matter, and that is what we are trying to do.

The amendment is going to strike out something so that the result from this amendment would be this: if the veteran wished to have it so, the price would be set, but he would have to go on for the rest of the 10 years paying rent. There would be no great advantage in having the price set, but there would be some advantage, because if he improved the land and built up its productive value, he would not be in danger of having to pay more on that account for it, as he would be at the present time. So there would be some advantage and that is why it is worth supporting. It does not deal, however, with the other matter — that, if this amendment were adopted and the Government does permit the price to be set, the veteran might pay for the land twice over in the next seven or eight years; and then at the end of the 10 years, he may exercise his option, and he would still be faced with buying that land and paying for it in full.

Now we take the attitude that once the price is set, at the option of the veteran, any of the rental paid should apply on the purchase price. There seems to be nothing wrong with that, but that is found fault with by the Government, and it is not covered by this amendment, and for that reason I do not see how we can support the amendment . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Would you charge interest on it?

Mr. Tucker: — Well, of course. Yes, at whatever rate would be agreed on — two or three per cent, or whatever might be deemed right. But actually the rental would apply upon the purchase price and the veteran would have the right then to say whether he wanted to go on that basis or go on renting. Surely the veteran should have that right! Why say to him, "You do not know where you stand for 10 years; in the meantime you are going to have to pay full rental, perhaps pay for the land twice over, and at the end of the time buy it over again"? It does not improve the situation completely to say that the price should be set.

March 27, 1951

In regard to the interest that might be charged, I perhaps should deal with that for a moment. I am not sure that if we were in office we would charge interest. It would be a matter that would have to be decided upon, and I must say that, in Alberta, as I understand it, rental is charged until the amount invested in clearing the land and so on is paid, and then the veteran is entitled to his title as soon as he can get it under the Veterans' Land Act.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — What rental do they pay during those seven years?

Mr. Tucker: — I understand it is $1/6^{\text{th}}$ and $1/8^{\text{th}}$.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — No, it is $1/3^{\text{rd}}$ of the crop share for a period of seven years.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, I understand they do not pay rent during the first two or three years — I am speaking from memory now, I did not intend to take part in this debate; but my impression is that for two or three years they do not pay any rent at all, and then after that time they pay whatever rent is set — and I am not quarrelling with the Minister about it. But whatever rent they do pay goes right upon the purchase price, and when that is applied on the purchase price, if it pays it off, then the person is entitled to his title just as soon as the 10 years is up. I have said at times in the past that I myself am rather inclined towards that policy, and I think that I would favour it; but this question of whether there should be interest or not — certainly, if it was decided on it would not be any high rate; but I myself think that as I remember the attitude I took in the past endorsing the Alberta viewpoint, my own attitude has been that interest should not be paid on that — that it should be applied on a fixed purchase price.

However, that is a small matter. As a matter of fact, today, the situation is that the veteran is required to pay his rent right along for 10 years. Then at the end of the 10 years he has to have the price set, and the way it is today, if he builds up the productive power of his land, he is liable to have to pay more than if he had not built it up.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — No.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, I will read the contract and the Minister will see that. I intend to run over the contract, and as I do it, the Minister will see that. Now, even if this amendment is adopted, the price is set, he will still pay rent, and at the end of the 10 years he will not get any credit for it. So I suggest to the members opposite that they consider whether they think that is fair or not. So far as we are concerned, we do not think it is fair. We think that, when a person goes on that land, farms it, pays rent, he should if he wishes have a purchase agreement, and from the time he gets the purchase agreement, all payments should go on the purchase price.

Now I would just like to run over the agreement, because the Minister seems to be very proud of it, and I have often wondered about it. Clause 3 says that the lessee can convert any portion of the cultivated area of the land to pasture or the production of hay and fodder crop upon such terms and conditions as the Minister may determine, provided that he may waive payment of rent. In other words, this man who is on this land,

cannot convert any of it to the production of hay and fodder crop unless the Minister agrees.

Then it goes on to say that, after the expiration of the first 10 years of the term of this lease, the lessee may, at any time, during the remainder of the term — that is any time during 23 years — give the lessor written notice of his desire to purchase the said land. If the lessee has, up until the time of giving such notice, performed and observed the several covenants, conditions and agreements by him herein agreed to be performed and observed, the lessor will offer to sell the said land to the lessee at a price and under terms based on fair productive value. In fixing the price the Minister shall make allowance for the cost of any clearing done on the said land at the lessee's own expense, such offer shall be open for acceptance for a period of 90 days after the day on which it is mailed.

Now here is the situation — the Minister contradicted me with his usual gay and complete disregard of facts, by saying that the price would not be based upon the productive value of the land. Well now I will read it to you again, Mr. Speaker. It says:

“. . . will offer to sell the land to the lessee at a price and under terms based on fair productive value.”

Now that is exactly what I said, and the Minister said, “No.”

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I cannot recall ever having made that statement. Certainly the sale price of the land is going to be determined on the fair productive value of that land over a long term of years, but if the final price cannot be agreed on by the lessee and the lessor, then the Saskatchewan Arbitration Act applies.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, the Minister must be suffering from amnesia or something. I am under the impression that I said that the price would be fixed upon the fair productive value, and the Minister said, “no” . . .

Premier Douglas: — You are having hallucinations.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, the Premier thinks I may be having hallucinations — of course the feeling is maybe mutual; but in any event that is what I said about the agreement. I said that, at the end of that time, at the end of 23 years, the purchase price will be based upon the productive value, and that if a veteran works that land well, builds up its productive value, he may find that he has to pay more for it than if he lets it run down and the record is not such as to indicate that it has a high productive value.

Now then, that is the difficulty about this sort of thing. We all have had lots of experience in regard to farming, and we know that two people may start with a similar piece of land, and one will farm it well, handle it well so that no erosion takes place or anything of that nature, and after a period of 15 or 20 years, one person will have a wonderful farm and another person who has not handled his land well, who may not have adopted the best cultivation methods and so on, will find that his land is not producing

March 27, 1951

nearly as much. The result is that when the time comes that the record of the land is looked into, the man who has really applied his knowledge and ability and worked hard in eradicating weeds and all the rest of it, will be faced with the fact that the fair productive value of his land will be higher because that is the productive record of his land. They will say, "look what you have produced!" The tendency will be to discourage people from building up the productive value of their land and farming to his best advantage.

Now why should the veteran be in that position — why should he be placed under that handicap — at least for the 10 years until he can exercise his option? That is another clause in the agreement and that is why I am glad that the Government is willing to let the person have the price set at once, because it means then that he is not going to suffer if he builds up the productive value of his land.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You are completely off the beam.

Mr. Tucker: — The Minister of Agriculture is moaning, and that is a good sign that I am hitting pretty close to the truth.

The next thing in this agreement that I would like to draw to the Minister's attention is Clause 10:

"The lessee, unless he has a place of permanent residence in the district in which the land hereby described is situated, and is resident therein, or unless he obtains the written permission of the Minister to the contrary, will enter into possession of and commence to reside upon the said land within three months after the beginning of the term of years created by these presents.

"Whether or not the lessee resides upon the said land he will have to, after taking possession, continuously thereafter remain actively engaged in agriculture and in the farming operations of said land."

In other words, it just means that the Minister can graciously give this person the right to reside off the land in a neighbouring village, we will say: but, notwithstanding any right that the Minister can graciously extend like that, if the veteran for a year or so finds it difficult to farm the land himself, then he is breaking a term of his lease.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Oh, no!

Mr. Tucker: — Well that is the way it reads:

"Whether or not the lessee resides upon the said land he will, after taking possession, continuously thereafter remain actively engaged in agriculture and in the farming operations of said land."

Now there is the agreement, just as plain as the English language can make it, and that is a clause in this agreement that I feel is much more stringent than is applied where a person owns his own land. The Minister says how much better off a person is operating under this sort of thing, than when he owns his own land. Where you own your own land, Mr. Speaker, you do not have to come to the Minister and get permission to live off it for six months, or something like that, and you do not have it laid down that you are breaking the agreement if you do not actively engage in agriculture yourself. Now that is another clause that I draw to the Minister's attention.

Another clause that I found very interesting in this agreement is this:

“The lessee shall have the privilege of leaving any of the said buildings or other improvements on the said land after the termination of the said term, and during the period of 90 days after such termination shall have the right to sell the same or any of them to the incoming tenant or to the lessor”.

That is, assuming that he has got in the position where he is not able to buy the land — he is faced, we will say, with a purchase price that he cannot pay — then he has the privilege that he can leave the house that he has built on the land — (this is a real privilege) — he can leave the house and other improvements he has built on that land for 90 days, to give him a chance to sell it to the incoming lessee.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — No!

Mr. Tucker: — Well, here is what it says. I will read it to the Minister again:

“The lessee shall have the privilege of leaving any of the said buildings or other improvements on the land, after the termination of the said term and during the period of 90 days . . .”

He does not have to move them off the moment the lease ends; he has 90 days. Now, of course, his house may be on foundations and so on, but I admit it is a privilege to be able to leave it there for three months:

“He shall have the right to sell the same or any of them to the incoming tenant or to the lessor . . .”

And incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the Minister, quite gaily and again with complete disregard of the facts, said this is a “renewable lease”. And I asked the Minister where is the term providing that the person has a right to renew this lease. The Minister did not see fit to answer. I have looked over this lease very carefully and I do not see any term providing that he is entitled to a renewal of this lease. It is a lease for 33 years — that is what it says in the lease; and I will read it to the Minister. It says:

March 27, 1951

“To have and to hold the said demised premises unto the lessee for and during the term of 33 years to be computed from . . . subject to covenants, stipulations, conditions and agreements hereinafter contained.”

There is the lease. There is nothing in the lease that I can find providing for renewal of it, but the Minister says it is a renewable lease. Well, let the Minister say what clause provides for renewal. I will sit down if he wants to tell us what clause provides for renewal. He cannot do it because it is not in it. So again I say, the Minister gaily and completely in disregard of facts makes these statements.

Mr. Benson: — I would like to ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition to read the crop-failure clause of the agreement.

Mr. Tucker: — That is one that I must have missed. You can close the debate, and you can read that.

I just borrowed this, because, as I said, Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take part in this debate.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I did not say there was a crop-failure clause in this agreement. I said that The Farm Security Act — the crop-failure clause in The Security Act applies to veterans as it does to all other farmers in the province.

Mr. Tucker: — Now then, I repeat, the lessee has the privilege of leaving his buildings on this place that he has a lease on for 90 days, and he can sell these buildings to the incoming tenant or to the lessor; that is, he can sell them to the tenant or to the government, but the lease provides: “At the expiration of the said period, all buildings and other improvements remaining on the land and unsold shall become and be the property of the lessor”.

Now isn't that generous, Mr. Speaker? If he cannot get them off inside of 90 days, then they become the property of the Government:

“In case of dispute as to price to be paid for any such buildings or other improvements, the price shall be determined by three arbitrators, of whom each of the negotiating parties shall appoint one, and the two arbitrators thus appointed shall appoint a third, who shall have all the necessary powers of valuing and appraising such buildings and improvements.

“The arbitrators shall appoint a time for payment of the price determined by them, the decision of the majority of the arbitrators shall be final. The expense of the arbitration shall be borne equally between the parties hereto.”

Now all people who are farmers know that you might spend \$10,000 on buildings on a farm, and the value that you might increase your farm by would not necessarily be the \$10,000. It might be only a very small part of the \$10,000. If this person improves his property, builds a good house

there on a foundation and all the rest of it, and cannot move it off without destroying the value of it, then it becomes the property of the lessor, and a matter of arbitration as to what should be paid. Well, I am inclined to think that the amount that this person will be paid will be the amount that it increases the value of the land by — and is that so very generous, Mr. Speaker? But this is in this lease. Then it goes on to say:

“These presents shall in no way restrict the lessor in permitting any person to enter upon the said land for the purpose of exploring and searching for minerals.”

In other words, an ordinary person who owns his land does not have to let anybody come on and go all over his land hunting and searching for minerals — at least I don't now that they have to let them come on at will, and without any provision for compensation or anything of the sort; but here the Government has reserved that right against the returned soldier.

“These presents shall in no way restrict the lessor in permitting any person to enter upon the said land for the purpose of exploring and searching for minerals.”

In other words, so far as the Minister is concerned, he can give anyone carte blanche to go all over this land hunting and searching for minerals, regardless of the lease.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Oh, no!

Mr. Tucker: — Well, here is what it says. The Minister of Agriculture is interpreting this lease now. I will read it to him, and then I ask him to consult the Attorney General and ask him if what I say is not true.

“These presents shall in no way restrict the lessor in permitting any person to enter upon the said land for the purpose of exploring and searching for minerals”.

In other words — for that purpose, it is just as if this lease did not exist. Now the Minister of Agriculture may be studying law and so on, but I suggest that he take the advice of the Attorney General in regard to that. Now the next clause:

“The Minister or any person thereunder authorized by him or any officer of the Department of Natural Resources and Industrial Development of the province of Saskatchewan may at any time during the said term enter the said premises and examine and inspect the condition thereof. The lessee will, upon request, furnish the Minister of the said Department, or to any officer thereof, any further and additional information which may be required in order to enable the Minister to determine whether the said land is being operated and managed in a proper manner”.

March 27, 1951

I could not help but laugh when I heard the Minister of Natural Resources talking about how they are protecting the rights of the veteran and so on — and here there is a right reserved, not only to the Minister, but to all his officers and inspectors (and goodness knows how many there are), to go in on this land and the person on it has got to answer all questions and so on. Well, that, of course, is very interesting in the light of what the Minister of Natural Resources said.

And here is another interesting clause that is put in this lease — to protect the veteran, I suppose:

“If the said land or any part thereof is at any time required for, or in connection with any road, trail, railway, telephone line, telegraph line, power transmission line, aeroplane landing field, beacon, or for any work or works to be constructed under The Water Rights Act, Water Power Act, Water Users Act, or the Irrigation Districts Act, or for any public purposes, or if it appears that the said land contains minerals . . .”

Just listen to this, Mr. Speaker, this beautiful agreement:

“. . . if the said land contains minerals as defined in The Mineral Resources Act, the Minister may cancel these present . . .”

Just wipe them out if they find that the land contains minerals. Now then, isn't that real protection for the veteran?

“. . . or withdraw any portion of the said land from the operation thereof by notice in writing to the lessee, without having previously given the lessee notice of intention to do so.”

In other words, without giving any notice of intention whatever, they can just cancel this whole business if they want it for any public purpose or if they find that it contains minerals . . .

Mr. McCormack: — Or a golf course!

Mr. Tucker: — Oh yes, a golf course. If the Minister decides to build a golf course on one of these pieces of land he could simply cancel the lease; or if they found out — and again I draw your attention — I can tell when I am really dealing with sound arguments, because the Minister of Agriculture begins to moan and mutter. Now, of course that is a sure sign, Mr. Speaker; it is most encouraging to me; always, when that happens.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker the hon. member is suggesting that I am just simply sitting back here and deliberately suggesting that he doesn't know what he is talking about — that is exactly the truth. We are governed by The Provincial Land Act on the manner in which we issue leases.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Tucker: — I had better read it again because the Minister of Agriculture did not seem to get it:

“If the said land or any part thereof is at any time required for or in connection with any road, trail (and so on) or for any public purpose, or if it appears that the said land contains minerals as defined in The Mineral Resources Act, the Minister may cancel these present . . .”

In other words, this man that may have farmed this land for 9 or 10 years is about to exercise his right to purchase it, and the Minister has a right to say, if there are minerals on it, if it contains minerals, “this is cancelled — your rights are gone”. Or if he decides to use it for any public purpose, the veteran’s rights are gone.

Well now, why should not the man entering this agreement, under the Veterans’ Land Act, have the same rights to be protected under the law as anybody else? Why should those strict clauses be put in this particular agreement? The Minister can say, if he wants, he has had no complaints. Well, I wonder how many soldier settlers have read this agreement and seen the way they are protected so carefully by the Minister.

Well now another clause reads:

“The lessee will not assign or transfer these presents or any part thereof or sublet the said land or any part thereof without the consent of the Minister”.

Now, if this Government were by some chance in office and somebody wanted to assign one of these contracts, how does anybody know that the Minister is going to agree? He may take the same attitude as I heard just recently, about the transfer of a taxi licence. The Minister figured that the purchaser was willing to pay more money than he thought right. All right, there was objection by the Government to the transfer. Now this reserved that right to hold over the soldier settler that unless he gets the consent of the Minister, he cannot even assign this lease. Why this desire to keep such a whip-hand over the veterans of this country? Why should they be treated so much worse than other people? Now that is the question we in the Opposition ask, and I believe the hon. member for Last Mountain, figured he would bring to the Government’s attention. If they want to continue this situation, it is up to them; but it is being brought to their attention now, and from now on there will be no excuse for these clauses in these agreements. Now it goes on to say:

“In the event of the lessee’s failing to pay the said rent when due, whether formally demanded or not . . .

That is, if they fail to pay the rent, whether it is asked for or not;

“. . . failing to observe or perform any of the covenants, conditions, stipulations or provisos

March 27, 1951

by him herein agreed to be observed or performed or failing to comply with the conditions and provisions of the acts and regulations to which these presents are subject . . .”

That is, if he violates some regulation of which he may know nothing — what is the penalty for any of these things?

“In the case of said premises being not used for the purpose for which they were let or used, or be used for any other purpose than that for which they were let, or in case they be used by any person or persons other than the lessee, or in case any tax levied remains unpaid for a period of two years . . .” (if he cannot pay his taxes) . . . “the Minister may cancel these presents after having given the lessee 6-months notice of his intention to do so, provided, nevertheless that in the case of such cancellation, the lessee shall continue . . .”

Now this was some real protection for the veteran — even if they cancel it:

“. . . to be liable to pay and the lessor shall have rights for the recovery of any rent then due or accruing due, as if these presents had not been cancelled, but had remained in full force.”

That is real protection for veterans! If he violates some regulation or something like that, they can cancel this lease; or if he does not pay the taxes for two years, they can cancel the lease — and then, of course, having cancelled it, they have very carefully provided that he still remains liable for the rent and the taxes. It goes on to say:

“No implied covenant or liability on the part of the lessor shall be deemed to be created by the use of the words ‘demise’ or lease’, or any other words in these presents.”

