

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session –Twelfth Legislature
26th Day

Thursday, March 18, 1954

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVILEGE

Mr. A. H. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to call the attention of the House to a letter appearing in the Leader-Post with regard to automobile insurance. The letter is signed by Mr. Leonard James, Public Relations Director, Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office, Regina. And he mentions a Mr. McDonald in this letter. I don't know whether the Minister has seen the letter or not, but I would like to know if the McDonald referred to in the letter is myself. And if not, I would like to have the name of the McDonald that is referred to in this letter. If the Minister has not read the letter I would be pleased to send it over.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — There was a letter written by a Mr. McDonald the other day in the Leader-Post, and this is a reply to that letter. I presume it was not the honourable member who wrote this letter, stating that he had some insurance with another company and when he want to settle up, the Insurance Office told him the other company would have to pay the claim.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, regarding the person who wrote the letter, whose salary is paid from the funds of this province, I would much appreciate it if he could state to the Leader-Post that it is not the member for Moosomin who made the statement.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! That is not a proper question of privilege.

Mr. Lopston (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is proper for a member on this side of the House to take up a misleading statement in the press.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The only thing a member can rise on a question of privilege is a matter affecting his privileges as a member in this House; and if the Mr. McDonald referred to in a letter in the Leader-Post is not the member for Moosomin (and I presume it isn't) then the member for Moosomin can quite easily put a letter in the Leader-Post saying that he is not the Mr. McDonald in question. What appeared in the Leader-Post is hardly a matter affecting the privileges of this House.

Mr. McDonald: — Well, Mr. Speaker, on that very point, I am not in the habit of writing letters to the Editor of the Leader-Post or any other newspaper. And I think that when any gentleman whose salary is paid out of the public funds of this province writes a letter to the Leader-Post he ought to name the person he is referring to, and not leave the inference that it might be myself.

March 18, 1954

Mr. Speaker: — Order! We will start the procedures on Orders of the Day. I rule the point of privilege is out of order.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — If the member would send that photograph he has along . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — . . . that letter to know.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! If the honourable member wants to speak, will he kindly get on his feet.

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, I can do that, Mr. Speaker, if you ask me to do it.

Mr. Speaker: — Ask properly for a point of privilege.

Mr. Danielson: — All right. I am allowed to speak now, am I?

Mr. Speaker: — No, you're not.

Mr. Danielson: — I want to point out to the Provincial Treasurer . . .

Mr. Speaker: — What are you rising on? The honourable member will kindly state for what reason he is rising. On a point of privilege?

Mr. Danielson: — You can call it anything you like.

Mr. Speaker: — The honourable member will kindly take his seat.

Mr. Danielson: — You asked me to get up, and I . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The honourable member, if he has occasion and a proper reason, must conform to the ruling of the House. Will the honourable member take his seat?

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, I am on my feet now.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Well, so is the speaker. Sit down!

Mr. Speaker: — All right. State your point.

Mr. Danielson: — My point is that the gentleman was in the employ of the government, paid by the government of Saskatchewan, and he has written a letter . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Danielson: — . . .and he hasn't even put the initials of the name in there.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Sit down. Show some respect.

Mr. Speaker: — The honourable member for Arm River has been in this Chamber long enough to know something about proper rules. The honourable member for Moosomin was out of order in bringing up what he did on Orders

of the Day, and that is the point of order that I was ruling on.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on that very point, I don't think I was out of order at all in bringing this to the attention of this House. That is done almost every day.

Mr. Speaker: — All right, if you don't think the point of order that I take is well taken, all right, then. Object to it and put it to the House. That is the proper method.

Mr. McDonald: — But, Mr. Speaker, this is done probably two or three days every week — referring to something that appears in the paper where it could be your name or someone else's.

Mr. Speaker: — I do not propose to argue with the honourable member.

Mr. McDonald: — I do not propose to argue with you, either.

Mr. Speaker: — There are certain rules of procedure that are set down for the conduct of this Legislature and I hope and trust that the members will stay within those rules.

Mr. McDonald: — Well, Mr. Speaker, on that very point, I don't think I ever broke the rules. If I did, I ask your pardon, and any time that I am out of order I am prepared to be brought into order and to go by your rules.

Mr. Speaker: — I have ruled you out of order.

VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS ASSISTANCE AGREEMENT

Moved by Mr. Willis (Elrose), seconded by Mr. Buchanan (Notukeu-Willowbunch): —

That this Assembly, recognizing the extensive development within the province of vocational training facilities which have been facilitated by funds made available through the Dominion-Provincial Vocational Schools Assistance Agreement which expires in 1955, urges that the Government of Canada continue its interest in this field through a renewal of this Agreement on an expanded financial basis.

Mr. Maurice J. Willis (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, in moving this resolution for an extension of vocational grants to the provinces, first of all I would like to welcome these students to the Assembly, this afternoon, and I want to assure them that what they saw in the past few minutes does not usually happen in the Chamber. I do not want that impression to be carried away, for at one time I was wondering whether I was going to get to the motion at all, this afternoon, after having these students with whom I find myself quite at home here in the Chamber.

In 1942 the federal government passed an Act respecting the carrying on, in co-ordination of vocational training. This Act was agreed

March 18, 1954

to by the province of Saskatchewan in 1945, and under section 4(e) of the Act, we have been able to get certain substantial grants from the federal government. Section (e) reads: "The development and carrying on after the present war of vocational training on a level equivalent to secondary school level."

Under this agreement that we made in December, 1945, the main terms were that the federal government gave a grant of \$10,000 for administrative costs to the province, a second and operational grant of \$163,900 which money has been passed on to vocational schools in this province, and a capital grant of \$858,200 which was matched by the province on a 50-50 basis in the building of composite schools and also an extension of existing composite schools. All this money, at the present time, has been matched by the provincial government with the result that we find, in 1952, there are 18 new composite schools which have been built, and 13 extensions have been made to schools for vocational work. Grants also have been made to three dormitories for composite schools in this province, making in all a total of 36 projects on which this money has been spent.

Now this agreement is terminated, and my resolution, this afternoon, asks for it to be extended.

The funds were distributed upon the number of high school teachers in a given town or city, in a non-unit area; or in the units, on the basis of the number of high school students in the unit; and 80 per cent of the cost of the school and of the equipment was spent, on a 40-40 per cent basis, 40 per cent being put up by the Dominion Government and 40 per cent by the Provincial Government.

I want to bring to the attention of this House, this afternoon, that, in making a survey of this province, in 1944, there were 17,714 students in grade V, and in 1952, of those 17,000 students, only 2,125 had certificates for grade XII. Out of 17,714 students, only 12,056 took up grade IX in this province, and of that 12,000, only 2,125 graduated with their grade XII.

This afternoon I make a plea to all in this House for an extension of this agreement in order that we can extend vocational courses to the rural areas of this province, so that boys and girls will have a choice of courses, and I want it clearly understood that vocational work is misunderstood in this province sometimes. It is not a finishing course; it is an exploratory course for the students of this province. Too often the people of this province think that if a boy or girl goes to vocational school, when they complete the vocational classes, they are finished products and can go out into industry. That is purely erroneous. It is simply an exploratory course, and we hope, and I will go on this afternoon to show, that we want something to advance from a vocational school, to go on from there. And with the expansion in this province of oil, gas and industry, I think I am expressing the wish of all the people of this province that we are on the threshold of great things, and that we need skilled workers and trained workers.

In the past, being a young province, we find our students had little choice of a course. They could not pursue a very wide course. It was academic, and it was built for those who were able to go to university. That is fine. We have that, and we have a fine university; but we want more

than that, because so very few of our total school population go on to university, and this, if we have sufficient funds, will give other boys and girls the ability to go into trade. We sorely need skilled tradesmen in this province, and particularly in the years ahead (I may be too optimistic; but this province has been built on optimism) that we will be able to have skilled workers trained so that when the positions are offered, our own boys and girls will be able to avail themselves of those positions.

At the time the money was spent in this province the whole province had only a few units. As I said already, there are only 36 projects. Many units will be developing composite schools and will need capital and equipment for that. The Minister of Education advised the members that if they were going by the Saskatchewan hotel, they should take a look at the shop mobile. I understand there are four more of the itinerant shop mobiles or courses given in units at the present time. Now, under this agreement, those areas do not get any grant under the Dominion-Provincial agreement for agricultural programme, vocational agricultural course for farm students. We need it sorely. It is impossible for our youths to go from the rural areas — we have a very fine Department of Agriculture at the University, and we have short courses; but it is impossible to get the numbers from a rural area to take these courses, and farming today is a scientific procedure and vocation.

Then I think that, to solve our rural high school problem, one of the greatest things we need in this province is dormitories, so that the rural students can come into the towns to take vocational work in connection with the composite schools and the high schools. Where they have these dormitories — and I am speaking of Kindersley — they cannot, at the present time, look after all those who want to enrol in the dormitory. It indicates to me that the rural people want their boys and girls to come in to these dormitories. They have supervision there.

The second thing is that, in many of the towns, it is just impossible for the rural boys and girls to get boarding accommodation. I know in my own town, today, every Monday morning there are six students go right through the town of Eston over to Kindersley because they have been fortunate enough to be able to get accommodation in the dormitory there.

Then I would like, and hope, that if these grants would be extended, we would be able to set up in this province a provincial technical institute. That institute would take those who have taken these exploratory courses in our vocational schools, and they would be able to go on for three or four years, just as our grade XII students from the academic classes go on into the professions and the university. They have got one of these in the province of Manitoba. It would be a place for these graduates of our composite schools and, as this province develops its natural resources, there will be a place for those graduates. The crying need of this province, today, is for skilled small businesses, “We want more graduates,” and they can’t get them. In this institute, courses would be flexible enough to meet the training needs as they arise. It would provide for the training of groups of apprenticeships, for nursing assistants, for car mechanics, courses in rural electrification, courses in pipefitting, plumbing; it would provide semi-professional courses for oil workers in the oil industry and the gas industry. And this school would be available to serve the needs of the province as a whole.

March 18, 1954

And so, if we have funds available, I feel sure that they would be used to take vocational training facilities to areas that have not had the opportunity up to the present time. After all, when the larger units came into being (the first ones were after 1944), there are several that have been formed in recent years and they have been unable, up to the present time, to share, and all the money is gone — the \$858,000. And so, this afternoon, I make a plea for the rural boys and girls that those facilities that some enjoy now will be available for others in those areas that have not had that opportunity.

I would also like to see us set up a provincial technical institute so that the graduates of the vocational schools could go on and, when they graduated from the provincial technical institute, they would have a certificate that would be worthwhile.

Moreover, in this province, during the war it was difficult to get supplies to equip the schools, and the \$858,000, with the controls taken off, could not buy a lot of equipment; and today, in Canada, I think that we need skilled workers not alone for this province. We are proud to train our graduates at our University. They become citizens of Canada and citizens of the world, and the graduates of our University take second place to none on this continent or any other continent. The same thing will be true if we have the funds available for a technical school, because I feel sure the standards would be brought up and we would have skilled workers. Too often, in the past, we have taken our young people and we have offered them only the one thing, an academic course, with the result, as I showed you this afternoon, that one out of eight was all that finished their grade XII, in 1952, that started in 1944 — that finished grade V.

That is a challenge, Mr. Speaker, to us this afternoon. I am not saying that we would be able to get them all to take these courses, but we would be offering them to them, and in doing so we would then graduate many times what we are doing today, people whom we sorely need in the Dominion of Canada today — skilled workers.

And so I ask the members — I think they will all have to agree with me, this afternoon. I haven't given any cause to ridicule anyone, and I hope this motion, which I now move, seconded by the honourable member for Notukeu-Willow Bunch (Mr. Buchanan), will be unanimously supported by all members of the House.

Mr. J. W. Horsman (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this resolution. I did not intend to; but after listening to the honourable member for Elrose, I feel that someone on this side of the House should support this resolution, because I realize the great value of vocational training for the young people of this country.

