

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Twelfth Legislature**  
**36th Day**

**Tuesday, April 7, 1953**

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

**ROYALTY PAYMENTS TO SURFACE RIGHTS' OWNERS**

Moved by Mr. McDonald, seconded by Mr. Danielson:

"That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Provincial Government adoption of a policy under which the individual landowner, where mineral rights are held by the Crown and in all other cases where possible, would receive an amount equal to at least one-fifth of the royalty in the event of the discovery and production of gas or oil on land owned by him on which he owns no mineral rights, over and above compensation for actual loss from surface damage."

**Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to speak at any length on this motion, nor do I think it necessary to do so, as it is self-explanatory. I would say, however, that it is my belief that, if the Provincial Government would adopt a policy giving the owner of surface rights a percentage of the mineral rights where Crown land is involved, the majority of the mortgage companies and other companies owning land in this province would do likewise. I know that has been my experience with them. In the one particular case I have in mind, at the moment, the farmer made such an arrangement, and he was able to pay his mortgage off and had a few dollars left for himself as well as the clear title to his farm. I do not believe . . .

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — Could I ask the hon. member a question? I was wondering if he had in mind a case of where a farmer had mortgaged a piece of land, or had he in mind a case of where a farmer had bought a piece of land from a mortgage company?

**Mr. McDonald:** — No, the farmer had a mortgage on his land.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — Well, how in the world would the mortgage company own the mineral rights . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — He had lost title of it to the mortgage company. They got his title to his surface . . .

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — Oh, he was buying his title back?

**Mr. McDonald:** — Yes, but they retained the mineral rights. Then they gave them back to him, and he sold them.

**April 7, 1953**

Today, as we know, the only payment that a farmer who does not own his mineral rights gets in the event of any minerals being found under his land, is the surface damage. I do not believe that that in itself is great enough to compensate any farmer for the destruction that is caused by an oil-drilling company on his farm. I know that the companies themselves will do everything possible to do as little damage as possible. But when we think that they only buy (I think it is) some 4 acres of land and then pay for the road into it, that it is little compensation for the actual damage, in my opinion, that is done to property. I believe that the farmer who owns his own mineral rights or has any interest in the mineral rights is prepared to overlook that damage through the possibility of obtaining some revenue if gas or oil is found on his property.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I want to move, seconded by Mr. Danielson (Arm River), the above motion.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a question? I'm not just clear — he didn't make very extensive elaboration of his resolution. There are two points: had he in mind that where the Crown owns the minerals and the Crown has leased those mineral rights out to an oil company and the Crown is entitled to a certain royalty, that one-fifth of what is coming to the Crown should be turned over to the farmer or should be paid by the company?

**Mr. McDonald:** — I think that, when the provincial Government made its deal with these private companies, it could have got a one-fifth interest for the man who owned the surface rights if it had been up on its toes at that time. I believe now that the Government would have a good opportunity of getting that out of the company, without taking it out of the portion that goes to the farmer or to the people as a whole of this province.

**Premier Douglas:** — Add it to the company's royalty.

**Mr. McDonald:** — I believe you could have done that, yes.

**Premier Douglas:** — With reference to where the mineral rights are owned by the C.P.R., and C.N.R. or the Hudson's Bay Company, would the farmer there get the share too?

**Mr. McDonald:** — Of course the only thing you can do there is to endeavour to negotiate with these people to get a share for the man who is farming that land. You might use the same method that I have had success in using with some of the mortgage companies. I don't say you can do it, but I believe that, if you led the way or set an example, you would have a good bargaining power to deal with these other people. I don't know if you would be successful or not, but I would certainly like to see you try.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I beg leave to adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

(Debate adjourned)

Moved by Mr. Berezowsky, seconded by Mr. Gibbs:

"That this Assembly, recognizing the critical situation that endangers the peace of the world and the need for governments to assess and reaffirm their position in regard to International Affairs, —

(1) Affirms its full support of the principles of the United Nations which, despite its shortcomings, remains an essential agency for building world peace;

(2) re-affirms its belief that mankind's hope for lasting peace can be realized only through a comprehensive and spectacular programme of economic and social advance in every part of the world, since military preparedness, deemed necessary by U.N. in the present international situation, cannot take the place of positive action to end poverty and exploitation;

(3) urges the Federal Government to press for world economic progress and world peace by:

(a) allocating available raw materials in accordance with need;

(b) planning the development of world resources to the highest possible degree;

(c) providing technical and capital assistance to underdeveloped areas on a scale many times greater than the amount now available for these purposes;

(d) taking international action to achieve maximum production of food and providing for its equitable distribution;

(e) establishing International Development Corporations for these various purposes, which would be free from control by private capitalism or by any one country;

(f) increasing the scope and resources of the Colombo Plan;

(g) planning an expansion of world trade based on consideration of world needs;

(h) achieving greater equality, on a high level, of living standards everywhere;

**April 7, 1953**

- (i) resisting attempts by any nation to use the U.N. for selfish ends;
- (j) supporting the inclusion of all nations willing to abide by the U.N. Charter;
- (k) insisting that any action against aggression undertaken by the U.N. be completely under the control of the U.N.;
- (l) working toward the abolition of the veto in the United Nations.

**Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland):** — Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to the motion in all humility because I am fully aware that mine is only a very small voice of the multitude of world people. Nevertheless, I join with them in opinion that we must somehow bring peace to this world. I feel that the powers of the millions of people like myself urging the representatives to speak openly on a subject is presently without contradiction a most important and vital issue at stake and a solution of which may either mean human survival or human destruction. Past records of history, Mr. Speaker, indicate that nations either survive or are destroyed, depending on whether they follow the policies of peace or of war and so, taking these lessons from history, I am in full accord with the peaceful representations of the people the world over.

In the short time at my disposal it would be impossible for me to fully outline the reasons for the unsettled conditions existing in the world today, or to argue the methods that are generally accepted by reasonable men as to how these problems may be solved. Nevertheless I feel that something should be said on these matters, Mr. Speaker, and I would suggest that world misunderstanding and strife is not a condition entirely applicable to this day and age. National and international strife predates what we call contemporary civilization. For that matter since recorded history man has experienced similar difficulties. People living in areas of rich natural wealth sustained themselves quite well, while those who were not so fortunate organized themselves into warlike bands and made attacks upon their peaceful neighbours.

I think it has been consistently true that nations which developed peaceful industries and commerce fared sumptuously in friendly association, valuable trade and made progress. But, Mr. Speaker, within those same nations, when they came over-imbued with their power and their

false superiority, we find they were sowing the seeds of their own destruction.

Such was the case with the ancient nations of Greece, of Rome, mediaeval nations such as Spain and, of course, of contemporary and imperialistic empires of Europe. In this century we have seen modern imperialism disintegrating very rapidly for the same reasons as the nations and empires disintegrated in the past. I would like to read from an editorial I found in the Prince Albert 'Herald', dated November 5, 1949, concerning free Indonesia:

"The Governments of the Netherlands of Indonesia have concluded an agreement bringing to an end 300 years of Dutch rule. Under the new agreement the new Republic of the United States of Indonesia will remain linked to the Netherlands by ties similar to those which bind the nations of the British Commonwealth. It is yet to be ratified by the parliaments of the two countries. It has taken a long time for the Dutch and the Indonesians to iron out their difficulties and differences. The prejudices and distrust which has grown up in the hearts of the Indonesian people during three centuries of Dutch rule have been sharpened by the reluctance of the Dutch to give ground in the face of growing Indonesian nationalism. In the end nationalism has triumphed. Nothing has been gained by the delay in operations of the Dutch against Indonesian independence movement. A great deal may have been lost. Only the passage of time will tell whether the Dutch can maintain their ties with Indonesia and temper the hatred and distrust which has been the fruit of the uprooted Imperialism. Though we understand their reluctance to give up economic advantage which their relations with Indonesia gave them, the Dutch attempt to maintain the advantage by force may prove costly."

I refer to another country, whose ambassadors I think were in Canada just a very short time ago — as a matter of fact only a few days ago — asking the Federal Government for money to continue the war in Indo-China. I refer to the ambassador from the French Government and the assistance he requested of our Government. The story is the same. Hundreds of years of rule over an underprivileged people. Its results are indicated in this editorial I quoted from the Prince Albert 'Herald'.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a very good reason why an Imperialistic country itself does not want to give up the rights it may have in any colony. I would like to quote something I took out of the paper just the day before yesterday, I think, from the 'Star-Phoenix', and it probably will indicate to this House what I have in mind:

"London: Grave Threat in Deflation"

"European observers said Saturday the possibility that deflation would spread across the Atlantic from the

**April 7, 1953**

United States appeared to them the gravest threat that could arise from easing of international tension."

Reference of course is to the tension that is now easing in Korea.

"These observers studying the new Communist peace overtures saw a second but less important threat in the possibility that deflation might arise in western Europe itself. This might come chiefly through overproduction in countries with economies based on raw materials. Generally, European commodity markets suffered much more than the stock exchanges from the news of the Korean peace moves. Many stocks made up initial losses but in the commodity markets Malayan tin and rubber were hard hit."