Why was it necessary to put that clause in, Mr. Speaker? because, by long-established decisions under British law, if you lease a piece of land to a person he has certain rights under that lease. These words “lease” and “demise” have certain rights attached to them. Was it because they wanted to be sure that these curtailments had full right to operation by saying that there shall not be attached to these words the usual meaning that applies to them by court decisions? Why is this little clause put in there? I will read it again:

“No implied covenant or liability on the part of the lessor shall be deemed to be created by the use of the words ‘demise’ or ‘lease’, or any other words in these present.”

Isn't that something? If they made an ordinary lease, then there are certain things, certain rights that the veteran would have, that would flow from the fact that they said, "We are leasing the land" — but they say, there shall be no rights implied by virtue of the fact that those words are used, in order to make sure that these curtailments, these rights of cancellation and so on, shall prevail. That is the only reason I can see for putting it in — and then they talk about mortgage companies, and they talk about private enterprise! Why, there is an example — I do not remember in all the time I have practised law, having seen an agreement more carefully drawn to protect the lessor, and to make sure that he did not give any rights, except what were exactly in this thing, to make sure that there were no rights even implied, than this agreement here that the Minister is so proud of.

Now, there it is, and I have just read the agreement, and the Minister can consider what I have said.

Now, as to our attitude towards this matter. As I have said, it is set out in our platform. We believe that any one of these veterans should have an option — if they want to carry on on this basis of leasing land for 33 years and then taking a chance on whether they can get a renewal or not, or carry on for 33 years and then say, "Now I want to know what I have to pay to buy this land" and perhaps be confronted by a purchase price which they cannot handle, and then having to move off and leave their homes. What protection is that to a wife? Or children? Supposing a person was carrying on on this basis right to the end of the time; and suppose that he died at the 32nd year, or something like that, what would be the situation? At the end of the 33rd year, they would have a right to leave those buildings on for 90 days while what the new lessee had to pay was being determined. If they wished to purchase and a price was set that they could not handle, would they have the same rights as if they owned the property? Of course they wouldn't, Mr. Speaker. Anybody who understands the situation at all knows that that is the case — that they have a 33-year lease, and unless they are able to buy and meet the terms of purchase that are set, off they must go, and then, of course, what they get paid for the improvements is decided by the arbitrators. On what basis? I take it on the basis of how much those improvements have improved the value of the land — maybe only a fraction of what they invested in it. Is that a protection the same as they would have if they owned their own land? Well, of course it is not.

We take the attitude that it should be at the option of the veteran. If he wants to farm on this basis, nobody is going to say that he should not have that right if he wants it; but if he wants to have the same rights that practically every hon. member of this House, I expect, has exercised, of owning his own farm and his own home as soon as possible, then, at any rate, he should know how much he has to pay for it if he wants to buy it, and be able to have what he is able to pay applied on the purchase price. Why shouldn't the veteran have that right? Why should he be deprived of that right for 10 years? because this amendment does not change that situation. All it does is say the price may be set, but for 10 years all he can do is pay the rent and then wait for the time when he has a right to ask for title.

We think that he should have the right — not only to have the price set, but to have his payments applied upon that price when it is set. I

March 27, 1951

think, Mr. Speaker, that our attitude should be that when we are disposing of this land to veterans as a re-settlement policy, we should be willing to take the attitude that at least in regard to any payments made up to this date under these leases, they should be applied upon the purchase price.

Now in regard to anything to the future, I think the same, as far as that goes — that these payments should be applied upon the purchase price. Because, what is the situation? In the past there was a policy of letting people take up a homestead — they paid \$10 for it. Now then, on these Crown Lands, if a reasonable price is set on them and the veteran is paying a reasonable rent (as they do in Alberta), it does not seem to be out of place at all that for the first 10 years those agreements should not bear interest. After that time — if they have not yet paid for it, perhaps the arguments of the Minister in regard to protecting the School Lands fund and so on, should have some weight; but it seems to me that, in regard to these veterans, the province has some obligation to them.

One of the Ministers — I forget which one it was — said that this is a Federal obligation. Well I would say, Mr. Speaker, that these boys fought to defend Canada and we are part of Canada, and there are certain things that we have a right and duty to do. We have control over the land, the natural resources, of this province, and having that control and ownership, we have some obligation to recognize their service, just the same as the Federal Government has — we are part of Canada. Surely this Government has some obligation to recognize their service, and I do not think it would be out of place at all that, if the price were set and it was provided that the money paid as rent should be applied on their purchase price at least for the first 10 years, it should go on without any interest being charged. Other provinces appreciate the service given by their ex-servicemen, like Alberta, and can do something like that, I do not see any reason why Saskatchewan cannot do it, too.

It seems to me, for that reason, I should vote against this amendment, because while it sets the price, it does not mean that these people have a chance to pay for their land until the 10 years is up. If by some chance the amendment is carried — and I do not see why these rights should not be given to veterans; but if there is sufficient opposition to insure the carrying of the amendment, then, of course, at any rate it is a step forward in saying that if they want, they can have the price set, so they will know what they are going to have to pay ultimately for the land, and not be facing an uncertain future. To that extent, the motion as amended will be worth supporting, but as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote against the amendment, and if the amendment is carried, I intend to vote for the motion as amended.

Mr. L.L. Trippe (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, as this debate has gone on, there are a few matters that have come to my attention in connection with it and few remarks that I would like to make. I do not intend to speak very long, because the matter has been argued in considerable detail; but, perhaps, as one who has gone through a couple of these settlement projects, I might be qualified to speak on some aspects of them. I have not heard any of the other hon. members say that they were settlers under this old Soldier's Settlement Board, but I was, at one time.

Considering the relationship between the amendment and the resolution, I am sure that, no matter what happens, the hon. member for Last Mountain has gained some point anyway. There is some relaxation here in the regulations. I am quite sure, also, that nobody is going to accuse him of being political, because I do not think he has any politics as far as I know. I believe that the proposition that he has put forward to us today is reasonable. It seems to be reasonable for a number of reasons. There are a lot of things that are proposed to this Government and to the Federal Government that, if you would take them they would involve you in expenditure of money. But here is one resolution that does not involve any expenditure. As far as the matter of the School Lands are concerned, it is agreed that you are going to sell them anyway at a certain period, and to say that you are going to sell them at some period previous to that will not involve the Government in any outlay or in any sacrifice of any of the people's assets, as far as I can see.

Now, it is altogether probable that a great many of settlers on these lands have the same desire to own outright the premises that they occupy as an urban dweller has. There is never any real argument about whether a man in the city wants to own his house or not, and if he does every facility is given to him to immediately own it by any persons that I know of who have anything to do with it. And, likewise, if persons in the country wish to own their land, and if that is regarded by them as a secure proposition, reasonable security — which it is by a great many of the veterans — then I am sure that every facility should be extended to these people to own their land and own it quickly if they would like to do so.

There is another reason why this might be good, and it is that an early valuation would give the veteran a chance to pay for something, own it and possess it at a time when he might be able to do so. Things may occur later on, where he would not have the money; and maybe today he has the money. We hear considerable about inflation and 'easy money' and fifty-cent dollars and one thing and another, and maybe he has a bunch of this money today; but if there was a little recession at all he might not have it. So it would be very nice if we could just extend him the privilege of buying his land today, if he can do so.

It is my personal opinion that Crown land sitting there in the name of the Crown with nothing much going on, or even if you get one of these minimum rentals, it probably is not of very much value to the Crown. I believe that the costs of administration and inspection and one thing and another would largely eat up the very small rental that you get, even if you rent it and continue to do so; and there are certain occasions where you do not get any rental. I believe that the Crown's position in this should be that we should be first of all tax collectors and try to get these lands on the tax roll and keep them there, and if a person owns

March 27, 1951

them it would be beneficial in that regard. Of course, if you want to make the person a deal, you can make it in bushels of wheat today as well as any other time, and I do not think there would be any objection to that. That would protect the person in case of fluctuation of money values or anything like that. The bushel of wheat would still be there, and I believe the veterans would be in favour of that.

There is one thing that disturbs a good many of the veterans today, and some of them have told me about this, and told other people. That is that if they had a deal made today, they would be able to do one of two things. If the price was going to be unacceptable to them, and what they consider to be entirely out of line, a good many of these men are young and they would have a chance at the present time to walk away from this deal before they get too old to get themselves established in something else. It might be a particular advantage to some of these fellows. If they do not know what deal they are going to get at the end of ten years, as the hon. member for Moosomin has said, at the end of ten years a great deal of their young life and their working ability is gone, and they may not be satisfied with the deal. So I think it would be very nice of the Government — and I know that there are people in the Government who have the interests of the veterans at heart, in their way of interpreting; I believe it would be very nice for them to make this deal so that a man would find out whether he really wanted to accept it at all.

I am concerned, as some of the other members are, about what would happen in the case of death of a man, and the infants and wife knowing very little about business, I am wondering what their equity would be, how it would be figured out, whether it would be substantial, and if it would be in cash. I have not heard of any of these deals today, or recorded as having been made today, in which the widow was offered any money where she could leave this thing and go off and do something else if she wanted to, and perhaps, she would find herself in a very hard position if she just had to carry on with the man's original lease. I have heard really no valid argument against the sale to the veteran, at this time, of the land if he wishes to buy it. I have not heard anything at all. And I suggest that it would be a nice thing to do.