We must recognize, in our school system here, that when a young man or woman comes out of high school it seems to me that about the only training he has is training for a schoolteacher's certificate or something like that. We must recognize, too, that every young person cannot take on a white-collared job. There are too many other jobs; and I think that vocational training for the young people is of very great importance.

I am quite sure that you will have no trouble to get the Federal Government to go along with you in renewing this contract. I feel that education, now, is financed mostly by the taxes on land and property, outside

of grants that we receive from the Government. Land taxes now are beginning to be a burden, as are taxes on property. So I think that anything we can do to get some more help for education, no matter what kind of education it is, everyone in this Assembly should support it. I feel sure that if the young people go out into life with some vocational training in some line — not that they might follow; but when he takes a vocational course it gives the young person a chance to find out what he is fitted for. Many young people get into some job that they never should have got into in the first place. A little training while they are young will give them an idea of whether or not they are fitted for a certain job. That is why I think vocational training is such an important thing in this country.

I take much pleasure in supporting this motion.

The question being put, it was agreed to unanimously.

HOUSING

Moved by Mrs. Cooper (Regina City), seconded by Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords):

That, in order to provide more adequate housing for residents of Saskatchewan and to enable a greater number of persons to construct dwellings to meet their urgent needs, the Government of Canada be urged to make provision through the *National Housing Act*:

1.(a) lowering the rate of interest to 2 per cent rather than imposing a heavy burden of carrying charges on the homeowner;

(b) extending the amortization period to 30 years, provided the interest rate is 2 per cent;

(c) extending 90 per cent loans beyond the \$8,000 maximum proposed in the amending Bill now before Parliament, up to a lending value of \$12,000;

(d) extending 90 per cent loans on the full lending value of two-family homes instead of reducing the ration of the loan to 80 per cent one one-half the lending value of a two-unit structure, in order to encourage this type of home construction;

(e) extending 90 per cent loans to dwelling units in multiple co-operative housing projects instead of the 80 per cent proposed in the Bill presently before Parliament, and

2. allowing limited dividend corporations set up by the Government of Saskatchewan to operate under section 9 of the present National Housing Act, under which limited dividend corporations

March 18, 1954

may borrow up to 90 per cent of the cost of a low-rental project at $3\frac{3}{4}$ per cent interest for a term not exceeding 50 years, in order that Saskatchewan may have additional authority to take advantage of present Federal and Provincial legislation and to carry out a vigorous provincial housing programme.

Mrs. Marjorie Cooper (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, I feel that the motion I am going to move, this afternoon, is one of the most important to come before this Legislature. It is rather lengthy, and so I am not going to take the time of the House in reading the whole motion. I will deal with it clause by clause and thus save the time of reading the motion.

I had a good deal to say in this House, last year, on the subject of housing, and I am going to have a good deal more to say today, because I believe that there is nothing more important to the welfare of this country than the provision of decent, proper housing accommodation for our people.

I was hoping, Mr. Speaker, that the new Act passed by the Federal Government would do much to remove the obstacles will in the way of a vigorous housing programme; but I was very bitterly disappointed when I found what the Act actually does provide. It seems to me that this Act is in the nature of a retreat rather than an advance, and certainly it does nothing to assist the people who most need help in getting homes for themselves.

The primary purpose of a public housing programme, in my opinion, should be to assist the people who are unable to get help themselves, and who cannot use the regular channels of mortgage companies and lending institutions. But this is precisely the group which is almost entirely neglected in Bill 102 before the Federal House, because they have provided assistance for only those people who are in the upper income groups, most of whom could probably get mortgage money under the regular lending channels.

If we believe that the home is the most important unit in society, and that the spiritual welfare of the nation is dependent on the welfare and the health of the homes (and I think at least we give lip-service to this), we must agree that there is only one practical approach to the housing problem, and that is to start with the axiom that every family must somehow be in a position to have a decent, proper home in which they can bring up their family in privacy; and that housing must be available for every family, whether or not they have the financial ability to pay the total cost of buying or of renting a home. If we accept this as a basic philosophy, and only if we do, will we begin to make progress in solving this housing problem.

I contend, Mr. Speaker, that any action designed to eradicate the worst evils of housing must begin where the worst housing is, not just with help to those people who can well afford to build homes themselves. It should start with the lowest income group, and yet, in the present housing legislation, which is the group that is almost entirely neglected. It would be most unrealistic to suggest that happy, healthy, stable homes can exist where all across this country we find hundreds of families, whole families, living in one or two rooms — perhaps in an attic, or perhaps in a damp basement, or maybe paying

\$90 for a basement suite; where we find people living in all sorts of substandard accommodation, converted army barracks, emergency shelters, trailers. The situation is a national disgrace. We find many families in accommodations where they have to use the living room for sleeping accommodation, with the result that, unless the parents go to bed when the children do, the children never get any proper rest or sleep. And if you don't think that is a real problem, you just ask any schoolteacher. It is a well-known fact that many families in Canada today are split up, and in many cases the children are having to be taken into government care, not because they don't want to live as a family but because there is simply no way that they can find a place where they can live as a family; and I think that is a disgrace.

We have cases of young families trying to live with relatives, with the result that tensions have grown and a family breakup has been the result. In fact, social workers tell me, today, that a major cause of family breakup in Canada is our housing problem. They also tell me that is a factor which contributes to mental illness, and they tell me that juvenile delinquency can be directly traced, in many cases, to our housing situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is a good thing for young couples to have their families while they are still young, because when you are young you have a much better chance of understanding the needs of your 'teenagers, and you have more patience and more understanding which it takes to bring up children. But I know, and I think many of the members of this Legislature know, many young people who simply will not take the risk of having a family, because if they do, they know they may have to give up the living accommodation they have — and where could they find a place where they could afford to live, if they had to make provision for a family?

I could go on at length outlining the evil effects of the housing situation. I could cite cases, as I did last year in the House; but I am not going to do that, because I feel the members of this Legislature know full well what the housing situation is. It seems incredible to me, however, that, in spite of the fact we know the situation that exists and that Canada is one of the richest countries in the world, today we are so far behind many less favoured countries in solving our housing problem. In Britain, in New Zealand, in Sweden, in the United States, Holland, and in many other countries, public enterprises are providing thousands of homes at terms whereby working people can afford to buy, or at rentals scaled for their ability to pay. But in Canada, we are very far behind.

It seems to me that any housing programme should be designed to help the people who need help, as I said before. But Bill 102, or the Housing Bill, before the House of Commons at Ottawa, seems to be designed primarily to protect the mortgage companies against losses on housing loans. That is what the Bill appears to do.

I think perhaps our greatest difficulty lies in the fact that it has been traditional in this country for private enterprise to have the field of housing to itself; and inasmuch as private enterprise can fill the needs of the people for housing I would agree with this policy. But private enterprise is not filling, and cannot fill, the housing needs for low-income groups; and every country that has tried to face its housing problems realistically has come to the place where they admit this. They have found that the

March 18, 1954

only sensible permanent housing policy must be one of a large public housing scheme, with housing subsidized where necessary. I would like to quote from Peter Stratton, the president of the Vancouver Housing Association. He has this to say:

The fact that, normally, not more than one-third at best of all families can afford to build their own homes means that the urgent demand for housing for the lower income groups has little or no influence on the supply; and while the Federal government can influence the volume of private building to a limited extent by increasing or relaxing credit restrictions, no organizational means at present exists to meet the unsatisfied demand for low-cost or moderate rental housing. This gap in our building economy must be filled before we can solve our housing problem.

And he goes on to say,

A little reflection, however, will suggest that for the government to provide an essential commodity such as housing, where the individual cannot do so, is no different than the provision of schools or hospitals or fresh water, on a community basis. On the contrary, if it is desired to preserve the existing economic organization the best way to do it is by removing any sore spots which disfigure it; and bad housing is certainly one of the sorest spots.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that in the Bruce report of 1934, and in the parliamentary committee on housing in 1935, we find the following statements. (This is from a national construction company of Canada, a council whose constituent members were the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the Unions of the building trade, the Manufacturers of building materials; and the Architectural and Engineering Institutes of Canada) The statement reads as follows:

Our investigations of housing for the low-income group show that the provision of this class of housing cannot ultimately be profitable to private enterprise. The responsibility for housing for these groups is, in the final analysis, the responsibility of the State.

I think that is quite an interesting statement, coming from this particular group, and certainly it is a very true statement. With the present high cost of housing, this statement is even more true today. And, of course, later on, as you know, in the Curtis report, they also laid emphasis on the need for a vigorous public housing programme and for the provision of subsidies where necessary. But the Federal Government, in this Act which they have before them in Ottawa right now, has completely

refused to face that fact. They have made little or no pretence at meeting the needs of even the moderate income group, let alone the low-income group. This is the situation. Loans for housing construction are available under this Act to only those with incomes of \$3,600 to \$4,000 or more. The presently existing regulations are that monthly payments cannot be more than 23 per cent of the borrower's salary. Now these payments include interest, principal, fire insurance and mortgage insurance, and if you take a pencil and write that out, you will find that the salary requirement for a \$9,000 home is \$3,600; and for a \$10,000 home, approximately \$4,000, before you can get a maximum loan.

In the west, where our housing is more expensive due to high freight rates, the need for better insulation, more expensive heating equipment, it is almost impossible to build a family home for much less than \$11,000; and if you need a four-bedroom house, it takes practically \$12,000, so that I think it is absolutely fair to say that, in Saskatchewan, before you can get a maximum loan under this Act, you must have a salary of \$4,000 or more; and this, of course, excludes 80 per cent or more of our population. I was looking up income statistics and I find, in 1953 statistics, that of those who made returns, 42.8 per cent of the people had salaries under \$2,000; 72.3 per cent had salaries under \$3,000; and as I pointed out, it takes pretty close to \$4,000, so I think it is very conservative to say that 80 per cent of the people of Canada, and particularly of the west, cannot possibly qualify for a loan under this Act. And this is the very 80 per cent a public housing programme should serve, and this is the group that is completely excluded.

Coming now to the resolution itself. We are proposing, in this resolution, a method by which loans could be made available by the Federal government to these people who really need government help — those in the low and the moderate income groups. We are suggesting that money be loaned at 2 per cent. We are suggesting that a revolving loan fund be set up under C.M.H.C., or the money could be loaned directly through the facilities of the Bank of Canada, because it is only when you can get low interest rates that there is any hope of getting low-cost housing.

When we come to discussing housing costs there are so many people ready to blame the whole thing on the high cost of labour. I can imagine the Leader of the Opposition already saying, "It is the high cost of labour"; and the Leader-Post does that all the time, too ...

Mr. Lopston: — It is the high cost of housing.

Mrs. Cooper: — I have read their editorials on housing, and I get quite disgusted, because the only thing they can say is that the high cost of housing is because of the high cost of labour. Certainly labour costs have risen. In a period of inflation for which the Federal Government must take some responsibility, labour costs have had to rise. After all, as surprising as it may seem, workingmen have to live and eat too, and, therefore, their wages have to go up. However, these same people, or few of them, ever take time to mention, or stop to mention, the high cost of building materials; nor do they mention profits made by contractors. They very seldom mention anything about real estate agents. It is just labour; and almost never do they mention that little matter of interest rates, which are the biggest factor in the high cost of housing,

March 18, 1954

and I am going to prove that to you.

You could reduce the labour costs very materially without cutting the final cost of the house materially; but when you reduce the interest rate to 2 per cent, let us see what happens — I will come to that in a moment.

The Federal Government, in Bill 102, has adopted a new principle, the principle of mortgage insurance, under which the Federal Government is guaranteeing the loans made by banks and mortgage companies, by this method of mortgage insurance. Of course, the prospective buyer has to pay this premium, which, by the way, is \$172 on a \$10,000 house. But it is interesting to note that, although the loan companies are protected, there is no protection given to the buyer's equity. If he puts a lot of money in his house and, for some reason or other cannot carry out his payments, there is no protection given to him.