Well, that is what is behind all this conflict — commercial exploitation. Now, Mr. Speaker, I repeat that the present world conflict between the ideologies of Imperialism, whether it be capitalistic or Communistic, is based on entirely the same reasons. I say these are a lust for power and commercial expansion for the purposes of human exploitation, particularly in those areas where you find people who are weak due to the dissipation of their energies in the struggle for emancipation from some form of feudalism or other.

I must particularly point out, sir, that the areas of Asia and Africa today are where the struggle for freedom is most strong. I would like to quote from the 'United Nations of the World', March 1953, a paragraph by Marcelle Hitchman:

"Politically speaking, Asians just emerging from servitude want these things above all: The time to build new states; as peaceful relations as possible with nations of different ideologies; and freedom for other nations still living in servitude."

Now the interference of power states during these past hundreds of years is further expounded by the same author, and here's what he says in the same article:

"When the United States on one hand tries to enroll them in a crusade of the free world against totalitarianism and on the other side with colonial powers (and I refer to the Dutch and the French particularly) the Asians are understandably suspicious. These are a few of the awful truths which responsible Asians would like to have well known in Washington."

Now it is obvious to me, Mr. Speaker, that insofar as the people of the underprivileged countries are concerned, they are neither well informed or to any important degree are they concerned with capitalism or communism. They are essentially concerned with their own self-determination — national determination, if you want to call it. To them their own autonomy and their own national self-determination is paramount, because they feel that

it is the only course for the emancipation of the masses of their people out of feudalism.

Now, Mr. Nehru speaking at Lucknow October 3, 1950, said this:

"We have to deal with deeper problems of every country; more difficult questions than questions of Communism or Anti-Communism and fighting Communism, as if that was the only question left in the world."

It is much deeper than that, Mr. Speaker. I submit that the resistance in Asia to white Imperialism, whether it is of European or American origin, is definite. The harsh and unjust exploitation of these people, particularly by the Western and European imperialists will not soon be forgotten, and confidence can only be redeemed by sympathetic and friendly and helpful action.

It is strange that although Communists are not trusted, yet they have an appeal to these people, and the question is why? Well, some of the things they do — for example, they promise land reform and the abolition of debt; and what do we promise in the democracies? Communists promise jobs, industrial expansion, benefits of technology. The capitalistic countries, or the democratic countries, promise continued colonialism and servitude to the monopoly imperialist. But I say that for these countries that are not too deeply involved, such as Canada, who are not too deeply involved individually, who have a voice in the United Nations, they in my opinion can play a most effective role in persuading the aggressive powerful nations to follow or adopt a more sympathetic role to bring about better relationships between themselves and the underprivileged nations. I believe also that, when action is decided upon by the United Nations, we must show by deeds that there is no organized attempt or superficial subterfuge to interfere with the social, economic, religious or cultural development of these new States. It does not matter whether it is in Asia or in Africa or anywhere in the world; the only object that we should have is to try to be of assistance to these people in their economy and education, and try to encourage them to develop their particular cultures. The object is not to be charity; it should be assistance for the building of world welfare as opposed to world warfare.

To illustrate, Mr. Speaker, how the war, the last great war, has made things worse in Indochina, particularly, I would like to quote a few figures that I have here in a book called 'New Horizons in the East', and here's what we find:

"The production in south and south-east Asia in thousands of tons — prior to the war, rice produced in the paddys was 70,990 thousands of tons, while in 1949 it was 70,117 thousands of tons;"

You will note that there has been less production after the war than prior to the war:

"Oils and fats, 3,596 thousands of tons, and in 1949, 3,174 thousands of tons' . . ."

Again a decrease. In sugar —

**April 7, 1953**

"Prior to the war, 6,223 thousands of tons; in 1949, 6,200 thousands of tons; jute — 1,831 as compared to 1,340; cotton — 1,132 as compared to only 606 thousands of tons; rubber — 864 thousands of tons, and in this one case there has been some increase to 1,397 thousands of tons; tin — 116 as compared to 94 (again you see a drop); petroleum has a slight increase, from 7,960 to 9,034."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe very strongly that the only way that we can bring about an improvement in conditions in those particular countries, the under-developed countries, is by an economic development plan similar to the Colombo Plan, which was planned for south and south-east Asia, and include the greater part of the Commonwealth nations and which was laid out by the Commonwealth nations in June 1950. Briefly the purpose of the committee was to have surveys made of the area, assessing resources available locally, assessing the capital, and the manpower on hand, assessing the problems which particularly affect the area, but, foremost and firstly, to assess the vital needs of those countries of the south and south-east Asia for the development of their own natural and human resources. For the purpose, I say, to bring about the most economic and maximum production that the area can maintain.

It is also the purpose of the consultation committee of the organization to focus world attention on the area problems with the intent that, by co-operative effort, the standard of living of the people may be raised considerably. This means, Mr. Speaker, that non-Commonwealth countries are also invited to participate in such a programme, as they stand to benefit from the economic and democratic development of the area as greatly, or even more so, than the Commonwealth nations. Now, the cost to bring the various projects under way and to fulfil a 6-year plan was estimated by the committee to be about \$6 billion, actually 1,868 million pounds. Such projects to be undertaken by public, co-operative and private enterprise, and these were to take in irrigation, power, structures, communications, railway construction, road and industrial development on one hand and, in addition to that of course, the problems of health, education, housing and other social services on the other. The bulk of capital, of course, would have to come from the outside nations, because these particular states, as far as their wealth and money is concerned, are bankrupt or very poor.

At that time I see that Canada agreed to spend \$25 million a year to aid in the Colombo Plan, and I suggest that we should press that greater assistance be given to aid in this plan. I think that probably \$250 million would be much closer to what Canada should be able to contribute.

Now, Mr. Speaker, such action to have these backward countries industrialized to make them become self-sufficient is as I have said, not charity or altruism, but good political acumen. I think it is a brighter light in the field of hopelessness and human want. On the part of the established nations, it requires the loan of administrators, of technicians, agriculturists, teachers, engineers, craftsmen. It means that the outside nations, or the United Nations, would have to supervise schools, hospitals, industrial enterprises; it means the supplying of machinery, of equipment, of rolling stock. But I say, Mr. Speaker, that all that kind of assistance would be more worthwhile and much better than the supplying of guns and



ammunition for the destruction of humanity. I believe it is sound business to encourage and assist in the economic and industrial growth of any country, because the ultimate results will reflect, as it has reflected, on increased commercial inter-dependence between nations. Yes, increased production of rice, sugar, cotton, jute, rubber and tin by the eastern Asian states will mean an increased export out of those states, and I believe that in time the area will become self-sufficient and self-dependent and it might become in time, I believe also, an exporting area from which we may buy other materials that we require. For example, turning back to the problem of industrial self-sufficiency and industrial inter-dependence, I see the British and American development in industry, which spurred on Canadian development in the mines, in the forests and in other places and industries.

I believe that our Canadian markets have consistently expanded as the needs of the other nations grew. Such is the experience in trade among all nations. Now, Mr. Speaker, Canada no doubt realizes these opportunities and the resultant benefits, but, in keeping with traditions, has been very parsimonious in granting assistance to potential producing countries, and particularly so I think, because of the selfish interests and pressures directed by monopoly interests in the United States, either directly or indirectly, through the United States Government.

Mr. Speaker, such aid to needy nations need not be permanent. It may be required for 10 years; probably only 6 years — I don't know; but as I have said, actually as production in any country increases, as has been the experience in this Canada of ours, to that extent dependence on outside help or aid decreases. And there is, therefore, no reason to believe that, after 10 years or so, the underprivileged nations of the world would not become self-sustaining, with their exports equalling or exceeding their imports.

I believe that the most important results in such grant-in-aid programmes could be the relegation into past history of the internal conflicts and strifes, or external warfare with outside powers. Positive, realistic and beneficial occupations would tend towards general progress of the people; full stomachs as compared with empty stomachs and famine; well-clothed people as compared with people going around in rags; an understanding nation as compared with one prejudiced and angry. As indicated in this editorial: — again I quote the Prime Minister Nehru, speaking at Lucknow:

"In the perspective of history today, Asia demands attention in many ways, from the point of view of, let us say, developing under-developed areas, of providing food where food is needed and so on; but much more so in understanding for Asia is a country not only in the process of change but in the process of torment."

Further, he said:

"It takes different shapes in different countries of course, and it is a problem ultimately for ourselves to understand and solve with the help of others I hope, but the burden is on us. Others can help or others can hinder. They cannot solve it for us."

**April 7, 1953**

Now that is the thought and feeling, Mr. Speaker, of 550 to 600 million people, hard-working, starving, unclothed people of the world, living amidst hunger, illiteracy, and prejudice, but who have all the self-respect and dignity and faith and hope in the future that you or I or anyone in this country has. Any down-trodden country, Mr. Speaker, evolving out of, or revolting against, feudalism or any kind of imperialism is like a baby who must learn to walk. We can help it to obtain the confidence to walk, but, in the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, this function must be learnt through the individual's own efforts.

I am glad to see the active interest Canada takes in the United Nations. This country is in a formidable position to use its influence with the more powerful states of the world. I say, and I believe, that Canada's geographical position between the great Communist country on the one hand and a great capitalistic country on the other hand, could mean a stabilizing influence if efforts in that direction — yes, I mean by means of conciliatory action — were directed. Not only could understanding be engendered but a working relationship brought about within the present limitations of the United Nations. At least it is well worth trying to achieve such an understanding.