We have heard something about the position of people after the First War, with regard to these land policies of the Government, and I do happen to know a little something about that, because I was a settler under that scheme after the First War. There are some great illusions that have gone around since then as to the conditions under which those people were settled, and the deal that they got. I must say that that was the most advanced piece of legislation that had ever been put forward to veterans up to that time, and if we look back 30 years we can certainly see where some improvements could have been made in almost anything — and so they could have in this; but it was the best thing that the Government of the day could figure out. I do not think it was a Liberal Government. My understanding was that it was a Conservative or a Coalition Government at the time. I did not have much interest in politics those days, did not know very much about it; but that was my understanding. And we all thought that we got the very best kind of a deal, and the prices we had to pay were prices that ranged at that time. Nobody was compelled to take any land either — any poor land, as has been said — because everyone was agreed on their land and everybody put down 10 per cent, and I am going to tell you

that if they did not get the land that they thought they wanted, there was a real howl from the veterans' organizations, who put the pressure on to see that they got it. So nobody was done badly by at that time.

What really did happen was this. When most of them were settled, in the fall of 1919 and 1920 we had a most unusual condition in this country. There was a very hard winter; things froze up early and the established settlers — about half of them — failed, to say nothing about the people who were not established, but just getting their feet in. And we paid some very fancy prices for the things that we got in those days, to get established, but you could not do it any other way. If you let these men come back and did not do anything at all for them, that would have been wrong and if you were going to stake them you would have to pay the prices that prevailed at that day. So I did not hear much kick about it until some of them commenced to fail, and it just took me about six years to go along with the rest of them, although we did have a very nice place, and we put in our savings (which were considerable at that time), and these went along too.

I have no regrets, however, not a particle of regret over that; and of all the other people who were in that settlement — and there were many; there is only one survivor down there now — I have not heard them express any regrets either, because most of them did better after they got out of there than they would have done had they stayed there. The fellow who stayed there now has had a great number of concessions offered him, one after the other, until he does not find himself, as far as what he has paid out, with any fault to find with the concessions. As for giving title to these fellows who happened to have stuck it out and stayed on the land, I believe that that should be taken care of on an individual basis as to what a man is doing and what he has done, what sacrifice he has made and what he has done with his land. In that way it has been taken care of, because the Government, year after year periodically, has made concessions to these people who stayed on the land. But the danger in making an across-the-board concession on this thing would be that you would have 500,000 other men who would also require to be fixed up for just as much money as they had given these settlers, and that would be an almost impossible thing to do.

Now, in those days I never heard any politics talked at all either. I would not have known very much what they were if I had heard them, and I was not interested; but we did not hear any politics talked in connection with any of these land settlements. Then we got to a time when the Conservatives happened to be in power in this province, and I may say that I am citing this to show that most of this settlement has been non-political; there were no political strings or implications attached to it. They made a good deal for the soldiers. There was considerable land in this province that had not been settled in 1929 and years around there, and they made the arrangement that, when land was considered to be valuable and suitable for settlement, they turned it over and the veterans got one-day priority for filing. That was a very good concession. The veteran also got what was called a "soldier's grant", in which they gave him free of cost (it did not cost him anything), one quarter-section of land. I happened to be lucky enough to get in on one of these settlements at that time and I got a quarter-section as a homestead on which I paid \$10, and a soldier grant that was right beside it that did not cost me anything at all. I picked up on this settlement scheme just about what I had sacrificed on the other one, so that at the end of this time I found myself, when I did prove up, in possession of

March 27, 1951

a very nice piece of land — it cost me \$10; and when I got through with it and was ready to move out of there, I was able to sell it for \$5,000. So I considered that to be a pretty good deal. All in all, if you followed these things up and took advantage of them as they came to you, they just about balanced out, and I do not think the veteran had very much kick on that.

If you wish to call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I will continue after supper.

Mr. Speaker: — It being six o'clock, I leave the Chair until eight o'clock.

Eight o'clock p.m.

Mr. Tripe (Continuing): — Before recess we were speaking about the different veterans' land settlement schemes and had traced them up through two or three different administrations with a view of indicating that there was nothing political in the set-up of the veterans' settlements in times gone by, and that all political parties had more or less tried to give them the very best deal they could as times went on.

Then we come to the policy of the Federal Government in setting up these veterans after the last war, and I believe, also, that that was as good a scheme, and a better scheme really than any that had been introduced up to that time. There were certainly more cash grants and a better chance of them to go into different occupations than there had been under any other settlement scheme. It was an entirely good deal for the veteran, perhaps going as far as any Government would be expected to go, and, certainly away ahead of anything that had been offered to them by any of the other Allies to their veterans. The basis of that was, of course, that the man should get his holding and be able to own them as an individual, and that was the basis of the scheme that the Federal Government had set up. They had gone further even than farm lands. They had a chance to rent a business in the cities, or something like that.

Then this Provincial Government came along with their scheme of settlement and, as far as the land policy was concerned we heard that talk this afternoon in the House. I have never read one of these leases over, but I was startled to hear that the minerals, as defined by the provincial Acts, were under control of the Crown here on this land and that they could go on to this land and do any kind of searching. Of course, "minerals" is quite a broad term and included in it is also sand or gravel; so I expect that if they found this on a man's land they could go in and take it for some of their road-building. I do not think that is a very good scheme. Then, too, if he cannot assign without consent of the Minister, that is not good either, because he should be the person who signs the deal and determines whether he thinks that is a good deal or not, and he should not have to make reference to anybody as to whether it is good. That might lead to a little abuse as far as the politicians are concerned, and some of the veterans think that it would. I can see a possibility myself, because we have had occasions here where the veterans have not been treated very kindly when they came to do business. We have the case where they did give one of them permission to sue the Government and he did quite nicely,

but the next two that came along with the same kind of grievance were denied permission. Perhaps they would have done just as well as the first man did, but they did not get permission to sue and finally got a settlement very much less than the first man got when he sued for the same kind of an offence. So, if they use the same system in dealing with these fellows when they want to make an assignment, or with regard to minerals or something like that, I am sure that is not going to be very good.

We have gone a certain distance, and I am pleased with the way this was introduced. We have got the Government in a position now where they are going to make some kind of concession anyway: they are going to value this land for them, even if they do not let them buy it just now, and that is something. But I believe myself, that what we are going to discover, before these resolutions are fully passed, is just one thing — whether it is the intention of the Government to try and socialize these veterans and whether it is their intention to perpetuate this use-lease system which they have had in their platform for a good many years. That is about all I have got to say about it, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I want, first of all, to rest the mind of the Leader of the Opposition easy. He made quite a case reading the various provisions contained within the veteran's lease. Those same provisions have been in every lease issued by the Provincial Government since we took over the natural resources. For the benefit of the hon. member for Turtleford I want to tell him that provisions in the Provincial Lands Act fully protect every lessee, and if he is disturbed in any manner as far as minerals or anything is concerned, there is compensation provided for in the Act. The people in the Lands Branch must administer this Act, or all lands administration, in accord with the provisions of The Lands Act. For the benefit of the hon. member, I am going to read some extracts from this Act. And as for these provisions in the lease agreement, we are compelled to put them in there. For instance, this is Section 6 of The Provincial Lands Act:

“There shall be implied that every disposition of Provincial lands under this or any other Act of the Legislature, all reservations provided for in this Act, The Minerals Resources Act, The Forest Act, the Water Power Act, the Water Rights Act or any other Act of the Legislature.”

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Hon. Minister a question? What is the footnote at the end of that section, — when was it passed?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — This Legislation was passed — I am referring to The Provincial Lands Act, being Chapter 14, 1931.

Now the other provision in mind gives the right to construct provincial roads, for instance. There is a right provided for that, a reservation:

March 27, 1951

“There is hereby reserved to the Crown out of every disposition of Provincial lands under this or any other Act of the Legislature, the right to construct on such Provincial lands any colonization or any other road, or any road in lieu or partly deviating from an allowance for road, drain or drainage works, without asking compensation therefor.”

That is in the old Provincial Lands Act.

“And what gravel and other materials required for the construction or improvement of such road, drain or drainage works may be taken from the said lands without making compensation therefore or for the injury thereby done to the lands from which they are taken.”

Now, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition wants to criticize, let him go back and criticize this enactment by a previous administration.

Mr. Tucker: — I was not here then.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — No, he was not here then, he says. I want to say this to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that if he is charged with the responsibility of administering Crown lands he must do so in accord with the provisions of this Act, as far as minerals are concerned.

Mr. Tucker: — You can change the Act if you do not agree with it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Let me read further:

“There are hereby reserved to the Crown out of every disposition of Provincial Crown lands under this Act all mines and minerals, whether solid, liquid or gaseous . . .” (we heard some of those this afternoon) . . . “which may be found to exist within or under such lands, together with the right to work the same and for this purpose to enter upon, use and occupy the said lands or so much thereof and to such extent as may be necessary for the effectual working and extraction of the minerals.”

Now, there is provision in this Act, too, for compensation to the lessee for surface rights damage, and I want to say to the House that a lessee with Crown surface rights has no less protection than any other individual as far as surface rights compensation is concerned. We had one case in the Lloydminster district where there was a young veteran settled on Crown lands. We negotiated for compensation for surface damage. The young veteran got sufficient to pay for his land entirely, and the Province was also adequately compensated for capital damage to that land.