The point that I was really wanting to make is that mortgage companies have always argued that they need high interest rates for this type of loans because the risk involved is very great. But here there is no risk. The Federal Government is taking the risk, so why they should expect 5 and a half per cent or more is more than I can understand. My argument is that, if the government is taking the risk anyway, why should the government not loan directly, as I suggested, through a revolving loan under CMHC, or through the facilities of the Bank of Canada? If, in order to give interest rates at 2 per cent, it is necessary to give a subsidy—the is an argument whether a subsidy is involved or not; but if it does mean a subsidy, then, for goodness sake!, for once, let us subsidize the buyers rather than the mortgage companies. I can never understand why is it that so many people never blink an eye when it comes to subsidizing a mortgage company or a large corporation, but subsidy is a terrible word if it is used to benefit the common man. I just don't understand that.

The thing that cripples people in this matter of buying a house is the high interest rate. Let us look at the facts. On an \$8,600 loan on a \$10,000 house — you understand the down-payment is 10 per cent on the first \$8,000 and 30 per cent after that, so that on a \$10,000 house your loan is \$8,600; and at the interest rate suggested, amortized over 25 years, 5½ per cent, before you finish paying for that house you have paid \$16,800; almost double. That's what your little bit of interest does! If, however, you reduce that interest rate to 2 per cent and amortize over 30 years, you will find you pay \$11,520 for an \$8,600 loan, which is a saving of well over \$5,000. To a man on a moderate or a low income \$5,000 means an awful lot of money, and that is one thing reducing the interest rate would do.

Coming back to the resolution — clause (a) suggests that the money be loaned directly at 2 per cent, and that the period of amortization be 30 years instead of 25; that is, provided we can get the 2 per cent rate, because if we don't reduce the interest rate, there is no point in lengthening the amortization period. What would this mean to the prospective homeowner? I have shown you it would mean, in the total cost of the house, a saving of over \$5,000; but besides this, secondly it would reduce the carrying charges enough that a great many more people would be able to carry the payments of a home. On a \$10,000 house, again where the loan is \$8,600, it will reduce the payments from \$672 a year down to \$384 a year, or, on a

monthly basis, it would mean the difference between \$56 a month payment and \$32 a month payment. That is quite a difference. Now \$32 may look a bit low. Certainly the carrying charges are only part of buying a house; you have to add approximately \$190 a year for taxes (and that is very conservative), and about \$200 for depreciation, again a conservative figure; and you will find that if you are trying to buy a \$10,000 house your payments are going to be \$90 a month, and if the loan interest is 2 per cent, it will be down to about \$66.

I leave it to the members of this Assembly: how many young people can afford to pay \$90 a month over 25 years . . .

Mr. Lopston: — Why should they?

Mrs. Cooper: — . . . on housing accommodation alone. I have shown you that certainly not more than 20 per cent of the people can do that.

Then the third thing reducing the interest rate would do would be to greatly increase the number of people eligible for loans under the Act, because if you reduce this to 2 per cent, you will find that instead of having to have \$4,000 under existing regulations to get a loan, a man with a salary of \$2,800 could then qualify for a loan. This, of course, would give a chance to thousands of people in moderate and low-income groups, of buying a home. We have to realize even then that there is a large group that would not qualify — people under \$2,800; but of course subsidized low rental housing is really the only answer for this group.

Just a word about clause (c) section 1: we ask that the 90 per cent loans be extended on houses up to a value of \$12,000 instead of \$8,000 as it is at present. In other words, that a 10 per cent down-payment be allowable on houses up to \$12,000. As I pointed out, particularly in the west it is hard to build a house for much less than \$12,000, and I feel that the government would be just as well protected up to \$12,000, as long as you can only have money up to 23 per cent of the salary you get, and it would make more people ready and able to buy a home.

We are also suggesting, in the next section, that the 90 per cent loans also be allowed on multiple housing, duplex houses and so on. As it is now, you can get a 90 per cent loan on the one side of a duplex house, but you only get an 80 per cent loan on the other half. Duplex houses and multiple houses are a cheaper form of house, and they are a form that a workingman is more apt to be able to afford. They are not only cheaper to build, but they are cheaper to keep up. The taxes are lower and if good community planning goes into multiple housing, it is all right, and it is another way of getting more people into the bracket where they can qualify for loans.

The same is true of co-operative housing. We do not see why co-operatives should not get 90 per cent loans, why they should only get 80 per cent loans instead of the 90 per cent, because with co-operatives, they do a good deal of the building themselves, and that cuts down the cost a lot. If they could get the 90 per cent loan, more people could take advantage of it, and co-operatives say that if they could get the 90 per cent loan, they could get started and they could bring people in with incomes of not more than \$2,000 by the way they do their building.

March 18, 1954

Finally, we are asking that the Federal Government allow the Provincial Government to set up limited dividend corporations and to borrow money under section 9 of the old Act, which is section 16 of the new Act. Under this section money can be loaned for low rental projects, 90 per cent loans, 3¾ per cent interest, and 50 years amortization. This is one way of building cheaper housing.

This is not a new request from the Provincial Government. An amendment was passed, in 1946, to allow the province to set up limited dividend corporations so we could take advantage of section 9; but Ottawa still refuses to allow us to take advantage of this section. We feel that, when the Federal Government allows private builders to take advantage of this section of the Act, and now is allowing municipalities to take advantage of this section, they should also let the Provincial Government have this advantage because, with the lower interest rate and the longer period of amortization. Houses could be built more cheaply under this section. If limited dividend corporations could be set up by the province, we could help in places where no other section of the Act will cover it. For instance, section 35 of the Act only applies to housing in cities where the population is 5,000 or over. Well, we could perhaps, assist municipalities where the population is less than 5,000, if we could be allowed to build under this section of the Act.

Last year when I spoke about housing there was a good deal of criticism saying, “Why aren’t the Provincial Government doing something for housing?” Well, they are. But this is one of the reasons we have not been able to do more, because, as you know, and as all authorities agree, a large-scale housing project is the chief responsibility of the Federal Government and the province is only financially able to act within the framework of the National Housing Act. But here we are asking to be able to get loans under this section and it will give us a chance to have a more vigorous housing programme.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that the suggestions made in this resolution are both practical and possible, and that we have to have something like this before there is any hope of meeting the housing needs of the people of Canada. We are not asking for anything radical, and when you consider what is being done in other countries you realize how modest these requests are. In the United States, this year, President Eisenhower (and I have his statement right here) is asking for authority to build a million homes with a special emphasis on the lower and middle income groups; and he is asking — now listen to what he is asking — homes up to \$8,000, 40-year mortgages and down-payments of as low as \$200. So what we are asking is really not enough.

I am sure that the measures proposed in this resolution, as I said before, are the only hope of getting any assistance for the people who most need assistance in the matter of housing, and I would like to remind the members of the Assembly that material prosperity, scientific achievements, easy living — none of these things are any measure of real progress in a country unless, along with this, can go stable, happy, healthy, decent homes.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move this resolution, seconded by the hon. member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer), and it is my hope that every member of this Assembly will support this resolution.

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, in seconding this motion, first of all I want to congratulate the mover on the very able manner in which she has presented her motion. She stated in conclusion that her motion and request were both practical and positive, and I heartily agree with her.

To sum up, her speech indicated that, first of all, our present housing situation resulted in family trouble, lower health standards and the denial of a full life to many sections of our population. She pointed out that low-cost housing was being accepted and developed in many other countries successfully, and for the benefit of all of the people. She also pointed out that 80 per cent of Canadians today, Canadian wage-earners, are not eligible under our present National Housing Act, under our present standards, regardless of the fact that they have been lowered to 10 per cent of the initial cost. The regulation that they must have a certain standard of income still has a bearing on whether or not that loan is going to be made; so we are not covering the group of people who need housing the most.

She also pointed out that our national policy today is protection for the loan companies and not for the individual. Further, that a \$5,000 saving could be made through a low interest rate of 2 per cent, which would save the average home builder \$5,000 over a period of years; and \$5,000 Mr. Speaker, could do a lot in the average family and in the average home. \$5,000 could probably go a long way to seeing that each one of the average family got a good education, was able to take those final steps to get to the top rung of the ladder and provide for themselves a niche in society and probably be able to make a better contribution to our society.

Thinking of that saving, thinking of the opportunities that we have today to provide better housing for our people in those low-income groups, one cannot but think of the terrific opportunity that was missed just a few short years ago. I can remember those times well, back in the 'thirties, when we had people crying for work, crying for some system of public works that would have given them some opportunity to have work and wages. The opportunity was missed then to build something for posterity, not only in houses, but in schools, hospitals and every other public facility. We missed the boat then. Let us not miss it again, Mr. Speaker. There are so many things we can do.

We hear a lot of talk today about recession. Recession is a funny word. Someone said not so long ago that the difference between a recession and a depression is that it is a recession when the other fellow loses his job, it is a depression when you lose your own. And there is a depression coming, apparently, for quite a few people before very long.

This programme that has been outlined is only one small step in providing something better, providing something constructive, for all of the people of Canada. Let us approach this thing with a little vision, a little foresight, this time, If we are not going to have this false prosperity that we are enjoying continue, then let us introduce something stable to take its place, so that in future we will not be condemned, as we have been in the past, for blindness. Future generations will be able to say the governments of that day had real foresight in trying to build something for future generations; and housing is one of the initial steps.

March 18, 1954

We had the situation at the outset of the last great war where thousands of the young men and young women applying for military service were not physically fit, due to the very conditions that this resolution is trying to eliminate: the low health standards that are brought about by poor housing standards, and the low moral standards that are result from that type of living. There is so much that could be said about this, I shall not labour the point. The mover has covered her subject adequately, and I take pleasure in seconding it with the hope the decision here will be unanimous.

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

(Debate adjourned)

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENTS

The House resumed from 25th February, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Heming re Sections 365 and 372 of Bill respecting the Criminal Law.

Hon. H.C. Dunfield (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, I shall not be long. In rising to speak to this motion, I shall be presenting to only my own views but those of a great many people in the constituency of Meadow Lake who have expressed similar views on this question. I wish to say that my colleagues are not in any way bound to agree with me. They are quite able to arrive at their own decisions.

The motion in question deals with proposed amendments to the Criminal Code of Canada now under consideration in the House of Commons. These proposed amendments, as I understand them, are designed to set up certain safeguards against possible action by various groups, including unions, that might jeopardize the public welfare or the national safety.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the principles of unionism as originally defined are sound, and constituted one of the greatest constructive forces in human relations among the English-speaking peoples of the world. Many years ago, the first charter or bill of right for labour was enacted by a British parliament, and it was enacted in the face of the concentrated effort of British vested interests, interests who were then and had for generations exploited labour to the very limit of human endurance. This first bill of rights or charter was made possible because of the sympathy of the British public, who have long been recognized as being the outstanding nation of the world who believe in human equity and in justice. These industrialists saw in this first charter a great menace to their special privileges and, though they dared not flout the law of the land backed by such strong public opinion, they thought they could eliminate it. They took these young unions into court, and kept them there until their resources were exhausted. It made no difference what the pretext was, valid or otherwise; they kept them in litigation until they were bankrupt.

Once again the unions appealed to their government and again supported by public opinion, they were instrumental in having legislation

enacted that gave them complete freedom from court action. It was a most remarkable thing that any group of people could receive protection from the courts for their actions, and I believe that the underlying thought behind that was that these unions would have that protection until they had grown sufficiently in strength and power to stand on their own feet.