Even General Franco, Mr. Speaker, who is a professional fascist soldier, is to some extent a keen politician. He stated in an interview with Andre Vissent at San Sebastian as follows:

"The whole world, Europe as well as Asia, is undergoing a great change. The last war and the present world tension are the consequence, not the cause of the change. The basic cause is the desire of all the people of the world to improve living conditions.

"America has been dealing very ably with the consequences of the present change. I hope she will deal as ably with the causes."

Now that brings me up to another point, Mr. Speaker, and I refer to the outside interference in any country's internal affairs. For centuries it has been the habit of powerful states to partition weaker and smaller countries according to their whim or their power, and it is well known to the members here that, in very recent history, say 200 or 300 years past — there was the partition, say, of Poland, of the Ukraine and of course many others. The case of Korea very recently — it was, I believe intended to divide that state in order that two powerful countries may have a sphere of influence in that particular state.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest there is no justification, only a law of force, which permits such unfair and unjust practices, and I think that Canada should press very strongly so that all peoples and all continents shall have the freedom to sustain their own governments within their own geographical boundaries. If the United Nations, Mr. Speaker, or any other nation becomes concerned about the leadership of a state, they must remember that whether it is the Spanish 'Franco' or Chinese 'Chiang Kai Shek' or

Korean 'Syngman Rhee' or an Egyptian 'Farouk' or a Russian 'Khrushchev' or 'Malenkov', they must remember that the people of those countries, if left alone and given time, will take very good care of such leaders. The struggle of any growing nation, history has shown, can never be held back by the brief ascendancy to power of a dictator.

I believe that free intercourse between nations such as I have visualized; free association with them, would make these other nations who are tyrannized today come to the point that it would be impossible for tyrants to restrain their people for any lengthy period of time. Certainly, I believe that the United Nations or any outside powers need not interfere in any internal situation such as I have mentioned. Neither do I think they should threaten any nation by a display of war or force. As a matter of fact, efforts in this direction in Korea, I think, should be brought to the attention of this House and I think they have not been too successful as indicated by the reluctance of United Nations soldiers in frontline action. From press reports I read that 43,000 soldiers deserted from the United States army ranks alone, while the following excerpt out of the 'Leader-Post' of March 6th, indicates the attitudes and behaviour of Canadians, true or otherwise, and I would like to read part of it at least:

"The Canadian infantry officer thinks that perhaps half of Canada's troops now in action don't fire at the enemy because of their initial fear in action. To help build up self-confidence and self-discipline, he suggests that the army take some tips from the Communists. Major W. E. Garber, of the Royal Canadian Regiment, writing in the current issue of the Canadian Army Journal, recalls recent studies of United States infantry units which recommend never fire at the enemy because they say they are reluctant to take a human life. No such survey has been made of Canadian units, but Major Garber, now stationed in Washington, accepts that a similar lack of aggressiveness exists here, too."

I could go on. I don't quite agree with what he says about the fear of Canadian soldiers, but these are supposed to be facts of the situation so far as the struggle in Korea is concerned.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that there is a vast difference between policing an area and carrying on a war. Our soldiers, I submit, are the best in the world and have repeatedly proven themselves in what I think were justified wars. I'll read the following letter written by a young sergeant observer, Michael Fedirchuk, before his death, which was sent to his fiancée, and it is an expression of many Canadians of whatever origin they may be.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Will the hon. member answer a question?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I am quite prepared to answer questions when I get through.

**Mr. Loptson:** — I was just wondering if you were suggesting that the Korean war was not justified?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**April 7, 1953**

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Pardon?

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member says he will answer questions when he gets through.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — This is the letter, Mr. Speaker. This is what the boy said when he wrote to his girl friend just before he died:

"I am not a flag-waver, nor am I overly patriotic. When this wave of insanity which now engulfs us all in its seething turbulence began I was, to say the least, disinterested. As time went on I felt the urge to go over there and reap my share of excitement and adventure. My subsequent enlistment with the Royal Canadian Airforce followed. Gradually, the full meaning of this greatest of wars has filtered through my mind. I am no superman. I have been endowed with average intelligence and physique. You may see me on the farms and small towns, in running factories, in large city streets, in the dimness of pool rooms and the brightness of dance halls. In short, I am the youth of Canada. Ours is not a great nation. Rather let it be said that we are a growing country. Our fathers toiled and suffered, when necessary even gave their lives, so that we might live in security, happiness and peace. Yes, ours is a great heritage. No one must take that heritage from us. We must keep it even if some of us must block the breach with our own bodies."

Well, Mr. Speaker, Michael Fedirchuk and many like Michael did block the breach with their bodies and gave their lives. It is no surprise that the soldiers of Canada who think freedom and believe in freedom and have lived in freedom, are reluctant to fight soldiers and people who are endeavouring to achieve the same status.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is a proper and democratic attitude, and so it should be recognized. I further suggest that United Nations soldiers acting as a police force would do a good job because of the positive purposes of the world organization, such as protecting every part of the supranational community against all forms of international violence and aggression. Such protection is something that a Canadian soldier would understand.

Mr. Speaker, many ideals that men have and fight for can be termed by some as dreams. There are many paradoxes also. Contemporary democracies, for example, say they desire to make friends and influence nations to build similar states to their own, yet at the same time their public relations officers take about television instead of talking about food. They talk about soap instead of education. They talk about political scandals instead of industrial development. Is it surprising, therefore, that the people of China, of Indonesia, of Egypt, of Greece are not listening? They are understandably concerned with the practical approaches to their problems

by real earnest and vital leaders, and the jargon that they sometimes hear, which is meaningless to them, is not listened to. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that at times our motives are misunderstood and our actions are suspicious, while the more practical and definite approaches of totalitarian friends are easily assimilated — and approved? Now I suggest that we must talk in a language that is simple and understandable if we are to gain the confidence of all these underprivileged people.

There is another angle I wish to discuss, Mr. Speaker, which results from this whole international situation, and it is the effects on our present policies in our own country, the effects on our progress and the development of Canada. This House is quite aware, because there has been a lot of discussion, that over \$4 billion is being spent in the current budget, and \$2½ billion, roughly, is being spent for defence purposes. Now considering the size and the financial potentials of this country, such a sum appears to be rather excessive, particularly when from time to time we read articles in the press saying that there is no danger of a war in the near future and possibly no danger of war at all.

I am just wondering, Mr. Speaker, whether we are spending the money, which represents the people's wealth, wisely, because, as I think back — and when I think back to many countries; when I think back to the country of my father's origin where for 600 years there was nothing but strife and warfare, and when I see that the people were held back so they could not progress in the arts, they could not develop their culture; when I see all this, I cannot help but be concerned about Canada which is the country that I love and live for. I see the Soviet Union, for example, building up their industry, rebuilding their cities. True, at the same time they are helping the Chinese 'Reds', as they are called, and they are helping the people of Indochina, but they are rebuilding their country. Is that what we are doing? Is that what we are doing today? We are spending \$2 1/2 billion on what we call the defence effort, yet we cannot have a dam on the Saskatchewan River; we cannot have irrigation; we have not got the money to go ahead and build conservation projects such as planting trees and so forth to protect our fine agricultural land. We have not got the money — but we have got the money to spend on tanks, on airplanes which, two years from now, will be obsolete. And yet we say there will be no war in two years! I cannot help but think of these things. I cannot help also but think that, due to this crazy war-hysteria, many of our people in Canada today are not treated as they should be.

I know of a case at Cold Lake where the Federal Government is spending \$30 million to build a guided-missile range and an airport. You probably read, Mr. Speaker, in the paper where the only people who would be dispossessed out of that area would be 7 farmers. That came from Ottawa. But I was right in that area: there are 300 people being dispossessed, displaced. They have no place to go to, because they are trappers and fishermen. The whole area in the north is organized into a conservation area. They cannot enter into another conservation block. They have no place to go. The fishermen cannot fish elsewhere unless they go into the Northwest Territories. There is no room for them in Saskatchewan, because all the lakes and the fishing thereon is localized.

Now one would think that this great country of ours, with its tremendous wealth and being able to spend \$2 1/2 million on a defence effort, would be able to at least happily re-establish those same people — and there are 300 of them, not 7; — trappers, fishermen, mink ranchers and others. And

**April 7, 1953**

I understand from the secretary of an association, that they have there that these people were offered \$30,000 for re-establishment, or \$100 apiece, and that was 'it'. Why, Mr. Speaker, oil companies in this province of Saskatchewan which we look down upon and say they are monopolies and have no respect for people, would never do a thing like that. If they dispossess a man of his land they will pay him probably more than he could ever produce on that particular land. If they stay there one year, they will pay him for one year's loss of revenue income. If they stay for 20 years, they will pay him for 20 years. But as I say, because of this war hysteria, what are we doing but offering these people an average of \$100 apiece and telling that 'that's that', — to 300 of them. And Cold Lake is not the only place in Canada, Mr. Speaker. I could enumerate three or four places, but I prefer not to do so. There are places like that in Manitoba, and the same treatment is given their people. Now these are the things that made me concerned about where are we going? What are we doing?