There is one thing about these Crown leases, Mr. Speaker: the lessee gets the benefit of the protection of the Crown. I think the Minister of Natural Resources pointed that out. No matter what administration is in power, our responsibility is to protect the rights of the lessee. Of course, I could, Mr. Speaker, have brought up some of the old lease contracts in my office and read into them all of those terrible things that the Leader of the Opposition endeavoured to read into this veteran's lease. That is very easily done. The hon. members opposite are famous for raising “phonies,”

and they do leave a misimpression with the general public; and they leave imputations. They want to impute that this administration is the most arbitrary, dictatorial type of administration in existence. And when they do that, Mr. Speaker, and do it knowingly, they are then deliberately misrepresenting. Talk about imputing wrong motives! The hon. members opposite are the most guilty persons in this Legislature of imputing wrong motives to the administration.

I want to say that if the suggestion made in the resolution submitted by the hon. member for Last Mountain had been carried on in previous years, you and I would not be talking about veterans' leases at all today, the land would all be alienated. I can say that since land has been leased to veterans there are between 70 and 100 veterans who have given up farming. Immediately they gave up the lease, the lease was then made available to another veteran to become established. I do not know of any way, Mr. Speaker, in which a young man can get started easier, with less financial means, than he can under these Crown leases. Now, we have been bothered with an excessive demand for leasing; our problem is to find sufficient land to meet all requirements. I have not had one single letter suggesting that we should begin selling Crown lands. I want to say that we have very little Crown land left.

I want to mention to the House that three-quarters of the land that we are talking about is School Land, for the simple reason that School Land has been held in trust for the Education Trust Fund. I want to say, too, that our experience in this closing of School Land under the old system, and in accord with the provisions of The Provincial Lands Act, has been a very unfortunate one. I am receiving requests every day from people who have contracts of sale on land, who wish to give a quit claim and take out a long-term lease, they are so hopelessly in arrears in payments. And that stems largely from the fact that School Lands particularly were put up for public auction, and without due regard to the productive value of the land. A whole lot of hardship has been incurred by many of our farmers in contributing to that School Land Trust Fund, which amounts to some \$21 million. I have said before in this House that that fund was largely built upon the sufferings of the people who bought this land at exorbitant prices without any regard to the productivity of that land. The hon. member from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) smiles. All he needs do is to go through the records of the Lands Branch, and there are literally boxcars full of agreements for sale down there that tell a pathetic story of struggle on the part of farmers. And so, instead of talking about disposing of these lands quickly, we are getting demands for more Crown lands to be held under lease. I have here in my file innumerable letters that I could read, from veterans and civilians who want to become established in farming and cannot do so. It is only because we have a few Crown lands left that we are able to take care of the needs of those people.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when we embarked voluntarily and out of the goodwill of the Provincial Government, on settling veterans on Crown land, we did so for the specific purpose of establishing veterans in farming. Now, it has not been proven that we are not achieving that objective. All indications are that we have done well and capably achieved that objective, and hon. members overlook a few very pertinent facts in this whole matter. Truly, we are delighted to give a contribution to the Saskatchewan boys who

March 27, 1951

gave so much time and service and self-sacrifice during the last war. We are delighted to do that. But I want to point out again that the Provincial Government has a very large and onerous responsibility for re-establishing farmers in this province who now live on submarginal land. That is our first and major obligation. And P.F.R.A. has not seen fit, nor has the Dominion Government seen fit, to participate in any large-scale programme to overcome the missettlement pattern that resulted from the policies followed by the Federal Government in the early days. They have that responsibility for re-establishment, and they are not assuming it; and we are trying to do so to the best of our ability. I want to suggest to this House that when we made the some two thousand-odd parcels of land available for veterans, to that extent the Provincial Government will have to find additional land to go to all of the expense of establishing these people who now live on subsistence farm units. And it is going to be an onerous and a very big financial responsibility.

Then, too, we relieve the Dominion Government from a financial burden. Theirs was the obligation of rehabilitating veterans, and we willingly assumed a good deal of that responsibility and relieved them from a financial outlay in the purchase of farms that would otherwise have had to take place. All in all, Mr. Speaker, there has not been one single reason advanced as to whether or not the veteran was handicapped under the present 33-year lease. No one has proven that point, and I cannot understand the need for this type of resolution at all at the present time. I think that this new system should be given an opportunity to prove itself. The Dominion Government readily entered into an agreement with the Provincial Government. The veteran readily entered into an agreement with the Provincial Government, also, on a voluntary basis, and they are very anxious to get more of the right type of assistance from the Provincial Government.

Now, when we did that — and, as I mentioned, three-quarters of this land is School Land — we have gone a long way in giving concessions to veterans in that regard that may not be realized by hon. members in this House. I just want to review the provisions of the Lands Act as they apply to School Lands in this province, in order that hon. members can readily see the concessions that have been made by this administration. First of all, I want to correct one point raised by the Leader of the Opposition. He said that the lease-agreement contained no renewal clause. Well that is quite correct, it does not; but there is a renewal provided for in the regulations. That again was overlooked. Now, I would think that, before the hon. Leader of the Opposition works himself up into a lather and gets everybody excited about the terrible arbitrary Government, he ought to take the trouble of looking at the regulations, he ought to take the trouble of looking at The Provincial Lands Act . . .

Opposition Member: — Which should be changed.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . and at least have some of his accusations and charges based on some substantial fact. Here is the particular provision for renewal of the veteran's lease. I quite agree that it ought to be contained in the agreement; I think it was an oversight. I believe that it ought to be in the agreement itself.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, they can change it any time they want.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And I want to read it:

“Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 92 hereof, any veteran holding a 33-year lease under the benefits of the Veteran’s Land Act 1942 (Canada), and who does not take up the option to purchase as provided for in the said lease, shall have the prior right of renewal of the said lease subject to all regulations in force at that time, at the time of the expiration of the renewal.”

Mr. Tucker: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — What are you “hear, hearing” about?

“In force at the time of the expiration of the lease, provided . . .

Mr. Tucker: — That means that you can make any regulations you want, you are just proving my case 100 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You know, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition and I should get along quite well. The only time that I get a little uneasy is when he starts so slowly, laying his groundwork and finally gets himself so excited that he actually believes what he is saying. He reminds me of one of these chiefs in Africa, who have these war dances, which start out at a very slow tempo and in a short while he is just like a whirling Dervish . . . and it does have its effect on him, Mr. Speaker. I cannot help but get a little uneasy in my seat when I see one so totally ignore the provisions of legislation — particularly a lawyer, who ought to know better. I do not claim to be a man who can interpret the law, and (heaven forbid!) I never want to, because it does things to people. But to go on, Mr. Speaker,

“. . . at the expiration of the lease, provided that application for renewal is received by the Minister at any time during the last year of the term of the said 33-year lease.”

Well, I just thought I would correct that one first of all.

Mr. Tucker: — May I ask the hon. Minister a question? You can change that regulation any time you want, you are not bound by it?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Oh, we will never change it; but we are a little afraid that it could be changed, and it would be wise to have this provision in every lease agreement. I agree with that and I think it ought to be done, — in case that a Liberal Government gets back in power.

Now, while I am on this new subject matter, in these regulations, too, Mr. Speaker, the interest rate, in the event that the veteran lessee purchases, is 3½ per cent and 15 annual instalments, not 15 per cent and not 6 per cent either, as provided for in the Act as it applies to School Lands. Now, I just want to read those provisions of the Act, for the benefit of the hon. members. We made an amendment to The Provincial Lands Act in 1946, which said:

“School Lands may be sold to veterans qualified to participate in the benefits of the Veterans’ Land Act 1942 (Canada).”

March 27, 1951

Mr. Tucker: — After you were sued, you passed that.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We passed it in 1946.

“... and subject to terms and conditions to be prescribed by regulations made by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.”

I mentioned one — 3½ per cent interest. We also had to amend the Natural Resources Agreement between the Federal Government and ourselves, in order to make the provisions to exclude School Lands from the provisions of the Act. Now let us see what the Lands Act says about the disposition of School Lands. What I want to impress on the hon. members is that this administration has gone a tremendous distance in taking care of veteran lessees. This section 27 deals with School Lands.

“Sections 11 and 29 in every surveyed township in Saskatchewan and in every township hereafter surveyed, together with the gold and silver as well as other minerals contained therein, are hereby set apart as an endowment for purposes of education and shall be designated School Lands. They are hereby withdrawn from the operations of the provisions of this Act which relate to sale, and no right to purchase them or any part of them shall, subject to the provisions herein contained, be recognized and no right or title of any kind shall be acquired by prescription in respect of such land so long as the Crown has any right, title or interest therein.”

That is one provision. Here is another one.

Mr. McCarthy: — When were those provisions made?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Oh, in 1931. This Act was passed when the resources were transferred to the Province and, since, apparently concurred in by every administration. The other provision is:

“All sales of School Lands shall be by public auction, and an upset price shall be fixed from time to time by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, but in no case shall such land be put up at an upset price less than the fair value of corresponding unoccupied lands in the township in which they are situated.”