I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that, in receiving that protection by law, the unions took upon themselves a great moral responsibility that their demands would be not only in the interests of labour but in the interest of the public welfare and most assuredly within the law of the land. As long as the final authority for decisions remained with the body of the union that responsibility was on it. A great concept like unionism could not be kept entirely within the boundaries of the British Isles, however, and in due course it came to this side of the ocean, first in the United States and then in Canada. It became apparent within a few years that that sense of responsibility towards the public was not held in as high esteem on this side of the water, for of late years a great deal of evidence has accumulated that this authority of action in some of our unions no longer rests with the rank and file but has been delegated to a few leaders and some of their lieutenants. It has become quite apparent, also, that some of these leaders have no sense of responsibility towards the public at all, and quite often no sense of responsibility towards the long-term good of the members of their own union.

When prohibition ended in the United States a great many gangsters lost their most lucrative source of income and, in looking round for a replacement, they soon saw within the unions there they could find an income and power beyond their wildest dreams. They ‘muscle’ in and took over by any means, fair or foul. It was then that the day of lawlessness in unions was launched. I do not think this lawlessness that has become apparent is attributable in any way to that great body of men and women who constitute the bulk of the membership of the unions, but nevertheless they must be held responsible for that lawlessness.

I would like to read a quotation by John L. Lewis, who by no stretch of the imagination can be said to be a particular friend of the employer; but after 50 years or more of union leadership he has learned some truths the hard way. In speaking to 1500 leaders of industry and labour in New York, last year, he said this: “There is a continuing necessity of doing everything possible to increase the man-day daily output of coal”

And where I use the word ‘coal’, ‘product’ can be used for any industry . . .

There can be no increase in the miners’ standard of living except as we increase production and curtail practices and rules that do nothing but add to the price of coal. Labour as a whole in this country must become increasingly conscious of the fact that investors in industry are entitled to a return in the American way upon their investment.

And may I read another section, “Unions and the Law”. It is of no particular concern from what it is taken, nor who said it because it is a self-evident truth:

March 18, 1954

Breaches of the law by pickets during strikes are increasing at such a rate that further legislative protection cannot long be delayed. It is an offence for anybody in any circumstance to use force or the threat of force against his fellow citizens. In fact the renunciation of the use of force in settling disputes is an indispensable part of our democratic traditions.

And I think, Mr. Speaker, that that cannot be denied. I believe it is much in the public's mind today, that we must settle our differences — union differences, labour differences, or any other differences — in the courts of our land.

He goes on to give a number of instances of violence and disturbances that were entirely outside the law of the land, and he said this — I need not quote them because there are too many, and many of you have them in mind:

If the leaders of some trade unions continue to incite to violence and encourage breach of laws, and if nothing is done to restrain this transgression, other interests will have to follow suit and the result will be a kind of civil war, which the Communists wish to see as a preliminary to the final eviction of freedom. The solution is obvious; unions must be made as responsible for their actions as any other organization in society.

To bear that out, Mr. Speaker, a little less than three years ago, there was a convention in Saskatoon of the Liberal Party. I attended that convention three days in advance...

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask what the hon. member is quoting from?

Mr. Dunfield: — I am quoting — as I said, it makes no difference. I know you will not agree with this. This is entitled "The Outlook", a paper that is widely dispersed in the interests of free enterprise; it is a free enterprise paper, as I say, of self-evident truth.

Some less than three years ago there was a Liberal convention in Saskatoon. I attended that three days in advance on the resolutions committee, and I was very much surprised to not at that time that from all over this province of ours came resolutions from various groups, Liberal associations widely scattered, almost in the words quoted here that Labour must become responsible for its actions.

Mr. Lopston: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dunfield: — And that, again, I believe is a growing sentiment today. Now, unionism was founded because of the public opinion and the belief of the people in justice, and it grew mightily under this complete protection from court action; grew, as I say, in numbers, wealth and in power. But that protection from court action has, in late years on many occasions where leaders of unions have become irresponsible, led to the direct opposite of what it was intended for, and the pendulum of labour relations

has made the complete circle, or has swung from the one side, exploitation of labour by industry, to exploitation of the public and of union members by irresponsible leaders.

I feel sure, Mr. Speaker, that it is in the interest of all of us that unionism remain strong, but that it will remain within the law of the land. For he would be a stupid person indeed who would deny the axiom that we all should have an increasing standard of living — those employed and those self-employed and all. If we are to consume the vast products of our factories and mills today, there must be an increasing standard of living for all. I believe that that standard will be attained most quickly if this strife that has beset our unions is confined to the courts, and that all our troubles are adjudicated by those who are in a proper position to judge. I feel sure that in connection with this question today being discussed in the House of Commons at Ottawa, the Government has consulted the best legal brains that we have; probably they have consulted with the able union leaders of our country; and that, whatever the solution may be, I myself feel satisfied that it will be in the interests of all the people of Canada and in the long-term interests of labour.

I cannot support the motion.

Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to debate this resolution, I want first of all to say something about the inherent rights of labour as they have come to be recognized in all democratic countries. I want to say something about the effect which is this new proposed Criminal Code will have upon those rights and then I want to say what, in my opinion, are the probable results of this policy of the Federal Government in this matter.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, the well-known rights of labour have originated and have come to be firmly established mainly in recent years. It is only 40 or 50 years ago, 60 years at most, when it was regarded to be akin to sedition and treason for workmen to discuss together the possibility of strike action to attain what they considered fair treatment from their employer. At the time that the British North America Act was passed in 1867, labour and labour relations were not regarded as a special field of jurisdiction, and they were not specifically mentioned in either of the two sections which allocated the jurisdiction between the dominion and the provincial governments. Accordingly, labour and labour matters came to be regarded as a part of the field of property and civil rights which was allocated by section 92 to the provinces of Canada for control for legal enactment. Section 92 thereby gave to the provinces the exclusive jurisdiction in matters pertaining to labour, except in those cases where labour was — where the problem was — specifically referred to in Section 91 — Section 91 being the section defining the federal jurisdiction. For example, banking and currency was specifically alluded to in section 91 and that, of course, means that labour problems in banks are under federal jurisdiction. Railways, being a matter specifically referred to the federal authority, also included labour relations insofar as railways were concerned. But this great residue of jurisdiction in matters of labour still rests with the provincial governments of Canada.

Another important exception was created and that is the exception contained in the Criminal law, because section 91 giving the federal government its jurisdictions, specifically gave to them power to pass criminal

March 18, 1954

enactments, and if the federal government sees fit to include labour matters under the heading of criminal law, then so far as those matters are regarded to be criminal they are under federal jurisdiction.

So, basically labour and labour relations are a provincial problem. As I said a moment ago, the rights of labour have come to be recognized as an inherent part of our democratic system only within the last five or six decades. In the old days of the Gladstone Liberal era political thinkers chose to regard the economic system as a conglomeration of equal, free economic units in society. They chose to put labour, the individual workingman, on an equal footing with capital, the employer. They said that freedom, free enterprise, that the laissez-faire philosophy of Liberalism would eventually equate the rights of those two economic groups.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that subsequent history has demonstrated the fallacy of that kind of economic thinking. It is possibly true that if no employer was able to employ more than one employee and if every worker had his own private employers, possibly genuine equality could exist between employer and worker. But that situation went out with the Industrial Revolution. In an industrial society you have great preponderance of power in the hands of the employer of large numbers of factory labour. No kind of equality can exist so long as the workers are compelled to bargain individually for their employment and for their wages. And so, a result of that condition was the recognition of union rights; the recognition of the rights of the worker to bargain collectively. I submit that if you are to have any kind of equal footing between employer and employee, when the employer speaks with one voice, the employee must speak with one voice and the employee, the workingman, can speak with one voice only by his duly accredited union.

For us to talk about curtailing the rights of unions is, in effect, to hand over to employers and to industry in general *carte blanche* in the economic field. We believe it one of the essential cornerstones of democracy in this day of collectivism, whether it is collectivism of government or of business or of capital, that you cannot have genuine democracy unless you recognize the right of consumers to form co-operatives, employed workers to form unions, farmers to form producers' associations. The machinery by which they do those things are an essential part of our constitutional democracy.

So, when we see anybody, whether it is Hitler or Huey Long or McCarthy or the Liberal government at Ottawa, trying to interfere with or prejudice the rights of unions to bargain for their members, to bargain on equal terms with capital, you are undermining our democracy.

I say the Bill No. 7, as it is now before the Canadian House of Commons, given first reading on November 16, 1953, represents an extension of the Criminal Law of Canada. It represents new criminal law in this country, and insofar as it is new, insofar as it is an extension of the criminal law of Canada, it is by that much an invasion upon the jurisdiction of the provinces to regulate and manage affairs of labour relations. I suggest that we should examine these two sections 365 and 372 and see just how far they go in extending the criminal law of this country, see just how far they go in infringing the jurisdiction of the provinces to legislate in matters concerning labour and civil rights.

Before examining these two sections in detail, I would like to point out that the Criminal Code, as we have it in Canada, consisting of some 1100

sections, was the result of a Royal Commission which sat in England in the 1870's. The Royal Commission was delegated the responsibility of codifying the Common Law of England so far as it affected crime, and that codification was submitted to the British House of Commons, the British Parliament, and was never enacted by that parliament; it was never adopted by the Imperial parliament. It was, however, adopted in Canada in 1892 and to anyone — my hon. friend from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly) I am sure will agree, and anyone who has gone through the present Criminal Code will agree, it has become a hodgepodge of amendments, repeals and new sections. Undoubtedly, it required consolidation. It has never been consolidated from the time it was first passed in 1892 to the present. Undoubtedly it required consolidation. And Bill No. 7, to which I have referred, purports to be a consolidation of the Criminal Code. It purports to be no major change in the criminal law of Canada. It has been represented by Mr. Garson, speaking on May 13th of last year, that this draft Bill did not involve any change in the criminal law of Canada. He says and I quote: "The purpose of the revision was not to effect changes in broad principles, but to evolve as simple a code as possible."

Now let us see how these two sections accomplish the job of simplifying the criminal law affecting labour. First of all, these two sections have one thing in common; besides being very long, they are divided into two portions. The first portion of each section deals with the crime, with the offence, and the second portion of each section is the 'saving clause', and the saving clause is approximately similar in both sections. Perhaps I can best illustrate what I mean by saying that these two sections are something like a fishnet set out to catch unwary fish who transgress the legal principles contained in them. But then there is the saving clause which, I suppose, is like the holes in the fishnet that allow the little fish to escape. These saving clauses, as I say, are similar in both sections. I propose to read you out of section 365, the saving clause as follows:

No person who wilfully breaks a contract within the meaning of sub-section 1, by reason only that (a) being the employee of an employer he stops work as a result of the failure of his employer and himself to agree upon any matter relating to his employment.

Note that. He is not in transgression is he stops work be reason of the failure of himself and his employer to come to an agreement. Ah, but! if he stops work because the man at the next bench has not been able to come to an agreement with the employer, he does not come within this saving clause. Only if he himself stops work because of his inability to reach an agreement with his employer does he come within this savings clause.

Or, being a member of an organization of employees formed for the purpose of regulating relations between employers and employees, he stops work as the result of the failure of the employer and the bargaining agent, acting on behalf of the organization, to agree upon any matter relating to the employment of members of the organization.

March 18, 1954

Sympathy strikes are absolutely excluded from the saving clause.

None of these savings clauses have any benefit to the workingman unless he can establish as follows: “That before the stoppage of work occurs all steps provided by law have been taken through negotiation, collective bargaining, conciliation, and arbitration.”

What does that mean? He cannot get the benefit of this saving clause unless he can show that all steps have been taken. I suppose, if his agreement calls for arbitration, which is usually the final step in avoiding a labour dispute (but it says nothing about conciliation), and he has exhausted the field of arbitration, his employer has refused to arbitrate, then he has got to show that he has exhausted also the field of negotiation, collective bargaining and conciliation. In other words, these methods of avoiding a labour dispute, which are usually regarded as alternative methods of attacking the problem, must be treated as successive methods of avoiding a dispute. In other words, he is denied the saving benefit of the section unless he can show that all steps provided by law — not required by law, but provided by law — available have been duly taken.