It is fine to have a strong defence force, but is it worthwhile to sacrifice our children for defence that may be necessary, or may not be necessary. And we talk about lack of school teachers in this building here. If you checked the records and found the number of school teachers that have joined up with the Air Force and so forth, then you will understand where the teachers are going. Now, I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is time we began thinking, and in view of the encouraging news that has been coming over the press there is a possibility, I hope at least, of an early settlement of the war in Korea. But I hope also that we will use every influence we have in this House, in our districts and all over Canada, to try to persuade our country and our Mr. Pearson and all other influential diplomats and statesmen to try to see that this war does not spread. King Farouk said very recently in an article that the next struggle is going to be in Egypt. I say, God forbid!

Now, Mr. Speaker, what has happened in Canada? Our natural resources in the mineral areas, our forests and so forth, are going south. We are shipping them out. And particularly the mineral resources will never be replaced. As I said on a former occasion, when you take the minerals out you have a deep hole in the ground. It is all going south and the question is, why? Well, it is going to the neighbour to the south who needs raw materials for a war effort. And there again you have a country, one of the greatest countries in the world, probably the greatest, that is today running short of raw materials and natural wealth. And the reason for it is the same reason: we can call it a defence effort or war effort; the natural resources and the human resources of our neighbour to the south, as is the case with us today, are being dissipated. It is an effort that brings nothing back to the nation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that when the Creator created man He endowed him whether he was black or yellow or white, I think that He endowed him with some good qualities; human dignity, helpfulness, respect, love for his neighbour and so forth, and I think that, as I have lived through my life, I have met a great number of people and I think most of the people I have met have those qualities, and I think the strife of humanity since the time of recorded history has been just this — to try to build a higher civilization. True, we have had men who believed in power, we have had your Xerxes and Hannibal, and Hitler of recent times or Napoleon before that — but they will not be remembered. But the men who have really tried to build up civilization, whether it be Socrates or Plato or Tennyson, Pasteur or Banting, and one who is greater than all of them put together, that kind of contribution shall never die.

So, believing in human dignity and believing in our human destiny, because if I did not believe that man can go forward and build a better civilization with its arts and all the beauty that man can make, I would not be here speaking today, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move this motion, seconded by Harry Gibbs.

**Mr. Loptson:** — There was a question I wanted to ask. May I ask it now? I wasn't quite clear on the statement that you made. Was it true that you said that the Korean war was unjustifiable? I thought you made that statement.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Clive Bell said that "politicians when alive are ridiculous and when dead are forgotten." I suggest that the member opposite be not what Clive Bell said because I clearly read —

**Mr. Loptson:** — You read your speech.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I read the part which pointed out, whether it was justifiable or not, is it not a war.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Would you just give us what you read there. Just what you read.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — You can get the transcript.

**Mr. Loptson:** — I understood you to say that the Korean war was unjustifiable. I just wanted to know.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Well, I will answer it this way. I don't know if it is justifiable or not, Mr. Speaker, but I do know that, on January 2nd, of last year, 1952, General Van Fleet was talking to the Japanese generals and here's what he said:

"The war in Korea is a blessing. If there was no war in Korea there would have to be a Korea some place else."

Now, that should explain whether it is justifiable or not. I am not making the decision.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Gibbs:** — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

April 7, 1953

## ABOLITION OF ACREAGE MINERAL TAX

Moved by Mr. McCarthy, seconded by Mr. McDonald:

"That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan the immediate abolition of the acreage mineral tax on Farmers' mineral rights and the return to all farmers of mineral rights expropriated by the Saskatchewan Government."

**Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington):** — Mr. Speaker, this motion appearing on the Order Paper under my name does not take much explanation; it is self-explanatory, I think. All the members are familiar with it, and I will only take a few minutes to give you a few thoughts that come to my mind in connection with it.

In the first place, this tax has more or less lain dormant this last few years, on account of an action brought by the C.P.R. as to the legality of it. Well now that has been called off and the lid is off, so it becomes again a live question. The farmers are asked to again start paying a tax on something which they have no idea whether it exists or not. This is, in my opinion, one of the weaknesses of it. And another thing is that the Government did take some land from farmers under the provision of the tax Act. Now that had the effect —

**Premier Douglas:** — Now the land, just mineral rights.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I beg your pardon, you are correct. They took some of the mineral rights from farmers under this Act. That had the effect, a few years later, when mineral rights became more evident in our province, that people went around to the farmers and told them they had the oil rights and asked them if they had paid the taxes. Almost invariably the farmers said 'no'; so they put up a proposition where they would assume those taxes and give them 10 cents an acre for their portion of the mineral rights except for the 12½ per cent. There were a great many farmers in my district — practically 90 per cent of them — who disposed of their mineral rights for the reason that they did not feel like paying taxes on something they did not know existed, and so they leased their land to these oil men for 10 cents an acre, with the reserving 12½ per cent, of course.

Now, in Manitoba, the Government took an altogether different attitude to what our Government did. At that time the Government of Manitoba — I forgot the Minister's name — but he came out in a press statement and advised the farmers not to lease their mineral rights but to hang onto them. Instead of this Government doing that, they assisted the oil men indirectly, because of this 3-cent an acre tax, and the farmers thought well, there wasn't any great prospect of oil at that time, and rather than to lose them they leased them for a very small amount of money.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder would the hon. member permit this one small question.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I'm only going to be a few minutes, Mr. Minister.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I just wanted to ask a question.



**Mr. McCarthy:** — Well I'll answer it if I can, and I don't think I can answer any questions that you ask because you know more about it than I do; but if you'll just permit me for about three minutes to carry on, I'll see what we can do about it.

Now Saskatchewan, as I said, assisted these oil men to get it — indirectly probably; but nevertheless, they assisted them because this 3-cent tax was hanging over their head and, in my opinion, that is largely responsible for so many of the farmers having leased their land for a 'pittance', I call it. Now the Government claims they put this on to catch the C.P.R. and the larger landowners. Well, if that is the only purpose of putting it on they can easily exempt a section or two of the farmer's land and still get the C.P.R. and Hudson's Bay, if they want to. It isn't necessary to put the whole thing on.

There is another aspect of this that comes to my mind and that is as far as the municipalities are concerned. We had that experience down there, this fall and summer; we've had it for two years. These oil machines move in there; they are very, very heavy equipment. They go over a municipal road; they don't contribute anything to the municipalities and they wrecked these roads. Now the farmers in there aren't getting very much out of it because they have leased the most of their land, and the municipality isn't getting anything out of it because they have no interest in the oil rights, and that is another aspect of it that is very unfair. In my opinion, if we could get gas in our municipality, it would be much more advantageous for the farmers. Once you get an oil well in there it is not going to be so advantageous to the municipality, but they are now taking a rap on it.

During the election the C.C.F. promised that immediately they were going to look into the situation of the farmers' oil rights, and I suggest to you over there that is one thing that you could do for the farmers. You might be losing some potential revenue, but you certainly wouldn't be losing revenue because you are collecting on something that nobody knows anything about, and I suggest to you that if you were sincere in that respect that you will vote for this resolution.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member sits down, I would like to put this question to him, if he can answer it. I have heard a good deal about the press statement issued by the Minister in Manitoba. I would like awfully well to see it, and I am sure that the hon. member probably has it or knows where it could be had.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Unfortunately, I haven't it with me. I am quite sure I have it in my files at home. I didn't bring it with me — I have a whole file down there.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Do you know the date? And what paper it was in?

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Well, I imagine it was in the 'Leader' or the 'Producer' because those are the two papers I take at home. No, I am not sure of the date and I am not sure of the man's name. I said that. But I have the clipping at home, I am quite sure I have it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Was the hon. member from Moosomin rising to ask a question?

**Mr. McDonald:** — No, I was going to answer the question asked by the Minister of Natural Resources.

**April 7, 1953**

**Mr. James Gibson (Morse):** — Mr. Speaker, I only intend to take a few minutes of your time on this motion, but the hon. member said that this Government could, if they so desired, exempt the farmers from this mineral tax and collect it from the Hudson's Bay and the C.P.R. and leave the farmers exempt. Well, I do not think that would be a very fair or a very proper thing to do; I don't know why the C.P.R. should pay a tax on certain property if all other people should not be asked to pay the same tax. Of course I am not sticking up for the C.P.R., but I think that is one of the reasons that this Government had in mind when they imposed this tax because the C.P.R. and Hudson's Bay Company are owners of so many million acres of mineral rights. This Government thought that if those rights were valuable they were justified in taxing those rights. There was nothing compulsory about it. If the C.P.R. or any other individual does not consider those rights to be valuable they can abandon them.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Sure, that's what they wanted them to do.

**Mr. Gibson:** — The hon. member laughs at that. I don't see anything wrong with that at all. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I haven't spoken to a farmer yet (and I have spoken to a good many of them) who didn't think this was a fair tax.

The hon. member says they are paying a tax on something they don't know whether they have or not. Well, if they don't want to pay the tax, they don't have to. Take for example, Mr. Speaker; here is a man's neighbour who has the mineral rights on his land and his neighbour across the way does not have the mineral rights. Surely it would not be fair that his neighbour should hold those rights without paying something for them? After all, his neighbour is paying for the improvements in that locality so that, at any time, if those rights should become valuable and should be worked or developed, the facilities are there to go ahead with it — the roads and so forth. And so as I say, Mr. Speaker, I haven't yet run across a farmer who doesn't think that this is a fair tax.