There is still another provision:

“The amount to be paid in cash at the time of the sale shall be at least one-tenth of the purchase price and the balance of such purchase price shall be paid in not more than eighteen successive annual instalments . . .”

At an interest rate of six per cent. And then in case of any arrears, the provision is: “On arrear, the interest rate shall be 7 per cent.”

Another one:

“All moneys from time to time!! (and I want the hon. member for Last Mountain, to note this). “All moneys from time to time realized from the sale of School Lands shall be invested in the securities of the Province which are direct obligations of the Province to form a school fund, and the interest arising therefrom shall be paid annually into the consolidated fund for the support of schools organized and carried on in accordance with the law of the Province. The cost of management shall be a first charge on the revenue of the fund arising from any source whatever”.

Now, it has been suggested that we transform rentals into payments on principal. Just as quick as we do that, Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of this Act, it will mean that we will have to take this money out of the Education Fund and put it back into the Trust Fund and then, I assume, reinvest it in bonds that will probably draw from 2½ to 3 per cent interest. Now those are some of the practical problems that we are up against if we do this. Furthermore, the suggestion in the resolution that we make rentals paid applicable to the purchase price, just simply means that the sale contract should be made retroactive too, and, of course, the interest rate will be 3½ per cent as set out in the provisions of this Act. I do not see how it could be administered otherwise. And then, you would have many other inequities.

It has been mentioned that some veterans have received a very substantial crop return, perhaps sufficient already — and I know of some who have grossed enough, or made enough net — to pay for the land in one fell swoop. Now, these fortunate veterans can voluntarily put that money away, exercise their purchase right at the end of ten years and pay for the land, and have no interest obligation whatever. One of the good features of this contract is that there is no interest implied. It gives the veteran every opportunity to become established in farming, and out of his five-sixths' share of crop, on a sound economic farm unit, he should be able to set aside sufficient to make a very substantial payment on, if not pay all of the purchase price of the land at the end of ten years. Now, to go back and suggest that we will make the rental payments applicable on the purchase price would create considerable inequity. The more fortunate veteran would be in a good position, but the less fortunate veteran would be handicapped. If interest rates are charged, and I do not see how we can help but charge them if the veteran wants to purchase and apply his rentals to the purchase price. If that is done, it will mean that some veterans may be in arrears in that regard. We would just simply, in my opinion, increase the inequities if these particular provisions of the resolution was passed by this House. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, it is . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Might I ask the hon. member a question. In view of the fact that the veterans have these leases now, is it not quite correct that this would be optional, that they could either keep what they have got now or have a purchase agreement? that is all that is suggested, and without interfering with the right they have got today, it would have to be optional.

March 27, 1951

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Certainly it is optional with the veteran, but once he decides to exercise his option, then we would immediately apply, according to this resolution, the rental payments on purchase price. You cannot have two types of agreement rolled in one. You cannot have a lease agreement and a purchase agreement. This is a lease agreement with an option to purchase. It ought to be one thing or the other. I do not think the hon. member for Last Mountain would rent his place and then retire to town and, in about ten years' time or six or seven years' time, go back to his renter and say, "Well now, you have been a pretty good fellow, you have done pretty well, so I am just going to permit — you had better buy this place now, set yourself up, and I will apply all the rentals you have paid me on the purchase price." Now, I know the hon. member for Last Mountain could not do that, in principle. He could not do it in a practical way, because he has put a lot of his own money in that. But in principle it is the same: you either have a lease agreement with an option to purchase — certainly you cannot have everything rolled into one. It is easy, Mr. Speaker, to draw up this type of resolution, and some conventions, too, pass resolution that are inadvisable, through lack of full information.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, before the Minister leaves that point, I think he misunderstood my question. What I had in mind is: what is wrong with letting any veteran who wants to carry on under the present system, carry on under it, and any one, like the man mentioned by the Minister, who has already paid enough rent to pay for the land — letting him have title so that he does not have to continue paying rent? What is wrong with letting the veteran have the option?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Well, the man who is fortunate can do that now, Mr. Speaker, if he wants to exercise his option. The fortunate man has probably made more on the land out of his five-sixths' share of crop than the total purchase price would amount to. But the other veteran, the less fortunate one, he may want to exercise his option too, and then this whole matter of arrears could very easily crop up.

I think I have read enough from The Provincial Lands Act to indicate that we have some very definite responsibilities as far as School Lands are concerned. We can go too far. I think the veteran has an excellent chance now. There is every safeguard for his security, and I want to reiterate again, Mr. Speaker, that if we permit any easy disposition of this land and veterans discontinued farming, we would not have any more land available for the re-establishment of another veteran. And who knows who would have this land? Generally speaking, if present trends continue, it would be the richest farmers in the district, or it could be to a very wealthy businessman in town that this veteran would sell out. At any rate, the Province's opportunity to assist veterans, or to assist other people in re-establishment, would be aggravated and we would have to find land elsewhere and, as I said before, remaining land resources in this province are very limited. Let us never forget that. Outside of that big Sipanok or the Carrot River triangle, there is very little Crown land left available for re-settlement. I wish that hon. members of the House would have an opportunity, as I do, to scrutinize the innumerable and pathetic letters that I get in my office on the part of people wanting land. I think we should hang on to these Crown lands and use them for re-establishment, and to take care, as much as we can of the kind of people who are pushed out on the road by private landlords.

In addition, the Provincial Government, I think, is setting an excellent pattern in (if I may use the term) “benevolent landlordism”. I noticed that the people who are giving evidence and advice were the mortgage companies. They are the ones who are fearful of this very generous lease and all the security that is provided under this lease. There is no question about that Mr. Speaker.

Mr. A.W. Loehr (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Has the Government reserved all School Lands for the settlement of veterans?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The land that we are talking about is in the settled part of the province, and all Crown land that could be incorporated into a unit has been reserved there for veterans. That land is all gone now. The only other land resources that we have are in the unsettled parts of the province and, outside of the Carrot River triangle, we only have about 250,000 acres that are suitable for cultivation. The rest of the land that is available, particularly in the north-west, would be a combination type of lease. Now, there are School Lands in these new areas, and they, also, will be set aside and disposed of under a lease agreement, and the money that comes from those School Lands in rentals and in interest payments, goes directly into the Education Fund. All moneys paid on principal go into this Trust Fund, so, as I said before, we would have to take money, we would have to take public revenue, if we credited the rentals on purchase price. We would have to take money out of revenue and put it into this Trust Fund and then reinvest it and take the interest from it. So there is a little problem involved there.

I was going to read a letter or two, Mr. Speaker, but I do not now if I should. I think this debate has been going on for some considerable time now. I will read one of the whole bunch I have just brought over. This man says:

“I am wishing for some help to get a farm in some connection, so I was wondering if the Government had any land a fellow could get. I have a tractor and equipment to work with. I would like to get a section of land in a good crop district. I hear on the radio and papers that they help and put people on farms and help, so I would like to have some assistance in the same manner. I have had the luck to farm along the Lake, “. . . (that is up in the hon. member’s constituency, I think, along Last Mountain Lake) . . . “on the poor crop land for the last 15 years, which I cannot make a go of, and I am now wishing to get off somewhere where a fellow can get some crops. I am fed up with this hoping from one year to another and getting nothing for my work.”

I have one particular letter here from the same general district, from a young lad; he must be about 21 years old. It is a rather pathetic letter. He says that there were eight children in the family that has been trying to make a living on this land for years. He said:

March 27, 1951

“My brothers and I would like to get hold of some good land. We have only about 50 acres broke. My parents have worked very hard. We feel that we should contribute something to the support of our parents. They are both very old, but we cannot see how we can do it on this particular land. Can you find us some land in some other part of the province”?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I get these letters every other day, and my only regret is that we have not sufficient land to take care of all these. So the suggestion that we rapidly dispose of this other land, without due regard to good administration on the safeguarding of the Education Fund, I do not think is a very timely resolution. Again I say that I believe that the new lease system should be given an opportunity to prove itself. If nothing else, it will provide an opportunity for many of our young people to become established in agriculture. When they do well — and they should do well under the generous provisions of this lease, with all the provisions under The Farm Security Act, then — if they wish, and have enough money accumulated, they can step out and buy some land. It gives them a start, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is all to the good. And instead of resolutions of this kind, the administration should be commended for the good work that they have done in re-establishing veterans in this province.

There were several other points, Mr. Speaker, that I did want to make reference to, but I think I covered most of the things I wanted to bring to the attention of the House.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Mr. Speaker, I did not wish to interrupt this very rational and excellent address, but I think this question should be answered. In view of the fact that the Department of Agriculture collects the rentals, the Minister is undoubtedly in possession of information along this line. Is it not true that there are several hundred veterans who, by reason of crop failure and remissions for improvement of land and so on, have had the land for four or three, or maybe five years, who have not paid a single cent into the Department of Agriculture Land Trust Fund?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — That is correct, Mr. Speaker. We observe very strictly the provisions of The Farm Security Act, and when we have a general crop failure in this province our returns on land certainly fall off. But we are more concerned about the security of the farmer than we are about obtaining revenues from these lands. On these good lands we can get a return of six per cent interest, and I think it is a mighty good investment. I do not know where else you can invest the moneys in the School Land Trust Fund to better advantage. In fact, I would even go so far as to suggest that, if we had the authority to do so, we should use those funds to buy other good lands, because, in my opinion, there is no better investment, and then use these lands for re-establishment purposes. The trouble before had been, Mr. Speaker, that we had no regard, in disposing of lands, for what is termed a sound economic farm unit. We did not make the careful inspections that we are doing now, in order to determine the productivity of the land, and then to determine the size of the unit, and then to determine the equitable rental basis. That was not done in the past. I think it would be an excellent use to which this money could be put, other than laying in bonds drawing three per cent interest or so, or 2½ or 2¼ per cent interest, and our big problems of re-establishment going unattended. And it would bring a good return.