That, I submit, is cutting down the saving clause to where it practically does not exist at all for all practical purposes.

Then, what do the sections propose to penalize you for? You know, there is the danger, when we read a section in a criminal enactment, that we come to a sort of a hazy, general idea of what that section aims at; and because there are some very terrible and very dastardly things put in a section, we come to the conclusion that unless you have been a very great moral delinquent, you cannot possibly come within that section. But, remember this, as I read these clauses: you only have to qualify on the least of these clauses in order to be guilty of the offence. You don't have to qualify under all of them; under the least of them. So I would ask that you bear that fact in mind, Mr. Speaker, as I read section 365 to the House:

Everyone who wilfully breaks a contract knowing, or having reason to believe, the probable consequences of doing so, whether alone or in combination with others, will be (a) to endanger human life.

Well, nobody is going to quarrel very much about that: if a person wilfully breaks a contract knowing or having reasonable cause to believe that it may endanger human life, “or (b) to cause serious bodily injury”

Nobody is going to say very much about that. Nobody is going to complain if someone is prosecuted for wilfully breaking a contract that endangers human life. That has always been in the code. Or to cause serious bodily injury — that has always been in the code. But look at (c) — here's the ‘gimmick’ that has been put in; this is new: “(c) To expose valuable property, real or personal to destruction or serious injury.”

Mr. Lopston: — They could destroy . . .

Mr. Walker: — Therefore, nobody has ever gone on strike in this country if it was not for the purpose of exposing valuable property to injury. I submit, Mr. Speaker, if the only time when you can go on strike is when it is not going to do anybody any harm . . .

Mr. Lopston: — Won't hurt them.

Mr. Walker: — . . . then the weapon of strike is completely nullified.

Mr. Lopston: — It's all right for them to destroy property, eh?

Mr. Walker: — No, I am not condoning the destruction of property; but that is not what this section says. This section is not a penalty on people who destroy property. It is people who go out on strike, with the result that property may be destroyed.

Mr. Lopston: — Same thing.

Mr. Walker: — For example, if a carload of meat spoils in Quebec because of a strike which took place in Saskatchewan, whether the strikers anticipated that or not, is entirely irrelevant. No strike ever took place unless it was intended to expose valuable property to possible injury. So I think that, when the government of Canada put that section in there, they were putting it in with clauses which undoubtedly have a connotation of very serious significance to most people. And they put it in there hoping that it would escape notice, and with it in there, of course, they can invoke section 365 against practically any strike in Canada and you cannot get out under the saving clause unless you have conciliated and bargained and arbitrated and negotiated, and unless you, yourself, are one of the people whose contract for employment has failed to be renewed. And of course, you understand that in a single plant there may be half-a-dozen or more contracts of employment. There may be a collective agreement between the management and one small group of workers in that plant that has not been renewed. Only that little group of two or three can possibly come within this saving clause. And the fellow workers in the same plant could be prosecuted for going on strike because they are exposing valuable property to the risk of injury. So, I say that this section 365 represents a serious and unwarranted extension of a principle which was long established in the old criminal code.

Section 372, which is also mentioned in this resolution, has a similar saving clause. Oh! I may just say one more thing about section 365. Section 365 provided for a penalty that it was an indictable offence and a person convicted was liable to imprisonment for three months or to a fine up to \$100. The new section says that a person infringing it is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for five years, which is a pretty serious matter. Besides enlarging the size of the mouth of the fishnet, they have made it a much more serious penalty if you happen to get into it.

Section 372 also has similar sinister amendments. I will not read the saving clause again; it is almost the same as in section 365. But 372 says:

“Everyone who commits mischief” —

March 18, 1954

‘Mischief’ is unknown to the English law. ‘Mischief’ is a statutory offence created by the Criminal Code and known in Canada, but unknown in the Old Country — “Everyone who commits mischief, who wilfully aids, destroys or damages property”

Now, that answers my hon. friend. That has always been in there. It is still in the proposed section: “Everyone who commits mischief who wilfully aids, destroys or damages property or (b) renders property dangerous, useless, inoperative or ineffective.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, how can anyone go on strike without rendering property inoperative? It used to be that there was a very similar section in the old code, but it applied only to that kind of property which was used for fire-fighting or preventing fires, or the kind of property which had to do with safety in mines and so on. It always was law under the Criminal Code that anyone who rendered property essential for the preservation of life inoperative was guilty of the offence of mischief. But now, those important qualifications have been deleted. Now, you are committing mischief if you just merely render property inoperative or ineffective or useless or dangerous. And then Section (c) of ‘mischief’: “(c) Anyone who obstructs, interrupts or interferes with the lawful use, enjoyment or operation of property.”

That again only applied in the old code to certain vital services such as telegraph lines and so on. Now it applies to all property. Everyone who obstructs — a picket line now is obviously coming within clause (c); and these picketers are guilty of obstructing, interrupting or interfering with the lawful use, enjoyment or operation of property. And clause (d) is also new. Anyone commits a mischief — “(d) who wilfully obstructs, interrupts or interferes with any person in the lawful use, enjoyment or operation of property.”

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the justification for putting in these new clauses is only to be found in a secret and sinister desire to enact criminal law which can be used in the curtailment of the rights of labour.

Of course there are other clauses in both these sections which represent no change from the existing law and which I will not weary the House with reading. You will, of course, have seen in the reading of these sections that the union official does not come within any of the saving clauses, and can be convicted very readily if he takes part in any kind of strike. You will, of course, readily see that this represents a very serious breach in the rights of those workers in unskilled employment, where they have not a long tradition of active union organization membership behind them, where they have to depend on the assistance and leadership of union officials. They are now robbed of their leadership.

If we are in any way to interfere with the rights of labour to strike, we are taking away a right which has long been prized. Ever since the death of feudalism a man has legally been able to call his soul his own. He has legally been able to refuse to give the produce of his hands. He has legally been able to refuse employment. Unless workers can collectively do those things which they can legally do individually, then you are saying to the union that, when the 'chips are down' you can't do anything, boys!

You are saying to the union that you can go on talking to management and pleading with management, but you haven't got anything in the final resort by which you can enforce your requests or your demands. You are saying to them very much as you would be saying to a political party, "you may organize and you may petition the Legislature; you may petition the members of the Legislature; but you can't vote." How much use would it be? How much use are our political rights unless they reach the final, important step of casting our franchise? How much use are the rights of labour unless those rights ensure to labour the right to refuse to work under conditions which are obnoxious or intolerable?

So any infringement upon this right is a weakening of the position of all organized labour. I want to say this. There is a public feeling that strikes are costly to a community; that strikes are a wasteful inefficient method of settling disputes. Mr. Speaker, nobody needs to tell labour that. If there is anybody who knows that it is the working people. They are the people who lose, and for every dime that the community loses labour loses in the health and shelter and welfare of its own families, so that it does not lie in the province of the public to tell labour that the weapon on the strike is a wasteful, costly means of solving disputes. Labour knows it and, by and large, we all have to concede that the right to strike is something that is used by labour only as a last resort. The right to strike has probably settled a thousand disputes without a strike for every one that has had to go to a strike. The very knowledge that there reposed in the hands of labour is that final right has very often undoubtedly been the cause of harmony between labour and management. A right which is inherent does not have to be exercised to be of inestimable value.

You may say "what can be done in the case of emergency?" Obviously, I think that these new sections of the Criminal Code were passed because for some reason capital is fearful; big capital employers are frightened. What are they frightened of, I know not. They surely must have a clearer insight into the future than is given to most of us. But they obviously are frightened, and this kind of repressive measure is the desperate tactic of a frightened man who fears that he is going to lose something that he is not entitled to. Surely we have managed in Canada very well ever since 1892 when the Criminal Code was first enacted with those sections without these new clauses. Surely no one can say that labour has been flouting the general good of the community. Surely no one can say that the fabric of our economy has been undermined by irresponsible activities of labour in the main. Surely these new sections must be designed for something. Can it be that our fears of an invasion of McCarthyism into this country are warranted? Can it be that we are about to enter into a repressive regime of Tory government in this country? Because legislation of that kind has no place in a free democratic community and, in the event of emergencies, in the event of dire necessity, I suggest that the Canadian government ought to take a leaf out of the enactments of Great Britain in this matter.

March 18, 1954

In 1920, the British government sought to cope with emergency conditions by passing its Emergency Powers Act which is still in effect. The Emergency Powers Act provides that:

If at any time it appears to His Majesty that any action has been taken or is immediately threatened by any person or body of persons of such a nature on so extensive a scale as to be calculated by interfering with the supply and distribution of food, water, fuel, or light, or with the means of locomotion, to deprive the community, or any substantial portion of the community of the essentials of life, His Majesty may, by proclamation, declare that a state of emergency exists.

When that has been done certain emergency regulations go into effect.

His Majesty may by order-in-council either proclaim that the industry shall carry on pending arbitration, or pending a decision by the Cabinet, on an adjudication by the cabinet of the rights of the parties, or a solution in some other peaceable way. The very fact that that legislation has been on the statute books has been of inestimable value in labour relations in the Old Country. It has only has to be invoked four times in its 32-year history, and only twice was it necessary for His Majesty-in-Council to issue orders under the Act. The other two times, as soon as it was invoked the parties immediately got together and settled their problems. And in every one of those four cases, no interruption of work took place.

I suggest that the advantage of proceeding in that manner would be that you would clearly localize the restrictions which you seek to impose to those industries which are vital and important to the national economy, and to those occasions when the economy is gravely threatened either by outside dangers or dangers from within. But it would not have universal and general application.

My objection to proceeding by the method of incorporating it into the Code are several. In the first place, putting it into the Code you describe the offence in very short terms and you don't anticipate all the cases which might come within that section.

I am sure that Mr. Garson, or any member of the House of Commons, does not envisage all the possible variations of events which might be fitted-in to one or other of these sections and, of course, as soon as you do that, as soon as you define the offence in the Criminal Code, you open the door to anybody who wishes to lay a charge for prosecution under that section. By doing that you are taking the highly complex problem of labour relations and you are putting it under the baton of the policeman, and at the disposition of the informer and the labour spy.

Labour relations are a matter which cannot be dealt with by Justices of the Peace and labour informers. Labour matters are matters which should be left, where they were originally assigned in the British North America Act, to the provinces under the section dealing with property and civil rights. Every province has set up elaborate complex machinery

to adjudicate in a fair manner the problems of labour, and this proposes to take a highly important segment of labour relations, as I say, and put it into the pocket of the policeman.

Premier Douglas: — In the criminal courts.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — It should be remembered that once it is enacted in the Criminal Code it isn't left for the Attorney General to decide whether a prosecution shall be made; it isn't left for the Minister of Justice to decide. I am sorry that the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) isn't in his seat; but he apparently isn't aware of the fact that criminal proceedings can only be taken when somebody lays an information, when somebody swears out a complaint. He apparently isn't aware of the fact that the person who swears out the complaint has got to believe in the truth of the complaint. I remember he was asking the Attorney-General here, why he didn't prosecute. Well, I suggest that someone who believes in the truth of the complaint should swear out a complaint. That is the only way that criminal matters can be initiated. What you are doing here is leaving the Act open, leaving the penalties in the Act open, to any person who wants to swear out an information and complaint in these matters.

Mr. Speaker, I do not complain about this as a member of a trade union, or as a worker in particular. I complain about this as a citizen because I feel, as a citizen, very strongly that, unless each and every one of us defend and protect the civil rights of our neighbours, we are in dire danger of losing our own. None of us can stand idly by and see the common right of citizenship denied to our neighbour. If we do, then we have no footing to stand upon when our own are taken away. So, I join with those who moved this motion and seconded it, in deploring the tendency, the trend, that is apparent in these two sections and in other sections of the proposed new code, the trend to diminish, to eat away, civil rights and civil liberties that have come to be regarded by all citizens as sacred. I say the Canadian government is to be censured for having seen fit to so lightly whittle away these civil rights, these civil liberties.