I think it should be borne in mind, also, that while I may not have the rights under my land, my neighbour may own the rights under his, and it is quite possible for him, if oil is found under his land, to drain all of the oil from under my land, so actually he may not even be getting the oil from directly under his own property. And if that in itself is true, that is all the more reason they should pay a tax for it, if he thinks it is of any value at all.

The hon. member said something about the oil companies going through the municipalities damaging the roads. Well, possibly they do damage the roads; but if my memory serves me correctly, I think that, if they use equipment over a certain weight on municipal roads, the municipalities have right of redress for that. But personally I have found, and I have met other people who have found (and I am not now sticking up for the oil companies, but I like to be fair) that those men who are out there making those searches for oil for those companies are very helpful to the travelling public. I have heard of numerous cases where, during wet weather for example, people have been stuck on side-roads and so forth somewhere near those outfits, and they have taken quite a lot of their equipment, no doubt at considerable expense, to see to it that those people were given assistance. I have known of several cases of that kind.

I think I have said about all that I intend to say, Mr. Speaker, and in conclusion, I want to say that I support the idea of this tax not only so that the C.P.R. and Hudson's Bay won't be able to hold all of these millions of acres without having to pay something to the Province for that right, but I think it is fair to the farmer also. If he has minerals under his soil I think that he should pay something extra for that, in comparison to the farmer who does not have those rights. I think it is quite fair, and I believe the farmers themselves think it is fair, and so I certainly am opposed to this motion.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, I was rather surprised to hear the statement of the member for Morse, that he hasn't met any farmer that is opposed to this tax. I don't think many people in this country like to be taxed, and I never heard anybody that really liked any tax that was imposed on them. This tax, unlike other taxes, is a tax which presumes to tax something that nobody know whether it is there or not. It is taxing something intangible, something that nine persons who pay probably don't have it, and there is probably only one in a hundred that will have any of this commodity called minerals to tax. This tax was imposed, of course, by this Government on the pure assumption — and I remember very well. I was sitting in this House, right over here where my friend from Maple Creek sits, when the Minister brought this into the House, and it was 5 cents an acre printed in the Bill when it came in, and I remember what he said. He said that several methods were discussed. One was downright confiscation, but he said, after all, this is going to work out to the same thing, because the farmers won't pay this tax, and, as a matter of fact, he intimated quite strongly at that time that very few farmers had any mineral rights on their land anyhow. At that time I think probably he was honest in his statement. I didn't think very many farmers in my district had their mineral rights in their land, but we find now that there are a considerable number of farmers with mineral rights in their land.

Everybody who homesteaded in the early days, as soon as they were able, they bought land a quarter here and a half-section there, and they added to their holdings. That land was bought from Hudson's Bay, C.N.R., C.P.R. and Saskatchewan Land companies, and in practically every case at that time, in the early days of this province, the companies let the mineral rights go with the land, and they woke up one sunny day a few years ago when this interest in mineral rights started in this province, and they found that they actually had the mineral rights in that land which they had purchased from these companies, and they didn't know anything about it until the agents for the oil companies came around and told them. First of all they conducted what they call a geophysical survey, then they checked the titles and they were then able to go to the farmers and tell them what they were prepared to lease their rights, and they did. But only a very small amount of that was done until this mineral tax was introduced into this House. The next succeeding three or four years after that, the bulk of the mineral rights in the land was leased by the farmers to the various oil companies for practically nothing.

I remember when I came into the House one time during the time the Bill was on our desks, I noticed there were three or four big cars lined up in front of the Parliament Building here, and the people who were driving these cars came out with swell fur coats on, and they walked right into the building and to the Minister's office — I watched them because I was interested. That very afternoon the Minister came in here and took out the '5 cents an acre' definition in the Act and put in '3 cents'; and he admitted right here

**April 7, 1953**

on the floor of this House that a representation from the 'big shots' had persuaded him to do that. That is true, and everybody knows it. If I had my files here, from home, I could show you the exact wording of the statement he made; so I know that was so.

Now what happened? I pointed out at that time, as clearly as anything I said, 'If you are honest in this thing; if this Government was honest in what they tried to do, and are not going to fleece the farmers out of their rights all they have to do was simply say in this Act that the first section or half or two sections or three sections in every person's name, in every person's title, could be exempt from the tax.' Then every farmer would have been protected in at least one or two sections, or whatever the decision was; and that would have meant that the big companies we talk so much about, would have paid taxes on all over a certain amount. The Hudson's Bay Company could have been exempt on two sections of whatever you liked, and every other acre of their land would be taxable and the farmer with five sections of land would be exempt on one or two sections and would pay tax on the rest, but it would have given the little fellow an opportunity to protect the small holdings that he had.

You can never hurt the big fellow, Mr. Speaker. This Government has tried to do that and failed. It is the little fellow that is always hurt, because the big fellow would get the money and that would not hurt him, but the little fellow could not do that so easily, and every member in this House knows it. Could they not impose a tax on the big corporation without the poor people paying for it? If that was done by this Government or any Government, then the policies of this Government would be different from what they are today.

Here is the situation. Last year, previous to the election, we inserted something in our platform and guaranteed to every landowner, every farmer, the royalties on their land whether they had the mineral rights in their name or not. That was in our platform. The Minister came out and called it a bribe, trying to make political capital out of it, of course, and he laughed at it and everything. A few days after, the hon. Premier comes out and promised that they were considering doing something like that. He did not say what it was, but he did say they were considering the problem. Now I don't know whether the Premier is still considering this thing or not, but the fact remains that the mineral taxation has been declared to be valid legislation as far as this Government is concerned, and they are now going ahead to collect the arrears of taxes. We talked it over a few days ago and we pleaded then for certain concessions for these men who have already lost their mineral rights, that they should be re-instated and given a chance to pay up if they wish. I hope that will be done, but that is entirely different from this resolution, Mr. Speaker, and what I would plead with this Government is this — to create an exemption under the Act, so that every farmer and every landowner would be exempted up to 640 acres or 1280 acres or whatever you like, and that would give every person a chance for the benefits of the rights to which he is entitled. You could do that. At least give him the rights to his own property, and I plead with you that that should be done; and if it isn't done, this Government can convict themselves, as they already have, of going after the little fellow. In spite of their protestations, they have cut the throat of the small farmers all over this province of Saskatchewan by imposing a tax which is not on any tangible commodity but is on something which is a possibility only.

I am firmly opposed to any tax being imposed on anything which is not tangible, but that is not debatable here; but here is the place where this Government can get from under, can square themselves and go on and show that they are really interested in the little fellow. Here is your chance to prove it. Now let them prove it.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

### CONFERENCE RE LABOUR PROBLEMS

The Assembly resumed from March 19, 1953, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Tucker:

That this Assembly, recognizing the right of the worker to organize and decide to withhold his labour and the right of management to decide to cease operations and that there are certain fields of activity where the unlimited exercise of these rights to promote the economic interest of either labour or management may be most detrimental to the public welfare, urges the Federal Government to call a conference of representatives of the Canadian Government and of Provincial Government and of organized Labour and Management with a view to considering this problem and, if possible, establishing a process whereby, when the public welfare would be jeopardized by a strike or walkout, the dispute would be settled by such legally prescribed process.

and the proposed amendment thereto, moved by Mr. Heming:

- (1) That all the words after the word "operations" in the third line to the word "welfare" in the sixth line be deleted, and
- (2) That the last three lines be deleted and the following substituted therefor: "setting forth basic national rights of labour, management and public under a National Labour Code."

**Mr. A. Lopton (Saltcoats):** — Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take up much of the time of this House to speak in support of the motion. It was not my intention to say anything on this resolution, but the hon. Minister of Agriculture made a remark which I thought was entirely out of order, when he stated that the increase in the price of fertilizer from \$60 a ton to \$106 a ton had nothing to do with the increase in the cost of labour. I took some trouble to find out just what effect increased cost of labour had in the production of that particular commodity, and from what I can find out some 86 per cent of that increased cost represents labour, not only direct but indirect, and a portion of it represents taxes. So, when we

**April 7, 1953**

talk of increases in cost of labour not having anything to do with the cost of a commodity, I think that the man who speaks that way is not giving it much thought.

There was another reason why I would like to say a word or two on this resolution, and that is because it coincides somewhat with the suggestion that I made in this House about three or four years ago. I think it was in one of the addresses when I suggested that the time had come when an independent commission should be set up in order to deal with labour disputes. I suggested, I think, at that time that that committee should be a permanent committee or commission composed of representatives of labour, of management, of the Government and particularly of that ever-forgotten man, the consumer. I suggested then that it should be headed by an impartial judge.