Mr. Tucker: — I do not follow the Minister. Is he suggesting that additional money now should be taken to buy up land so that it can be put on 33-year lease? Is that what he is suggesting?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Oh, it is just a thought; but that is exactly what I am suggesting. I am suggesting, if it could be done, we have this money (some \$21 million) tied up in different securities; if we could utilize some of that money to purchase good land, to re-establish farmers on it under the same provisions, I think it would be a tremendous step forward in stabilizing agriculture in Saskatchewan. The hon. members opposite are a little confused; they do not look at some of these problems realistically. They worship so diligently at the shrine of free enterprise and ownership that they cannot fathom a solution to problems that have been created as a result of private ownership.

We are living, Mr. Speaker, in a mechanized age. The tendency towards larger operational units is very pronounced. It presents a real problem, and, as I said in a previous address in this House, if the hon. members opposite would be willing to support legislation under which we could control the land settlement pattern without 33-year leases or otherwise, I would welcome some suggestion from them; but it is not only a worry here, it is a worry in a good many other countries. I want to tell the hon. members that if these tendencies continue, it could very easily transpire that 60,000 farmers would operate all of the land, or farm all of the land in this province. Now, they have been giving a whole lot of lip-service to the family-size farm. The family-size farm, because of mechanization, terrific capital investment in machinery, is on the way out if we do not do something rational about it. Well, security is not always tied up with actual ownership. Ownership can become a real headache, as I well know. I would like to be relieved of the responsibility of having a whole lot of money tied up in land. I know, some of the hon. members suggested to me, "You have quite a bit of land." Well, Mr. Speaker, I have said before, and I say again, that any time the Provincial Government wants to take over, and to pay me for any deeded land I have, on its productive basis, I will be glad to sell it and release it on a 33-year lease basis. My Crown lease, Mr. Speaker, is the cheapest land I have, and I can see problems coming up in my own ranch operation: the bush is coming in. I will never be able to cope with that, Mr. Speaker, but a Provincial Government might give a lessee some assistance to cope with those circumstances that are beyond the power of an individual.

Mr. Lopton: — Would the Hon. Minister permit a question? Why don't you rent your land on a 33-year lease yourself?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Oh, I would probably do that, too. I would rather have the Lands Branch do it though. I think it would provide more security for the lessee, in fact I am sure it would.

Now I think, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken long enough. I have made practically all the points that I intended to make, in a sort of random manner, and again I want to say that I see no real justification for this type of resolution at this time. There are many other injustices, to which, as far as veterans are concerned too, the hon. members in the House can direct their attention and their efforts. The contract has been entered into with the veterans; an agreement has been entered into with the Dominion Government; three-quarters of these lands are School Lands. We have some obligation to

March 27, 1951

the proper administration of those School Lands. We must have some regard to that. The veteran has got a good lease; he has every opportunity of protection provided under all the legislation in this province — Farm Security legislation and otherwise. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that the provisions outlined in the hon. member's resolution could be implemented in a practical way. I think, though, that it may be advisable to put a valuation on this land if the veteran so desires. I do not know what advantage or what merit it would have; but if the veteran wants a valuation placed on his land, I think he probably should have the right, now, if he so desires. Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment.

Mr. Harry Gibbs (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, as a veteran with no farm land whatsoever, I feel that I should have the opportunity to say a word or two in this debate.

After the First Great War, and under the old Soldiers' Settlement system that the veterans had, I have heard hundreds and hundreds of complaints. I wish to say that under the setup which the Provincial Government has for veterans' land, I have never heard one single complaint yet.

Now there may be merits and demerits in both the resolution and the amendment, and we have got a lot of information and advice so far in this debate; but I am convinced that, under this 33-year lease, and looking back over the years, the veteran has one of the finest securities he ever had, for the simple reason that I think every member in this House knows that, under the old Soldier's Settlement Board, there were hundreds of veterans who had to leave their land, and I believe there are scores of veterans right up to the present day who have not got the title to the land they have. There were quite a number of them on sub-marginal land and they could not make a living — they practically starved, and nothing was done about it. Well, I think under this system that our Government, at least, will assist them or try to give them the best land possible, as far as productivity goes.

I am also, and so must you be, Mr. Speaker, reminded that when the depression of the 'thirties came along, there were a great number of people in this province, both in the urban and rural parts, who thought we owned some land, but it was a great surprise to many of us when we had to get off and get away from the farm lands we thought we owned, and get out of the houses we thought we owned, for the simple reason that we had to exist, and to exist we had to have the old mazoolla to buy in order to eat. Now we saw that, Mr. Speaker, and I say this quite seriously. As far as a person owning the land, I do not think we own the land. I think we just fool ourselves that we think we own something, because I have been in that position when I thought I owned something, and had to let it go. Who to? True, as the Minister of Agriculture said, to the mortgage company.

Now it is a nice contention, and I believe it is an old phrase — "the Englishman's home is his castle". It would be very very nice indeed, Mr. Speaker, if it were true; but I am convinced that it is not true. We get a piece of paper (they call it a title), that says you own something, but I think each and every member in this House knows that, back in the depression years — and I am speaking facts now, Mr. Speaker — if they went in debt or in arrears of taxes, how much did they own after two years?

And who got it? I have seen too many people, Mr. Speaker, and also veterans, work with their hands and give the best of their energy and blood to make a living in this country and in this province, and then have to walk off with nothing. That is not good enough; and as a veteran I would do all in my power to see that veterans do get a square deal, and do get the security which we have all talked about and longed for.

I really think that, under this 33-year lease, they are getting the finest security they ever had, for the simple reason that they go on there on a rental basis, which is very very fair indeed. I do not think there has been anything done like it in the Dominion of Canada before, and they see how the farm is going to go, and in 10 years, if it is good, well they can still go on leasing or they can buy the property. If they wish to be in that abnormal state of mind that they think they would like to own something — all right, it is there for them. If they don't . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Did you say “abnormal?”

Mr. Gibbs: — Abnormal. Yes, they are abnormal when they think about owning something. That is just exactly what I said.

In the meantime, they are protected. Now, we know, in this day and age, the prices of machinery today and the mechanism required in this age — thousands and thousands of dollars you have to pay for a piece of machinery today that you could get for a few hundred dollars a few years ago. Say the veteran wants to buy some property, he wants to buy the land, he wants to buy his machinery — and the first thing we know he is in debt right up to his neck, like they were back in the old days, and they don't know how to get out. I think this system of 33-year leases is one of the finest things there is, and, as I said before, I am all out to protect the veterans.

Now with regard to the lease. As the Leader of the Opposition said, this afternoon, and I quite agree with him, as far as the wording of the agreement is concerned, I think there is a lot of damned nonsense in those agreements. There are a lot of legal phrases and everything that should not be there. If we are going to protect a man we can protect him without a lot of that nonsense in these agreements. There is no doubt about it in my mind, and I quite agree with the Leader of the Opposition. You have an agreement there and you have small writing and everything is a yard long and one thing and another, and nobody knows what it is all about — you anticipate legal matters and all this sort of stuff. We want to protect the veteran, and we don't need any of that legal stuff, and the sooner we do away with a lot of that tom-foolery and nonsense, the better it will be.

Some Hon. Members: — And with the lawyers!

Mr. Gibbs: — But, I do really think, Mr. Speaker, after all is said and done, and that is why I am going to support the amendment; I am convinced that we do not own the land in the first place, and I am convinced, in the second place, that the veteran is getting the finest deal he ever had in his life under this Provincial set-up.

March 27, 1951

Mr. Benson: — Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few minutes to answer some of the statements that have been made in regard to this amendment, and in regard to this resolution. I am going to reserve the right, though, to close the debate after the House has turned down this amendment, as I hope it will.

Every argument that has been advanced here in regard to this amendment has convinced me that those speakers who have put forward those arguments are opposed to veterans buying their land; that they want to keep them on a use-lease basis. The Minister of Agriculture referred to a lot of Acts here which he stated gave the veterans all the protection that they required, which is not contained in this agreement that they have signed, and he knows very well that, before this Session closes, we can completely change all those Acts, and they mean really nothing, so far as the veteran is concerned who has signed this lease. We cannot change that lease though. That is an agreement between the Government and these men . . .

Premier Douglas: — We could, by an Act in the Legislature.

Mr. Benson: — Well, I do not think it would be wise to try that.

Premier Douglas: — It would not be wise to change the legislation either.

Mr. Benson: — Oh yes, this is ordinary legislation that any Legislature can change.

Mr. Tucker: — The regulations, too.

Mr. Benson: — Yes, and the regulations as well.