Mr. Garson has never yet acknowledged that the proposed new sections of the code represent a new invasion upon the rights of anybody. He still persists in the argument that all he is doing is tidying up the loose ends of the Criminal Code, and I think that gentlemen opposite, if they are true to the principles which they profess to espouse, if they are true to the principles of Liberalism, will join with us in protesting against this enactment. I think that the real test of the Liberals in this province will come when we find out whether they are prepared to stand on the side of the humble, on the side of the workingman, whether they are prepared to stand on the side of civil and individual rights and liberty, or whether they are prepared to go along with the McCarthys in this issue.

Mr. McDonald: — Oh, nuts!

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they had better have a very good look at their past; they had better have a very good look at their forebears; they had better have a good look at the people who founded the principles of Liberalism upon which they profess to stand. And if they do that, I haven't any doubt but that they will come to the same conclusion that we have on this side — that any extensions of the

Criminal law in this matter of labour relations ought to be looked at very scrupulously and that these particular extensions ought to be rejected. I shall certainly support the motion.

Mr. Robert Kohaly (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, I should like, first, of all, to inform you that actually I will not speak more than two or three minutes by the clock on this matter. I do that advisedly, because I realize that very few people like to listen to two lawyers in any one day talking about the same subject, and especially if they follow each other and especially if they are talking about law.

However, my learned friend has indicated his intention to support the resolution, a position which I have felt I would like to take on this resolution for some considerable time. However, my friend from Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield) has indicated in general that he feels the situation is well in hand, and I must somehow or other distinguish myself from the reasons given by the hon. member from Hanley. I agree with many of them, and he has given a very good review of the situation; but there are one or two instances on which I differ and I wish to place those on the record.

In the first place, I don't think there is any necessity for us to debate the question as to whether or not the Federal Government has the authority to accept it. They have long been accepting many things which are really not within their realm, by bringing them in through the criminal law, and they are in fact doing this. The only two clauses of Bill No. 7 (which is indeed a very hefty volume and one which we will see much more of in the years to come in our law offices), with which the resolution deals are clauses 365 and 372, and since this House, I submit, can do nothing but persuade the Federal Government to take some steps, we can do nothing but good by discussing it here. The matter, I understand is still in committee and possibly our persuasion, joined with others from other centres and sectors of the county, may have the effect on the Federal Government and on the committee that they will do something about it.

Now clauses 365 and 372 indeed do create new law. It is not merely amendment; it is definitely law, and as such cannot, of course, be put through as merely an amending or revising of the code, and it is, therefore, very worth while if we look at it carefully. The new law that is involved, first of all, enlarges the types of activities, putting it generally, for which the employees may be penalized. It enlarges them most definitely — a very wide category; and it adds certain offences which were not previously there.

I agree generally with my friend from Meadow Lake that the unions are not now in need of any further protection; but I don't think the unions have so conducted themselves that they need any further prohibitions on them. The country is getting along well and fine as it is, and this step does add prohibitions on them, which are certainly not warranted.

Secondly, the proposed amendments eliminate old section 499. Most definitely that section had the effect of making certain breaches of contract by employers and corporations offences of a criminal nature. That now is being deleted, and I think that it was a good idea to have it in there. It acted as a deterrent to some people who might do something that they should not do, and it should be left in there.

The end result then, Mr. Speaker, is that there is an extension

of criminal provisions, that these extensions are directed directly against unions, that there is no need for such an extension of the criminal law, and it abridges the situation insofar as it concerned employers as it was working before and working very well.

I believe that I would like to join with the mover and the seconder and the other speakers in connection with this resolution as it presently is worded, to persuade, or attempt to persuade, Ottawa to delete 365 and put back Section 499; secondly, that they delete, or amend, section 372, which extends the provisions of the criminal law insofar as it concerns the employee. They should amend that, and leave in those provisions which were in there before. They were working fine. They were not hurting anyone. They were a good safeguard — but we don't need any more of them.

I think that, generally speaking, this motion is a good one. It is one of the few that I think we could deal with dealing with federal matters. It will do no harm; it may do some good. And if it does, I hope that this resolution has a great deal of strength and is heard by the proper people in Ottawa when it gets there.

Mr. Lopston: — Mr. Speaker, I differ with my hon. friend from Souris-Estevan. He apparently gave us to understand that there was no need for any revision of the labour law. Well, with the conduct of the unions during this last year in these strikes I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is some revision necessary, and I am going to oppose the motion.

Premier Douglas: — What strikes?

Mr. Lopston: — In the east — gold mine strikes; the city of Toronto.

Mr. D.H. R. Heming (Moose Jaw City) (Closing Debate): — Mr. Speaker, it often happens that a labour man has to resort to an appeal in order to put anything across when you are bargaining with employers who are sometimes hard. Here is a paragraph that Wendell Wilkie spoke some time ago:

Our way of living together in America is a very strong but delicate society. It is made up of many things. It has been moving over many centuries by the patience and sacrifice of countless liberty loving men and women. It serves as a government for the protection of the poor and rich, of black and white, of Jew and Gentile, of foreign and native born. Let us not tear it asunder, for no man knows, if it is destroyed, when and where a man will find his protective want again.

The question being put, it was agreed to on division 35 votes against 6.

March 18, 1954

8 o'clock p.m.

'BASIC ENGLISH' GROUP WELCOMED

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to the attention of members of the Legislature a fine group of people who are in the Speaker's Gallery tonight. They are the 'Basic English Group', and a great many of these are new citizens to Canada. I have had the privilege of meeting with some of them individually, and also met their group when they had a Christmas party, this year. Most of them have made remarkable progress in the study of the English language, and are very interested in the conduct of public debate. I am sure I am expressing the opinion of all the members who are here, that we are delighted to have them with us. We hope they will get some profit in their study of the English language from the debates that are carried on. I would like to express the hope that the members who are taking part in the debate, tonight, will speak loudly enough so that the students in this class can hear them. I also want to say how pleased we are that this group of new Canadians should be taking an interest in our democratic institutions and we hope that, from time to time, they will come back and listen to the debates again.

FINANCIAL AID TO YOUNG FARMERS

The House resumed, from 4th March, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Swallow respecting establishment of loaning agency to assist young farmers.

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, I noted the remarks of the Premier as to how this Basic English group is here to get more knowledge about English. I don't think they will get it from me — the way I can drop my 'h's and put them on where they shouldn't be. I hope the students won't take that too seriously, and will just realize that that is the English way of doing things.

This motion, Mr. Speaker, is one to which, I believe, each and every one of us should give some serious consideration and thought. I believe it is something the Government of Canada could do which would considerably help our agricultural people. We have seen in this country the development which has taken place, this last 50 years with pioneers starting out on homesteads or trying to buy land, and all too often they spend a lifetime of hard work, they work and toil, for few of the comforts of life. We find that, when they have finally got their land broken, and have a few buildings so that they are reasonably comfortable in their surrounding, their health will no longer permit them to take advantage of the facilities which they had created, which consequently were no longer of any use to them. We have seen many a person start on farms, starting the hard way. There was no way of getting a long-term, low-interest-rate credit, and they suffered very greatly. Their families did not have a chance to be raised in decent comfort, with a decent standard of living. I feel that the Government of Canada, the government which is responsible for our export markets and the prices of agriculture, have it in the palm of their hand as to the destiny of agriculture not only of this province but of the whole of Canada. I feel that Government should do something for the agricultural people.

I feel, too, that this is a federal problem because agriculture is not confined to the boundaries of Saskatchewan. Agriculture is carried on in every province in this Dominion. While it is true that Saskatchewan is the most predominantly agricultural province of any of the Canadian provinces, agriculture does affect those other provinces. Any policy which is laid down by a Federal Government could be applicable in every province of Canada, not just in Saskatchewan; and it is true that no provincial government has the jurisdiction over the trade and commerce of their province to the extent that they can hope to control the destiny of agriculture.

We have set up, at the present time, such agencies as the Farm Loan Board of the Federal Government. That could be extended if they wanted to do so; or it could be done through new agencies. I do not thin it is necessary to have new agencies; it could be done from the existing one. And if they are going to make the money available on a federal scheme, where you can go through the banks, they ought also to include lending institutions which could take part in a scheme. They ought to include the Credit Unions and Credit Societies because those, today, are playing a great part in helping agriculture. It is true that they can only play a limited part; but with a scheme laid down whereby long-term low finance could be advanced to farmers, it would be of benefit to the whole of the nation. When we have to consider that we are living in a world, today, of millions of people who never know what it is to go to bed at night with a full stomach, then it is important that agriculture should be promoted to the fullest extent.

While it is true that we have a surplus in this country, worldwide there is definitely a scarcity; and as a nation of the world we should have some responsibility to other nation of the world. We cannot live by ourselves alone; and while we have surpluses here, we should do what we can to make those products available to other countries.

When it comes to production, it is true that e have had greater production this past few years than we have had in the past, but we have not begun to scratch the surface of the amount of production that Canada can produce if agriculture has a chance. In order for agriculture to have that chance, then agriculture must have the means whereby they can start to do things right. A young farmer, today, who wishes to start farming, unless he is in a position where his parents can help him out, is utterly up against it to be able to go out and buy an equitable farm unit so that he can start farming. Even if he is able to buy the land, can make arrangements to buy the land on time, he still has to buy equipment to work that land with, and I think the mover of this motion (Mr. Swallow), having had the experiences he has had through being an implement dealer, realizes more than anyone else, or equally as much as anyone else, the hard times to which the young farmers are put to try and buy their agricultural equipment. Admitting that after a while he does get his agricultural equipment, he still lacks the means whereby he can become a diversified farmer.

Most of the land in this province is not suited for straight grain economy. A big portion of the land in this province should be used for diversification. We should be keeping cattle, hogs, sheep or other lines of agricultural commodities. To do that takes a considerable amount of money to equip oneself and get foundation stock. It is appalling, when one goes through the length and breadth of this province, in places, and sees the type of stock that some of the settlers are keeping for foundation herds.

March 18, 1954

You see types of cattle, Mr. Speaker, that should never be used for any purpose whatsoever on a farm. They are not even milk cows, nor are they beef stock; the sires are very much of a scrub type. It isn't always the fault of the farmers who own that stock that they have not got better; they are not in a position to go out and buy the stock they need to improve their herds. So it is more necessary than ever, if we are agreeing to play a part in agriculture, which we should do, for some overall plan for agriculture to be worked out.

The Federal Government, as I have mentioned, having control of imports and exports of all commodities, could set a fiscal policy for agriculture, and they would run no risk whatsoever in a scheme of this kind, because they could set up a scheme whereby, as the products are marketed, they can get their money back over a long-term period. I am sure that the loss, if any, would be very slight.

Not so very long ago I was talking to one of the men who worked for the Farm Loan Board. He told me he was in charge of a goodly portion of the northern part of this province and had visited those districts from time to time. In fact, he told me he knew my particular area, knew a lot of my personal neighbours on farms close to where I live; and he said it was amazing the amount of money they had out with a low amount of bad debts. He said he did not think there was \$50,000, this last fall, out on the books that they considered bad debt. He said it was true that some had not been able, as yet, to make their last fall payments, but that was due to the fact they had not been able to market their grain; but the loans they had out in the districts where he had been working, that were a bad 'risk', were less than \$50,000. I don't know how many dollars'-worth of loans; I know from what he said that it would be less than 1 per cent of the money loaned out.

So, by and large, I feel that agriculture is a good place for investment. If we, as the nation of Canada, can give subsidies to gold mining – gold is a thing we cannot eat; we can't do anything with it except use it as a commodity for exchange or for ornaments – surely, we should be able to bring in some sort of a programme whereby we can help the basic economy of Canada. We could take the history of any country and we will find that where agriculture is prosperous, the nation is prosperous; where agriculture goes down, so goes a nation. Any nation which does not have an agricultural economy within its confines is a nation which is always hard up, and a nation which is never sure that poverty is not going to strike them the next day.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to speak to this motion. I hope that we get unanimous consent of the House, and I trust that the Federal authorities will give us some action on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker: — Is the House ready for the Question?