My concern is that the rank and file of labour should get a fair deal. The time has come now where, in many instances, the average rank-and-file member of labour unions is ordered around by labour bosses, and we have plenty of evidence to that effect. I have many relatives and I have many friends who belong to labour unions, and I have yet to find one member of those unions which have had some labour disputes, who was not prepared to accept the report of a conciliation board, which would indicate that the rank-and-file of labour are reasonable men and women and all they are asking for is fair pay, in accordance with the cost of living, for a fair day's work. They have had some good leadership and some of them still have good leadership, but, unfortunately, there are elements creeping in as leaders of unions now that are making use of the rank-and-file for their personal interest and personal securities, and for their political ambitions. It is for that reason that I am very much concerned about the justice that is now coming from these leaders to the rank-and-file of labour.

Now I am just going to cite, for instance, one or two strikes that were called — I might say that they must have been called against the will of the rank-and-file of labour. Let me take, for instance, the strike in the Hollinger mine, last summer. Sixteen hundred workers were called out on strike for no other reason than that the leaders wanted to secure themselves of the contributions out of the pay cheque of the workers. There was no dispute over wages that could not have been all fixed up by a meeting with the management, but they stayed out for a long time to try to force the management of the Hollinger mine to deduct the dues from the pay cheques, or the pay envelopes, of the rank-and-file so that the leaders were secure in their pay from the workmen.

Nor do I think that the rank-and-file of the Fishermen's Union in British Columbia would have refused to go out at an average pay of \$1,000 a month to catch the herring when it came to the shore last winter, if it has not been for the fact that the leaders prevented them from doing so. They were insisting on a pay which the producer just could not afford to pay, because they had already priced themselves out of the market.

Now it is for that reason that I am supporting this resolution. It is very mild. It merely asks that conciliation or a conference be called in order to try to arrive at some method where these useless strikes could be averted. With these few words, Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the motion and am against the amendment.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, just a few words before the vote is taken on the amendment. As will be recalled by the House, when I was speaking on this motion I pointed out that what I had in mind was that a conference should be called with a view to discussing the situation, and perhaps establishing a Royal Commission on which organized labour, management, and the Canadian Government and Provincial Government would be represented, to carefully examine what has been done in other countries in regard to this matter and then perhaps to suggest the fields wherein it was deemed that strikes did far more harm to the public welfare than they could possibly do good.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! May I remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition that he is now speaking to the amendment and not to the original motion. You have already spoken to the motion. I have let the others speak to the combined motion and amendment, but I think, in your case, you must confine yourself to the amendment.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I realize that, Mr. Speaker. I am just laying the foundation for what my motion stood for, because what I am going to submit is that the amendment changes the purpose of the motion, and I have got to point out what was involved in the original motion in order to make the argument that I wish to make namely, that the amendment changes the basis and purpose of the motion to a large extent, and I think that I am quite in order in doing this.

That was the purpose of the motion — that the matter should be carefully examined with a view to outlining the fields where it might be thought that strikes would do far more harm to the public welfare than they could possibly do good to the people who were striking. That, I say, was the purpose of the motion. The amendment strikes out the suggestion to examine the possibility that there may be fields of activity where the unlimited exercise of the right of labour to withhold its work and the right of management to refuse to permit its plant to be used, where the unlimited exercise of those rights to promote the economic interest of either group may be detrimental to public welfare. That is proposed to be struck out, and it is proposed that, in place of considering that particular problem, the purpose of the conference would be setting forth basic national rights of labour, management and the public under a National Labour Code.

Now while that might be quite desirable, it is not at all the problem that I was trying to direct attention to. If the motion were amended in that way I think we could support it as amended, but it would lose sight of the very thing that I had in mind, namely, the problem of the unlimited exercise, pursuit of the economic rights of labour or management, regardless of the damage to public welfare should be looked into. If the amendment carries the whole purpose of the motion of having that problem considered is destroyed. If we vote against the amendment, it is because we think that that is an important matter to be looked into and that it is too bad to have the purpose of having it looked into destroyed by the amendment.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I had to indicate what the purpose of the motion was. The purpose of the motion is to deal with this problem that there are strikes of such a nature that they are bound to do far more harm to the public welfare than they can possibly do good to the people involved in them. I believe the one that is still going on on the West Coast, of the grain handlers, whereby the shipment of all grain out of the West Coast is halted by

**April 7, 1953**

virtue of a strike of 250 men, in the long run is going to do far more harm to the people engaged in labour in Canada, is going to do far more harm to the farmers of Canada, than can possibly be done good to those people even if they win their strike entirely. Surely it would be a very fine thing if certain essential industries that would be recognized as such, and the people that went into them would recognize they were engaging in such an industry, and that there would be an understood agreement whereby their rights would be fully protected by some sort of a permanent labour court, or something of the sort, whereby they would be protected perhaps even better than if they were in an industry where they would have the right to strike, but where society would not be damaged by strikes in such vital industries.

That was the purpose of the motion — that this matter should be looked into and that it is much better to have it looked into and see if something cannot be done about it, and some sort of a set-up established, so that anybody engaging in certain fields will know that they are going to be protected, but that they are not reserving the right to strike, just the same as firefighters are to be protected. Then it would not be necessary when a strike suddenly descends on one of those industries that there would have to be a special action taken in that case, because when it is taken there is always a sense of grievance that there has been an interference against some certain group or persons.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that this important problem, important to labour as well as to farmers of this country, important to the whole country, important, I would say, to democracy itself, is going to be sidetracked, for if this amendment carries that purpose is defeated. Something is put in place that is quite satisfactory. What has been put in its place is that a conference be held to see if a National Labour Code could not be worked out that would be fair to management, labour and society; but that is another matter altogether and so, Mr. Speaker, because it would destroy the real purpose of the motion, I would suggest that not only those representing urban areas, having in mind the interest of labour, but I would suggest that those who realize that there is a problem here, particularly as it affects our farmers, should vote against the amendment in order that this problem may be looked into.

If the movers of the amendment want to introduce a motion that a conference be held to set up a National Labour Code, well that is another matter. I would be quite prepared to support that, but I do say to those who really are concerned about labour here, that they should not pass the amendment because it actually will then provide that we do not ask that this problem that I brought up in the first place should be examined. It sidetracks it and does away with it, and I do suggest that if they want to have us endorse the idea of a conference to set up a National Labour Code, I would be quite prepared to support it; but I do think that this other is an important matter and should have the support of this whole House. So when I suggest that I intend to vote against the amendment, it is not because I am against the idea of a National Labour Code, but it is because I think the other problem is one that should be examined into, and if the amendment carries it means that that problem will not be examined at all.



**Mr. Harry Gibbs (Swift Current):** — Mr. Speaker, I am quite surprised when I listen to the hon. Leader of the Opposition talk the way he has done on this amendment, because after all is said and done, it is true that we have hundreds of thousands and millions of people interested in labour throughout the world, and I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman that labour is at the point where it has had to fight for whatever it has got right from its very foundation, and it is still fighting today, Mr. Speaker. It is all right for the Leader of the Opposition to come out and say he would support a National Labour Code. Why didn't the Liberal Government give us a National Labour Code years ago? They turned a deaf ear to labour for such a long time in this country, Mr. Speaker, that it is no wonder that labour is turning against Liberalism today. I have made statements before that I never did see where former Liberal governments had ever supported (that is on the whole) the average labour working man in his organization. We have tried for years and years to get a National Labour Code. Every appeal has been turned down and I am kind of wondering, when I saw this resolution brought by the Leader of the Opposition, whether there was not something touching on that Bill that is now in Parliament, Bill 93. I notice that nothing was mentioned about Bill 93 and I am wondering whether they are still trying to get that 'padlock law' into effect. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that, a few months ago, Justice Minister Stuart Garson bitterly opposed an appeal from the League of Democratic Rights. He bitterly opposed that because they were asking for a National Labour Code and they were asking that Bill 93, where they have been trying to put a padlock on labour, should not come into effect. Now, I am kind of wondering whether our friends of the Opposition had some idea of this Bill 93, because if ever labour needed support they need it today in all Canadian centres and in this country of ours.

As long as I live, Mr. Speaker, I am going to fight for the rights of labour. It is only a year ago or so that the farmers in general started to come out with a Farmers' Union. I know they have talked about it in years gone by, but to get right down to the fundamental points or organization, the farmers are organizing and, as far as I am concerned, there is no redress that they should not get in the future, and should receive the same privileges as other organizations throughout the labour market in this country. It can be done, and I think now that they have the essence and the fundamentals worked out, that probably we shall see it come into effect some day. I hope so. I hope that the farmer gets the same privileges, working conditions and all that goes with it, as the average unionized labour man in this country gets today, and there is no reason why he should not. I am all for it, but I would like to impress on this House that we do not want a padlock on labour in Canada. Those of you who have any idea of the Taft-Hartley law. We do not want those conditions in Canada. What labour has fought for we want to hold, and we want to advance and progress like decent human beings. We do not want to be exploited like our fathers and our grandfathers were exploited in the past. We want to live and work like rational human beings, have a decent standard of living where we can provide the necessities of life, housing and clothing for the children and their children to come, and it is only by labour standing united that we get these things. So I hope, and I am pretty sure, that this House today is going to vote for this amendment so that we shall not relax or lose any of the rights that labour has fought and suffered so hard to get in this Canada of ours.

The question being put on the amendment it was agreed to by 29 votes against 9.