Now the Minister said that there was a great shortage of land in this province, and that he had received numerous letters, innumerable pathetic letters, from men who want land. I would suggest to him that he give up some of the Crown Land on which he holds leases, and let some of these fellows get into the business, too.

Some Hon. Members: — Pretty small. How about yours?

Mr. Benson: — Yes, he can have mine too, any day he likes.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Benson: — He tried to point out to us that the School Lands can only be sold by auction . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — If you cannot give better arguments than that . . .

Mr. Benson: — I will give you some more arguments yet. He tried to point out that the School Lands could only be sold by auction. Then, how are we going to sell this land to these veterans, under the present lease?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I read the quotation.

Mr. Benson: — Yes, I know. And he also told us that all moneys could not be applied. We could not apply this rental that has already been paid, because all moneys received from the sale of School Land has to go into this fund and be invested in securities in order to provide for school purposes.

I want to point out to you that any law that has been made by man can be changed by man, and any problem that has been created by man can be solved by man. We have created the problem in regard to these men who are settled on this land. I want to point out to the Minister of Social Welfare — and I did not criticize him or the Government, not one iota, on behalf of this agreement that is drawn up. I could find plenty of fault with it if I want to. I told him when I introduced the motion that the veterans of my constituency wished me sincerely to thank him for what he had already done. The Minister of Agriculture said that the veteran could put his money away, if he wanted to, for 10 years — set it aside. I want to say to him: would he like to have an agreement whereby he was going to be asked, today, to put money away in order to pay for his land, and at the same time, rent it and pay rental on that same land? I think it is absurd and it is unreasonable.

Hon. Member: — You are absurd!

Mr. Benson: — Now, I want to say a few words in regard to what the Minister of Social Welfare had to say. He asked the question, “What would we do about rentals on houses?” You know, I was criticized in the Legislature, here, a few weeks ago, by the Provincial Treasurer, for not introducing resolutions on the floor of this House, in order to solve some of the problems that I thought should be solved. Now here is a resolution that I introduced trying to find a solution for a veterans’ problem, and I suggest to the Minister of Social Welfare that if he wants the veterans who are living in veterans’ houses to be able to purchase those houses and to have the rental that they have already paid applied on the purchase price of those houses, then he should introduce a resolution in this Legislature asking this Legislature to support that idea — and I want to assure him he would have my support.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I wouldn’t ask for it.

Mr. Benson: — He said that politics had a lot to do with this particular resolution. I am going to leave that question until I wind up the debate. I was hoping, personally that politics could have been kept out of it, but he was one of the persons who introduced politics into this discussion, and he compared what is being done now for the veterans with the old Soldiers’ Settlement Board Act, and he knows, very well, that those men at that time signed an impossible agreement . . . Yes, it is all right to point at the Liberals, they were in power at the time. We have tried on various occasions to get those old veterans of the first World War an adjustment and a clear title for their land. Members of the C.C.F. have supported it. We have asked for a better deal time and time again for those old veterans. We are asking for a better deal, today, for the veterans of this last war.

So far as the Veterans’ Land Act is concerned, men who have signed that agreement today, have a better deal than the Province is offering under this Use-Lease. The Minister of Agriculture said the suggestion that the

March 27, 1951

value of this land should be based on the assessed value — and I mentioned that in my first arguments — that it should vary, perhaps, 10 per cent up or down — and he said that was a “childish suggestion” . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I did not.

Mr. Benson: — Not when you were speaking. It was an interjection you made when the Minister of Social Welfare was speaking. You said it was a “childish suggestion.” I want to say to him that the veterans of this province will be glad to hear that that was a childish suggestion.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Politics!

Mr. Benson: — Yes, politics if you like. I want to say to you that, under the Veterans’ Land Act today, in my district, they are getting an agreement, and they are signing it, which comes very close to the assessed value of the land — under the Veterans’ Land Act; and some of those fellows have almost paid for their land already . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Benson: — . . . while the fellows on the School Land have not yet had the opportunity of paying \$1.00.

Mr. P.A. Howe (Kelvington): — I was just wondering if you have any idea of what percentage of returned men were in the position to be able to avail themselves of the V.L.A. Act and put up the money and buy a farm at the prices that the farms are sold at now. In other words, what percentage would not be able to avail themselves of the V.L.A. Act, with no resources of their own, that are able to avail themselves of the Provincial land policy?

Mr. Benson: — I cannot answer that question, but I am going to tell you that, when we were sitting in the Opposition, we tried to get the Government of the day to stop the sale of all mortgaged lands — Farm Board land, and all other land that might be available in this province — and hold it at the price which was asked at that time, in order that it would be available for soldier settlement purposes. Land was selling at that time at considerably below the present assessed value of today, and had the Government of the day, or even this Government when it came into power, provided that land should not be sold at an increased price (which they had the power to do) we may have had some more land for these veterans.

Something was said about the veteran being protected under The Farm Security Act. When this lease was being drafted, before any veteran had ever signed it, I was one member (and there were others) who went to the Minister of Agriculture and asked him and pleaded with him to put that crop-failure clause into this agreement, and we could not get him to do it. We could not get him to do it! We were told that it would be impossible to write that clause into this agreement . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — To what Minister of Agriculture?

Mr. Benson: — Yourself — in your own office.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I would like to ask this question: Has there been a single veteran, under this plan, who has not taken advantage of the crop-failure clause, in The Farm Security Act?

Mr. Benson: — I was coming to that — and I told you, when I introduced the motion, that I had not had any complaints. I told you that your staff had caused no complaints, that they had treated the veterans very well. But that does not alter the fact that, perhaps some day, our friends across the way might get into power and they may not treat them so well.

Some Gov't Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Benson: — I understood the Minister of Social Welfare to say that there was some committee working on this lease-option agreement — I did not just get his argument there, and I was wondering what he meant at that time. He pointed out that, under the lease-option agreement, of mortgage companies, if they ran for three years, it was quite easy to set the price three years ahead. Well, under mortgage company lease-option agreement, the price was set when you signed the lease-option. He said it would be impossible to set the price for 10 years ahead.

Now I want to point this out — he was afraid of inflation. He did make the one good suggestion that, when the price was set, the payments could be made on a wheat, or on a crop-share basis, and that would take care of any inflation in price.

He had some scathing remarks to say in regard to the qualifications of the veterans. He said that we were going to set up a committee — a ‘gestapo’ committee — to decide whether or not those veterans were qualified. I want to tell the Minister that his committee has already decided whether veterans in my constituency are qualified or not — and a couple of them have lost their land. I am not criticizing the committee in any way; they probably did the proper thing because those veterans were not handling the land in a proper manner. But they have already decided as to whether or not these fellows were qualified — and I am not calling your committee a ‘gestapo’ committee.

I think that is all I have to say at the present time. I will have more to say when it comes to the closing of the debate. I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I hope the members of this Legislature will vote down this amendment. It is only about one-quarter of the loaf; we are asking for the whole loaf for these veterans, and this amendment suggests we give them one-quarter. I say it is not good enough. I am going to vote against this amendment, and I hope the member of the House will do likewise.

The question being put on the amendment, it was agreed to by 27 votes against 19.

Mr. Speaker: — The debate is now on the motion as amended — as follows:

“THAT this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government the advisability of establishing the purchase price of Crown Lands on which veterans are settled on request of the veteran and in the manner provided in the agreement, and that this Assembly re-affirm the policy of selling Crown Lands to the veteran occupants or their continuing under lease as provided in the agreements with such veterans.”

March 27, 1951

Hon. Members: — Question!

Mr. Speaker: — The mover of the motion is about to exercise his right to close the debate. Any members desiring to speak should do so now.

Mr. Benson (Closing): — Mr. Speaker, I wish now to say just a few words in regard to the amended motion, and I want to deal with the arguments or the statements that were made by the Minister of Natural Resources, when he spoke on the motion before it was amended.

The Minister of Natural Resources, I was sorry, had commenced his address before I knew the matter was coming up, and I was out for a few moments; but, in my opinion in discussing this particular motion, he brought the morale of the Legislature to an all-time low. I think that public morality has dropped to a pretty low ebb in this Province when statements can be made by a responsible Minister of the Government such as were made this afternoon. He said we were going to take money out of these rentals in order to “buy votes”. And he also said that I suggested that the valuation of this land should be based on the assessment in order to “buy votes.”

I want to tell the Minister that I have no desire to be judged by himself. I want to tell him that, in my opinion, he insulted every veteran in my constituency when he suggested that their votes could be purchased by the fact that I moved this resolution. I want to tell him, too, that I am not selling my soul for C.C.F. votes or Liberal votes or veterans' votes, and I want to tell him, as I told this House when I introduced this resolution, that I introduced this resolution at the request of citizens of my constituency, who requested me to place their problem before this Legislature, and I think it was my duty to place this resolution on the order paper. I also want to tell the Minister that the votes of the veterans who are settled in the constituency of Last Mountain will, no doubt, neither elect nor defeat me in the next election.

I do not know that I have very much more to say. This amendment — this motion now as it is amended, as I have said previously, gives the veterans about a quarter of what they asked for and, as I believe that a quarter of a loaf is better than no bread at all, I shall support the motion as amended.

The question being put on the amended motion, it was agreed to unanimously on a recorded vote.

The Assembly adjourned at 11:00 o'clock p.m., without question put.