(Question put)

Mr. Lopston (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I don't think we should adjourn the debate; it has been adjourned once before.

Mr. Lopston: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I haven't the material here to speak to this motion now. I didn't expect it was going on tonight. I can go on with the next one, but I cannot speak to this one.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The vote has already been taken, and if the hon. member wished to speak he should have made his wish known before.

Mr. Lopston: — I didn't hear, Mr. Speaker.

Premier Douglas: — I would think, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member hasn't got his material here that we should agree to adjourn it, but I think three adjournments in a row on one resolution are quite a lot and I think we ought to try to go through with these motions and get them cleaned up.

Mr. Lopston: — I would have spoken to it tonight, but I wasn't expecting it.

Mr. Speaker: — The thing is in the hands of the Assembly.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — They voted against it.

Mr. Speaker: — I shall put the question again . . .

Some Honourable Member: — The question on the motion?

Mr. Lopston: — I think it is a most unusual thing, Mr. Speaker, if I have not the right to adjourn the debate and speak to it tomorrow, or even later on tonight. If you want me to go on with it tonight, I will go and get my material, but there are four more motions down here we could go on with, one of which is mind and I am prepared to go on with that.

Mr. Speaker: — You have put me in a dilemma. Is it agreed to allow the hon. member leave to adjourn the debate?

(Debate adjourned)

FULL CIVIL RIGHTS FOR INDIANS AND METIS

The House resumed, from 4th March, the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Berezowsky respecting a rehabilitation programme for Indians and Metis.

Mr. W. H. Wahl (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to continue this debate on a motion of the hon. member for Cumberland and seconded by the hon. member from Pelly, asking the Federal Government to give full Canadian rights to the Indians and also to assist the Provincial Government to finance a programme to rehabilitate the Metis people.

When I adjourned the debate I had stated that, after going over my constituency thoroughly, I decided that the Indian and Metis people were sadly underprivileged and that I must bring it to the attention of this Assembly, which I did on a previous occasion; but I am adding to that in this debate.

March 18, 1954

The hon. member from Melville (Mr. A.P. Brown) and myself, accompanied by our views, visited the homes of all the Metis people in the Qu'Appelle and Lebret area; and while we found that some of these people had been able to pull themselves up 'by their bootstraps', in the majority of cases they were living in houses or shacks with mud or dirt floors, and I am just going to describe one of these homes and then continue with a meeting that we had at this place.

When we visited this one home, we found a shack about 14 x 18, with a mud floor. There was a lady in there with 14 children. We noticed when we entered the shack that there were three babies in one basket. They looked to be all the same age and I asked the lady, "Did you by and chance have triplets?" She said, "No, two of these babies belong to my unmarried daughters." One of the ladies with us said, "Lady, you're in a rut."

After we had viewed these conditions we decided to call a meeting of the officials of Qu'Appelle, the village officials of Lebret and the municipal authorities, members of the clergy, some doctors and anyone else who was interested. We had that meeting at Lebret in the parish priest's house, and he told us at the time that he had very little hope of being able to do anything, or very little hope of any good coming of this meeting; but he said, "I am all for it, and I will do anything I can to assist you." We had a very congenial meeting, and out of that meeting came two suggestions. One was for stricter law enforcement in that area, which has been carried out; and the other was that the Department of Social Welfare engage a social worker to do work amongst these people.

We interviewed the Minister of Social Welfare and he was very co-operative; but he told us that he could not accede to our wish of having a social worker in this particular area; but that a certain Father Blanchard had been having great success in certain parts of this province with saving unions and co-operative efforts, to try and bring these people a better standard of living. He agreed to have Father Blanchard go to that area, which he has done with some success.

The reason I mention these Metis people is this. You notice the motion asks for financial assistance to the provinces to help with this problem; I consider that that is a very reasonable request because I do not believe that the finances of any province could possibly complete this job without considerable help.

The hon. member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield), who is a very competent member I am sure (he is not in his seat) but I am also sure he has quite a few blind spots, spoke in defence of the Department of Indian Affairs after I had spoken on the Throne Speech debate about these Indians. He seemed very anxious to justify the Department of Indian Affairs, and, as I said, I am sure he forgot to look around if he was ever on an Indian reserve. However, I am very grateful to him because his speech portrays what I want to tell this Assembly, and it is this. He quoted the Department of Indian Affairs, giving these figures: they built 1,176 houses at a cost of \$880,167. Now if he had been good at mental arithmetic he would have seen that this is \$749 per house, and, as I have stated before, they were wooden versions of the old mud house, only not so warm.

The hon. member from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) also is not here. I wanted to correct a statement he made, and this has relation to the Indians, too. He said that the members on this side of the House have been very eager to criticize our great neighbour to the south, the United States. Well, I would like to remind him that when I spoke I praised the United States, both the federal and state governments, for their treatment of the Indians. I stated that the Indians I had seen in Montana lived in modern homes, drove modern cars, and they had the money and the education to assimilate with the rest of the population in the States, something which is not true in Canada. They are social outcasts here because they are not economically able to compete with us socially.

He went on to say that, on this side of the House, we had never mentioned Russia and again, the reason I had not mentioned Russia when I was speaking about the Indians before was the fact that I did not want to embarrass the Federal Government. Nevertheless, I am going to mention it now. If you remember, a very popular picture magazine that has a wide circulation on the North American continent, had pictures of the farms in Russia and the farm homes and their surroundings, and I noticed that these surroundings were very drab. They were mud one-storey shacks, and the things that you would notice around them were old-fashioned carts and things of that nature, and the people in these pictures had a very depressed look on their faces; you could see that they were not entirely happy. They had some articles at the bottom of these pictures which I read very closely because I was quite interested at the time (this was some two years ago) and I noticed it said that these people were always in constant fear of being taken away to slave labour camps. If they happened to do anything that would displease the Russian government, they were apt to be taken there. And it said if they entered these slave labour camps they were given a number, and that when the food or the grain or whatever they produced, grain or cattle, was divided, it was done under the supervision of a police chief. At that time I did not think too much of that, I thought it might be propaganda; but I have heard since from Liberal politicians that it is a true state of affairs in Russia.

But when I went on the Indian Reserves I commenced to think of this, and I noticed the Indians lived in the same shacks, only worse, and their surroundings were not as good. They could not even compare with these houses in the dictatorship of Russia. There was another thing. I have stated that the Russian got a number when he went to the slave labour camp; but the Indians on our reserves here in Saskatchewan and Canada, also have a number. They are known to the Federal Government by a number and not by a name. When I first suspected this, I couldn't believe it, because I thought it was only in prisons and places of that kind where people were known by numbers, but I had . . .

Mr. Wooff: — What about the army? You get a number.

Mr. Wahl: — That is a different thing. But I had occasion to check this, and I found that it is absolutely correct: the Indian is known by a number.

I am going to compare life on the reserves of this country with the dictatorship in Russia and to me this is a very disgraceful situation. A dictatorship is one which imposes absolute authority; the Federal Government

imposes absolute authority on the Indians. Any meetings they have are controlled, and when they divide up their band money, there is a mounted policeman in attendance, just as in Russia one of the state police is in attendance at these particular meetings. The methods of imposing this power, I admit, differ slightly, but the end is the same – a low standard of living, and I would say that the standard of living of our Indians is much lower than even that of the people of the collective farms in Russia, if that is possible. They both maintain the status of these people by depriving them of free opportunities. That applies to our Indian population equally as well as it does to the peasants in Russia.

This to me is an appalling thing, and I cannot understand us as a free people condoning it. Mr. Warden, who I believe is director of Indian Affairs temporarily in the province of Saskatchewan, is a very decent chap. I had quite a conversation with him the other morning, and I can see that he is genuinely interested in trying to do something for the Indians. But I would say that he is not able to do anything because the people who are his ‘bosses’ will not allow him to do what he would like to do. Nevertheless, speaking at Yorkton the other night, he said that we should give the Indians education and not liquor. Well I want to remind him about any citizen – there is something fascinating about the things we cannot do, and that applies to the Indian. They are deprived of having the opportunities that we have, even though some of them are bad, and there is fascination about those things. It is just the same as if you have a child and you lock your jewellery or some box and say “you must not touch that.” That fascinates him, and he wants to see what is inside. It is exactly the same with the Indian.

I see the hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly) is in here. He made a statement that I wish he had not made so definitely. He stepped out a couple of paces and he said, “I stand for private enterprise.” Now if he had said, ‘with reservations’, I would have been very pleased; but nevertheless, I want to remind him that under successive Liberal and Conservative governments, private enterprise has private-enterprised the Indian out of everything he had – his country and his honour.

There is some hope, too. A lot of people say there is no hope of doing anything for these Indians, but I am going to give you an illustration. You take the members on this side of the House, I think they have been here ten years in June, and they have been preaching practical Socialism for ten years. And I add that word ‘practical’ because they are practical men and they have realized that in an economy such as ours we must have both; we must have both private enterprise and some practical Socialism. But the thing is, the hard-headed gentleman over there, the Leader of the Opposition, the other morning, said something that shows what you can do in ten years; he said, “I believe in practical socialism.” Now, you see, if you can make an impression like ...

Mr. Lopston: — It isn’t over there!

Mr. Wahl: — . . . that in ten years, what could you do for the Indians with an honest effort?

Mr. Lopston: — What did ten years of Socialism do for the Indians?

Mr. McDonald: — It socialized them.

Mr. Wahl: — I would say that I am very grateful to the press for the wide publicity they gave to the talk I gave on the Indians. It went on the front pages of quite a few of the papers across Canada, and I got some very favourable editorials in several very influential Liberal papers. It shows that all people in Canada are concerned about this problem. Now I am going to say to the press and the radio that I hope they will give the same favourable publicity to the mover and the seconder of this very important motion.

I am going to read you something here that has been said by an educated Indian, and this probably describes the hopeless conditions on the Indian reserves better than anything I could say.

“Too many of us just don’t care. WE have been conditioned to take what we get and not what we want any more. We have become used to the idea that there are no advantages, no opportunities for the Indians.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the motion.

Mr. R. H. Wooff (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I would very much like to identify myself with the motion that is before the House, this evening. I have had many years experience with our native population at fairly close hand, dealing with them and visiting their camps on various occasions, ever since I was a lad. And I would like very much to commend the mover and the seconder of this motion for bringing it before this Legislature, this evening.

I believe this is one of the burning questions of the day, even though it may not be one of the popular ones. And when the history of the treatment of our Indian people is written, I am afraid it will be one of the dark pages of our national administration of a people who are defenceless and who have been exploited by we who supplanted them. When I say that, I am not going out on a tirade blaming the government whose responsibility it has been to look after them for all this trouble. However, I would very much like to agree with the hon. member for Pelly (Mr. Feusi) in his criticism of some of our Indian agents. I maintain that some of them are not fit to be in authority over anyone, much less over as defenceless and helpless a people as our Indian population is at the present time.

I do not make that statement with regard to every Indian agent; I believe that some of them have entered upon their duties with a high sense of responsibility. It is a tremendous task for anyone to endeavour to guide our native people at the present time. One of the big reasons for that is that they have been gradually pushed back onto our reservations and they have been exploited by their brother white men. They have been placed in such restricted quarters that they have been forced to work for you and me in order to keep body and soul together. All too often they have had to resort to the same kind of business tactics that the white man has used in dealing with them in order to exist at all.