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

April 7, 1953

## MOTION RE GRAIN STORAGE

The Assembly resumed from March 19, 1953, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):

That, in view of the fact present public grain storage and transportation facilities seriously fail to meet present day conditions arising in part from farm mechanization and inequalities in the quota system, this Assembly urges that, in the interest of orderly marketing and the stabilizing of farm income, the Federal Government make immediate provision for:

(a) storage payments comparable to elevator storage charges on grain suitably stored by farmers;

(b) substantial advance payments on grain stored in approved bins.

**Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena):** — Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is a principle to which all the members here can readily subscribe. We have, in the history of this province, seen grain grow and expand our potential agricultural output, but I am not agreed that we have had the growth in taking care of the grain-handling facilities that we should have had. As I mentioned on an earlier occasion in this House, 1928 was one of the record crops we ever had in this province, and in 1928 we did not encounter any difficulties with the handling of that grain. No farmer was restricted for any length of time from delivering his grain. The handling facilities were able to take care of it.

But during the war years it was found necessary to put the grain deliveries on a quota system in order that the boxcar facilities and other transportation facilities could be used for war purposes, as well as for hauling the grain from the farms of the west. Since the war has ended, it has never got back to normal in handling our grain. It is quite recognizable, also, that it is very difficult for transportation facilities to handle our grain as fast as they used to do, when you compare the speed with which the harvesting is handled in this province. If we get good fall weather, with the combines of today we can take our grain up pretty fast, so it is necessary to have grain on a quota basis. No farmer argues with that, but the public grain storage, while it has increased over this past three or four years from, I think it is roughly, 262 million to over 300 million of storage in Canada, it still does not take care of the grain, so it is necessary that some of the grain be stored on the farms and held by the farmers until it can be accepted by the Wheat Board.

The transportation facilities, I am certain, could move a lot of this grain faster than they have done. In my own particular part of the province, we are, at the present time, as all the rest of the province is, on a 15-bushel quota. Before it was increased to a 15-bushel quota, we had a 10-bushel quota on wheat and 8 on coarse grain. Many of the farmers have not been able to deliver their full quota on wheat, nor have they been able to deliver their 8 bushels of coarse grains, when it was increased to 15. While it has been increased to 15, the farmers have been able to deliver very little grain. A number of cars have come into my local point this last week, but now while there are some cars coming in, it is not possible for the farmers to haul

their grain due to the spring break-up of the road. Many of the farmers will of necessity be using the highway as they take their grain to market, and there will be a ban on the highways; I believe the ban is on that particular stretch of highway now. So, once again, the farmers are not able to market their grain.

Now when you consider the hazard this puts on the small farmers — and in my part of the province we are all considered as small farmers; there are no large farming units in that part of the province. Those farmers who have been able to sell less than their 8 bushels of coarse grains — and the northern part of the province grows a lot of coarse grain — how are they able to meet their taxes, their store bills, their repair bills and other payments out of an 8-bushel quota? It isn't possible for them to do so. Some consideration will have to be given to helping these farmers. These farmers are not wanting to call on society to help them; they want society to evolve a system whereby, when they have a crop, they can either deliver it or get advances on their crop in order to help them to build bins to look after it.

Many inequalities in the quota system have been pointed out by the mover of this motion, inequalities between various points and, in my opinion, there are also inequalities between one farmer and another. I would not only like to see some of the present inequalities taken out of the quota system but I would like to see, personally, a quota system put on a farm basis. A farm here in the southern part of the province where they are farming several sections of land and where they get a 15-bushel per acre yield if they have a real good crop over and above their average crop, if they get a 10-bushel quota, they are delivering the biggest bulk of their grain; they can pay all their expenses and carry on. On the other hand, a 10-bushel quota to the half-section farmer in the north doesn't begin to meet their expenses. Many of those farms up in the northern part of the province that I am well acquainted with, they may only have 50, 75 or 100 acres of wheat in. A 5-bushel quota only gives them 500 bushels of wheat if they have 100 acres in, and that does not begin to pay their expenses. I believe the quota system should be put more on a farm basis whereby each farmer is allowed to deliver so many bushels. If each farmer as his initial quota was allowed to deliver 1,000 bushels or whatever the case may be, the small farmer would have a chance to carry on.

We have heard much discussion in this House as to why farmers leave the land and why doesn't the small farmer raise more stock. Our quota system is one of the reasons why small farmers are forced off their land: they are not able to market their produce to carry on with. Many of the farmers in the northeast part of the province, farming isn't their sole means of income; but if they can sell their crop in the fall like they used to be able to, then in the winter months, they can go to the bush, work in the lumber camps or pulpwood camps or take our cordwood and so on, to help them get by for the winter. But if they cannot sell the grain they have produced, and whenever the quota is raised a bushel or two, they have to try and get the grain out and it makes it very costly for them. So I think not only the inequalities of the present quota system should be taken out, but there needs to be some consideration given to the small quarter-section and half-section farmers so that they may be able to deliver more of their grain, rather than on a mere acreage basis.

In the northern part of the province a 15-bushel crop is a very small crop. If we don't get 15 bushels to the acre every year, we will go 'broke' in short order, because our kind of farming economy is far more costly

**April 7, 1953**

than is that of the farmers in the southern part of the province. In talking to the farmers of the southern part of the province they tell me they go over their summerfallow two or three times; that is all they ever go over it and they have reasonably good summerfallow. The farmers in the north, due to the type of weeds we have to contend with, have to go over our summerfallow six or seven operations. Of necessity, we must have a larger yield per acre in order to carry on the farming, because we are not able to take advantage of large machines as the farmers in the southern part of the province are; so the quota system needs to be remedied to take care of those things.

Part of this motion calls for "storage payments comparable to elevator storage charges on grain suitably stored by farmers". I see no reason why the farmers should not get storage pay, if they are providing adequate storage for their grain, the same as elevator companies get, and it should not be too hard to pay that storage without a lot of extra cost for administration by the Wheat Board. During the war years we had that principle for a short while, and the initial price was just raised every so often to take care of that factor. It could be quite easily said that, by the Wheat Board or regulation, it would only apply on grain delivered in good condition. Grain that was sprouted or all mouldy or so on, would not come under this, so it would be easy enough to control that by the grading, and as was mentioned by the member from Gravelbourg when moving this motion, if this was only for storage paid until the Wheat Board was ready to accept it, then it would make it quite clear, and it could be adopted by all. I think that wording is implied here, — 'storage comparable to elevator storage charges on grain suitably stored by farmers.' The elevators do not get storage on the grain after the Wheat Board has agreed and is ready to take delivery of that grain. They can only get storage on the grain from the time it is delivered by the farmers up until the Wheat Board is ready to accept delivery from the elevator companies. So, if we can get storage payable to the farmers on the same comparable basis, it would only be until the Wheat Board was in a position to handle that grain; then no further payments would be made to farmers for grain stored on the farm. So I think that is implied in this wording — that it is comparable to elevator storage.

Now, with regard to some special advance payments on the grain, I think that the farmers should have an advance payment on the grain stored on the farms in approved bins. It has worked for several years across the line to the south of us, and I see no reason why it should not be able to be worked in Canada if it can be worked to the farmers across the line. I do not know what the situation is going to be for this present crop year we are in, but rumours were quite persistent, last Fall. Statements in the paper said the Wheat Board would only be taking approximately, this year, maybe 20 bushels per seeded acre of this year's crop. If that is correct, then the farmers of the north are going to be very hard put to it, because 20 bushels per acre will not pay the expense they have had, especially some areas of the north and parts of this province where we have had two crop failures prior to the crop that we are now trying to harvest. The 1950 crop was pretty well 100-per cent failure in some areas there, on account of the frost. The 1951 crop was lost through the snowstorm. The 1952 crop is the first crop we have had for three years. If we are only able to sell half of that crop and have got three years' expenses piled up to pay from half of that crop, we cannot carry on; so I agree that substantial advance payments should be made to the farmers, on the grain stored in approved bins.

I do not see where it would take much administration costs to carry out the points as requested by this motion. I believe it could be worked quite easily in conjunction with the elevator companies or the municipalities, and it would not need a large field staff to approve these things. I know lots could be said on this motion — a lot more I would like to say. I am aware of the fact that it is the Federal Government that has to take action on this motion. The Provincial Government cannot do it, and I know that it is the motion itself which they will be dealing with, not all of our speeches; so it gives me great pleasure in seconding this motion and to support it; and I believe, as the point was raised before, as far as the storage is concerned it is covered in these words, so I support the motion as it is.

The question being put, it was agreed to unanimously.

### **WELFARE SERVICES PROGRAMME**

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Sturdy, seconded by Mr. Heming:

That this Assembly, recognizing that while several comprehensive studies have been made in an effort to find satisfactory solutions to the problems created by unemployment, the various programmes of social insurance and categorical assistance presently in effect do not adequately meet these problems, therefore urges; that the Federal Government take the steps necessary to implement the recommendation contained in the report of the Canadian Welfare Council on "Public Assistance and the Unemployed" as follows:

- (1) The risks of unemployment should be reduced as much as possible by the full implementation of the Federal Government's policy of maintaining a high level of employment.
- (2) The Unemployment Insurance Act should be kept under constant review with the aim of achieving its fullest possible effectiveness. The following points in particular ought to be kept constantly in mind:
  - (a) The need to increase benefits in proportion with the cost of living and the needs of family life;
  - (b) The need to extend coverage as far as administratively possible with the idea of bringing in all paid workers.
  - (c) The duration of supplementary benefits should be extended and the amount increased in keeping with increasing costs of living and needs generally.

**April 7, 1953**

(d) The greatest possible flexibility in procedure should be permitted in order to meet needs quickly and with a minimum of administrative difficulty.

(3) The needs of the unemployed in periods of "abnormal" unemployment, national or regional, should be planned for in advance, by the legislative provision of extended benefits for persons who have exhausted their insurance rights, such extended benefits to be financed from consolidated revenue.

(4) Rehabilitation programmes for able-bodied and disabled persons should be further developed.

(5) (a) The Federal Government should assume most of the financial responsibility for the residual assistance required by all employable unemployed persons not provided for adequately by unemployment insurance or extended benefits.

(b) The Federal Government should fulfil this responsibility by the purchase of service from other authorities — that is, by payments to each province for the assistance and services given by it, or by its municipalities, to these people.

(c) The Federal payments should consist of a basis payment and a variable payment.

(i) The basic payments should be a percentage of the cost of administration of the entire general assistance programme at the provincial and local levels.

(ii) The variable payment would be the Federal Government's share in providing for the employable unemployed, the amount being determined at any time by a formula through which the amount of general assistance given to this group was ascertained.

**Hon. J.H. Sturdy (Minister of Social Welfare):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to state the problems involved in this proposed resolution. Even under present conditions of relative prosperity, possibly resulting from the war presently going on, there are about 10 per cent of the people of Canada who require assistance to enable them to enjoy the necessities of life. These categories include the very young, the neglected or potentially neglected children, and the aged people who are no longer able to work and who have not been able to set aside sufficient to provide them with a decent livelihood. There are 3000 needy mothers in this province alone with some 7000 children. There are unemployables, unemployable by reason of accident or illness, the crippling effects of diseases and so on. There are those who have only casual employment; some with relatively large families and unable to support their families in the manner in which they should be supported in a progressive,

democratic society. So I say that even under the conditions that exist today, there are about 10 per cent of the people of Canada in this category.

I just read, this morning, that prior to the Korean war, in May 1950, there were 4,000,000 unemployed in the United States. At the present time, there are 4,000,000 under arms in the United States of America, so that when this war ends, we must be prepared to face at least the possibility of unemployment. Our minds go back to the conditions which existed in Canada during the 'thirties when tens of thousands of Canadian families were in very dire circumstances indeed, when the situation was so serious that there were riots and bloodshed and concentration camps in which the youth of our country were placed; and we should be making preparations now, during this present period, for eventualities which may arise.

In 1867, the Fathers of Confederation made the responsibility for the provision of welfare services that of the Provinces. Certainly the Fathers of Confederation, back almost one hundred years ago, could not envisage or could not foresee the tremendous change there would be in the social and economic life of this country of ours. My memory goes back easily fifty years, and I do recall, on an Ontario farm in a relatively wealthy part of that province of Ontario, the pioneer conditions which existed in that time. There is as much difference between those conditions then, fifty years ago, and the conditions which obtain today, as there is between night and day. All social aid cases were, in those days, the responsibility largely of the pioneer families, and if there were people unemployed or unfortunately in other respects, they became the tramps of those days; and I recall, as a child, as many as twenty tramps a day, during a period of unemployment, who would call at the various homes seeking a 'handout', and they were cared for in that way. The services that a modern, socially-conscious society provide today were not dreamed of in those days.

Now, how have we attempted to provide for adequate social welfare services to the people of our country requiring them? Well, it is a pretty piecemeal proposition here in Canada. The Federal Government provide some of these services by way of old-age security pensions or payments, war veterans' allowances, family allowances, and unemployment insurance. The Provincial Government — we in Saskatchewan take care of mothers' allowances to the extent of over \$1 million a year; the Province pays out over \$1 million a year in respect to social aid; we have our share of pensions for the aged; we provide health services and hospitalization to over 35,000 people; we have our rehabilitation programme; we have workmen's compensation; and then the municipalities also assume some responsibility for the care of indigent and other social welfare cases. We have endeavoured since 1944 to relieve the municipalities of these onerous financial responsibilities and we have relieved them to a greater extent than municipalities in other provinces have been relieved. But you see, Mr. Speaker, that the present system of caring for these various categories under social assistance is a piecemeal, haphazard, inadequate system indeed.

Take as an example, residence requirements. Here in Saskatchewan, any one who has come from any other province or from a foreign land, who has residence in Saskatchewan for a period of one year, is entitled to all the social aid benefits which this Province affords, but in the province of Nova Scotia, they still adhere to the old Elizabethan Poor Laws and require a residence of four years before they will assume responsibility for indigent people in that

**April 7, 1953**

province. Accordingly there is a haphazard method of establishing residence all across the Dominion of Canada. These and other problems in connection with welfare services must be faced up to.

Now what should be the aim of a sound welfare service programme? Well, in my humble opinion, welfare services including social aid should be given wherever they are required, whenever they are required, and in the amount necessary to meet the needs of the individual or the family. In granting welfare services, any differential between employables and unemployables should be avoided at any cost. This Government has discovered that many handicapped persons who undergo rehabilitation training become employables, and to permanently classify such persons as unemployable would frustrate not only the individual but would frustrate any decent rehabilitation programme. It is my belief that every person capable of being placed in an earning position should receive such training and such rehabilitation benefits as will place him in that position. Only those whose handicaps, mental or physical, are so serious as to make rehabilitation impossible, should receive a pension or, shall we put it, permanent social aid.

It is my opinion, too, that the Provinces should administer, and they should all be required to administer, adequate welfare services, and that the funds from Federal sources should be forthcoming to enable the Provinces to carry on this onerous responsibility. I think that the Federal Government should establish standards below which no individual should be permitted to sink and that, if those standards are maintained, then financial assistance should be forthcoming to enable the Province to provide these services.

The principles upon which a sound programme is based might be listed as follows, and it should be recognized that there is no single solution to the problem of helping those who are in need. Preventative measures should be stressed. A works-and-wages programme in periods of depression should be provided by the Federal Government. Social assistance should be extended as far as is practicable and sufficient to meet the needs of all people in need. Assistance should be provided in such a way, too, that individual initiative should not be interfered with — and that is why I so strongly recommend that we do not fall too readily into granting permanent social aid to so-called unemployable persons. As I have said, the great majority of these can be placed, with proper rehabilitation services, in an earning capacity. Assistance should be sufficient to maintain the health and welfare of all people of our country.

The recommendations that this resolution embody might be listed as follows:

- (1) That the provinces develop adequate public assistance services for all those in need, who are not covered by other measures. That is, the Federal Government should require all Provinces to maintain an adequate standard to take care of the needs of all persons requiring it; that the Federal Government assist the Provinces with these services by helping the Provinces to pay for the cost of administering them. It is recognized that the Federal Government occupies practically all the lucrative fields of taxation and that the Federal Government is the only source from which the provinces can obtain sufficient funds to carry on an adequate programme.



(2) That the Federal Government assist the Provinces in assuming most of the additional cost of public assistance during periods of unusual increases in the needs of the people, that is, during periods of depression.

(3) That the risks of unemployment be reduced as much as possible by full implementation of the Federal Government's policy of maintaining a high level of employment.

(4) That the Unemployment Insurance Act be kept under constant review, in order to insure that it gives sufficient protection to the greatest number of people possible.

Let us examine the unemployment insurance fund at the present time. It stands at half a billion dollars, and it means that a person must work five weeks in order to enjoy the benefits of unemployment insurance for one week. Is there any reason why that one week should not be extended to two weeks and make the ration five-to-two? That is one thing that might be done. Then it is recognized, too, that there are many people that are not included in the unemployment insurance. There are seasonal workers, farm labourers, professional classes, domestics and so on. Unemployment insurance categories should be widened to include many more people than it does today. And an amazing thing about the unemployment insurance is that they cut off the payment of unemployment insurance during the illness of the worker. The very time that the family requires the most money, that is the time that unemployment insurance is cut off. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the unemployment insurance benefits should be extended in periods of abnormal unemployment long beyond the ratio of 5-to-1.

Lastly, I do think that a sound, adequate rehabilitation programme should be undertaken to bring the tens of thousands of Canadian people who by reason of handicaps are unemployed today. During periods of war they are made employable. I shall never forget visiting a rehabilitation centre at Leatherhead, just south of London, during the last war. I had marvelled at the fact that beggars, crippled people, and so on, had disappeared from the streets of London, and I was asking them where these patients or these trainees came from, and they said, 'from the streets of London.' There they were being trained into useful employment, provided with the necessary appliances that were required, and every one of them was trained to do a useful and a desirable job. From a humanitarian point of view, we have no conception of what it means to a person, an adult, who has never earned a cent or money in his life except by begging possibly, to be placed in a position where he can engage in gainful employment. We have no conception of the tremendous moral lift that it must give that individual.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal I could say on this subject, but I move, seconded by Mr. Heming, the Motion which appears under my name in the Order Paper.

The question being put, the resolution was adopted unanimously.

The Assembly then adjourned at 5.55 o'clock p.m.