March 18, 1954

I have visited Indian camps ever since I was a boy. When we first went into the northwest – and again it is with some reluctance that I talk about pioneer days for fear that that reference, along with my frosty hair, might lead some people to an erroneous conclusion; nevertheless, in those days, Mr. Speaker, we never knew an Indian to beg at our doors. They came through the country; they set up their camps and they trapped, and you could go to their camps and they had articles for sale. You could buy your buckskin jacket or buckskin moccasins, your purse or your tobacco pouch, or what have you. In other words, they were in business, and they lived much better than they have lived for many years since we restricted their movement and crowded them onto the reservations.

Mr. Lopston: — And your Fur Marketing Service.

Mr. Wooff: — Then came the period when we didn't even allow them to trap, when the sons of homesteaders – and I was one of them – trapped the fur that the Indians had been making their livelihood from.

I know, too, that many of our white people suffered through the lean years of the depression, but I submit that God alone knows the suffering, the anguish, the heartache and the sickness that our native population went through in those years. It is very true that the last years have been much better for our native population. I believe they have been better dressed and better fed and have been more independent for a number of years than perhaps for the last 40 years; but we have an element of our own people that begrudge them that independence. How often have I heard some of my fellow farmers say that the only position to have the Indian population in is to keep them as a 'pool' of cheap labour that we can get when we want them and can fire when we don't need them.

It is equally true that while they have had a few better years, they will be the first to suffer if a recession sets in. I am afraid that they are feeling the pinch of the present agricultural recession, and if it deepens into a depression again their conditions will be intolerable. Oh, I know they will be fed enough to keep body and soul together; but it will be another period when there is no independence and no dignity, not even the right to go out and work to live, which can but retard the day of their complete and final emancipation.

I believe that complete emancipation is the only answer to the native problem today, and that is full citizenship; but I believe that it will have to be accomplished by stages. I fear, along with many Indians, the acceptance by them of the franchise; I think it will be made arbitrary upon the yielding of their treaty right, and I am very happy, Mr. Speaker, that the mover and seconder of this resolution have written into it a clause that safeguards the treaty rights of our native population.

Up to the present time they have had certain educational opportunities, after which they have been thrown out into a hostile world which has refused to accept them upon equal terms with ourselves; while, on the other hand, to some extent, they have been alienated from their own people.

It was my privilege to visit some of our native people along with the hon. member of the Federal House who is now sitting for the constituency of The Battlefords. That member is held in high esteem amongst our native

population because he has taken a great interest in our native people, and when the Indian Act was being revised he spent a lot of time gathering information that he might present to the Committee. We discussed some of these problems with the Indians and with some of the Indian agents who were very sympathetic to the Indian people. We will take, for instance, some of the young people who, for a period, live in the shelter of a residential school and are given an education to a certain standard and then they are thrown out again into a hostile world. And where has the Indian girl to go but back again to the camp from which she came? In many respects I think she is worse off than she was before she went to school, because she has missed the training of her own people that gave her any ability to cope with the rugged kind of life that we have forced upon them.

Under the present Indian Act it is possible for people who have never known any other home but the reserve to be forced off that reserve. I am not speaking from hearsay tonight, Mr. Speaker; I am speaking out of personal experience. Only a year ago this last fall, I know a family that was forced off the reserve through no fault of their own. They were forced off in the fall with no land, with no home and with no assistance from the Federal Government. They spent a good portion of last winter in a tent on the edge of the reserve then did the only thing they could do. They waited until the snow got deep and then quietly crawled back onto the reserve and into a shack to spend the remainder of the winter. This in Canada, Mr. Speaker, and only last winter!

It has been pointed out, and rightly so, I believe, that many of our young Indian chaps are able to go out and take employment in garages and so on; they are able to take their place and to do a job; but I think we should always remember that they are taking chances. Under section 25 of the revised Indian Act of 1951, any Indian who leaves the reserve forfeits any title to any land, or a share of any property, owned by the band. While these young fellows may be able to go out under conditions such as we have had for several years, and make good, I ask you what their position is going to be when times get tough again, with their bridges burned behind them. So, Mr. Speaker, I do not blame the Indians for being cautious about the extension of the franchise to their people, unless they have a very good guarantee of the continuance of treaty rights to go along with it. And I suggest that there must be some overall policy of rehabilitation, of education, of vocational guidance and of better health services, and finally, full citizenship extended to them.

I would also suggest that, if the Queen's Loyal Opposition have any influence with Federal authorities at all, in the name of decency they use it on behalf of our native population. I would also like to suggest that we, the general public, have a responsibility also, to press this matter continually, keep it before governments and before the public, and that in our own personal attitudes and business dealings and relationships with these people we set up an example of tolerance and fair play and of understanding.

The hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley outlined some of the conditions which exist in some of our native or Indian homes. Sometimes we have a tendency to laugh it off. These are condition that create a grave problem for our Department of Social Welfare and our Department of Health,

but I want to say that there is a group of white men that are to blame for much of the evil conditions that exist around our Indian reservations, today. We can't laugh it off; and we can't blame it on our native population entirely, because we, our own group, are largely responsible for the ruination of the Indian maiden the Indian womanhood.

I am happy, Mr. Speaker, that this motion has come before the Assembly; I am happy to support it.

Hon. J. H. Sturdy (Minister of Social Welfare): — I haven't prepared anything formal on this debate, but as I listened to it, my interest has become more and more aroused and I feel that I must say something on the resolution.

I don't wish to be completely condemnatory of the Federal authorities for their treatment of the Indian as it applies to my own province here and something I know about. I do feel that in health an outstanding job has been done by the Federal authorities, and the general health of the Indians has improved, the birth rate has gone up and the Indian population is somewhat increasing.

For many years I lived next neighbour to Dr. Symes who was in charge of the health services for the Indians in this province, and if ever a man sacrificed himself, he did. He died only a short time ago, and I feel that he died as a result of the hardships and difficulties, long hours and his unselfish devotion to his duty of endeavouring to improve and serve the health needs of the Indians.

I have known Mr. Ostrander, the Commissioner for Saskatchewan, for many years. I used to think he was quite unfair to the Indians, that he didn't understand the problem (maybe I don't either) and that he considered it most discouraging and impossible problem to do very much for the Indians. But I am happy to say that in the last two or three or four years at least, Mr. Ostrander has very much changed in his attitude towards the Indians, and he is completely behind a welfare programme that will tend to improve the conditions of the Indians.

I cannot altogether approve of the educational system as it applies to the Indians. Remember, the Indian schools give the Indian children a very fine academic education. I have thought, and possibly you have too, that many Indians' command of the English language, particularly that of the women, might put many of us to shame. What has been pointed out, however, is true: that having enjoyed many of the modern amenities of life in a modern school and then suddenly to be returned to the reservation without any follow-up whatsoever, there is, of course, a rapid deterioration on the part of the 14-year-old child, and he or she soon slumps back into the primitive conditions that do obtain on many of these reservations. If we wish to assimilate the Indians into the ordinary stream of society and have them become a part of that society, occupying a dignified position in our society, then we may have to consider a revision of our system of education among the Indian. I can see great advantages in having the ordinary school system established on the reservation and then, possibly in the community or the town or village adjacent to that reservation, trade, training schools, or technical schools, or composite schools, that would enable the Indian children to go to the adjoining high school. If we wish to have them become an integral and equal partner of our society then I think that the time to start is when they go to school, in childhood.

I know something about the Indians, particularly two tribes, the Sioux and the Cree. I know many of them by their first names, and they are happy to refer to me as 'Jack' when I meet them in the Qu'Appelle valley. For several years I was manager of an Indian hockey team, and I got to know the boys very well. Eventually I had to give it up for the reason that they boys used to come into the house and become our guests in increasing numbers. So I had to give up the management of the Indian hockey team. But they were fine chaps and I liked them very much and our affections were mutual.

The problem as I see it, one which concerns my department very much, is the fact that wherever there is one of these reservations there is a continuous Metis problem. I don't wish to be too critical of Ottawa until we have demonstrated that we can do a job in rehabilitating the Metis people, which we are engaged in now. But it bothers me, as I have said, that, until the Indian becomes assimilated with our society and part of it, occupying an important and dignified position in our society, we are going to have these Metis problems with us. They will only disappear when the Indian has become assimilated with our population, become a part of the population of this province.

There are many social welfare problems that also concern me, and one is as it affects the family. An Indian unmarried mother's child's rights are determined by the father, and if the father happens to be a white man or a Metis or anyone off the reservation, that child has no Indian rights whatsoever. With us it is entirely different. Under our Child Welfare Act the child takes the name and has the right of the mother; but such isn't the case, for some non-understandable reason, with respect to the child of an unmarried Indian mother. That presents problems as far as we are concerned and may serve as an example of what I mean.

Another is (and I have been confronted with it because it has been brought to my office) that certain Metis families have been voted into the band as members of the band, and with equal rights to band's fund, and equal rights to the reservation. But recently there has been an attempt made, maybe on the part of the bands themselves, to get rid of certain Metis families. I have in mind one family in particular on the Meskopetan Reserve, whose father, a Metis, had been voted into the band and accorded all the rights of an Indian on that reservation. He was a very energetic type of man, so is his son, and particularly the daughter-in-law. They built up a very fine and productive farm there, with cattle. They have nine children, incidentally, who are well taken care of, and so prosperous was that particular family that it appears other members of the band became jealous and wanted to get rid of them, possibly to take over the resources that the family had developed. So they voted them out of the band.

Mr. Lopston: — Typical Socialism, eh? They got jealous of the successful ones and took them over.

Gov't Member: — What's 'funny face' talking about over there?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — The matter was brought to my attention and I simply told them to remain on the reservation and fight the issue. The family is still there, and I certainly hope will not have to sacrifice two generation of work to build up that productive farm on the reservation.

March 18, 1954

Another thing that I deprecate is the fact that Indian reservations, some of which comprised the best land in the province of Saskatchewan, were not fully utilized. Those Indian reservations should have been brought under cultivation years ago. They could have afforded a very high standard of living for the Indian themselves; good homes, a modern way of life ...

Mr. Lopston: — Why don't you do it for the Metis?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — If the Metis people had not been neglected, shamefully neglected, except around election time by the Liberals in this province for 35 years, there would have been a much better situation.

Mr. Lopston: — We did it at least then, but you never do it.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Oh, get up and speak!

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Gov't Member: — You mumble away till we get sick of you.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Ottawa, as the responsible authority, is too far away from the problem. They do not appreciate or understand the situation. I regret to say that Indian agents have been invariably appointed for political patronage reasons in this province, and you don't get a good type of agent, an understanding sympathetic, efficient, progressive type of agent, under that system of appointment.

Mr. Lopston: — You have lots of them.

Gov't Member: — There he goes again.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — However, Mr. Speaker, I do feel that Ottawa has been alerted to the seriousness of the situation and are prepared to do something about it. The staff of my Department concerned in this problem are working very closely with the staff of the Indian Department here at headquarters in Regina. I greatly regret that certain members of the Opposition treat a tragic situation with the levity demonstrated by them, or certain of them, during this debate. It does not reflect credit or dignity or honour on Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition.

Mr. Lopston: — Too bad! We're laughing at the speaker.

Mr. Berezowsky (Closing Debate): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to thank those who have supported me in this resolution. I feel it is necessary for me to stand up and reply to the hon. member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield) as I think he left certain impressions that may be misconstrued by this House. I was rather surprised at some of the statements that the hon. member made.

Mr. Waller (Gravelbourg): — You shouldn't be.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Probably I shouldn't be seeing how much he supports free enterprise and all it stand for; but I was amazed at some of the statements he made. One of the first statements, as I recall, was shortly after a speech made here by the hon. member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley that a number of our friends, native-Canadians sitting in the galleries, attended a meeting, and he said in this House that they were incensed at what we were trying to do in speaking for them so that they may have a better way of life.

After what the hon. member from Meadow Lake said, I thought that I would be getting a flock of letters, or at least my friend who spoke in the debate would be getting a number of letters, from these 'incensed' chiefs and counsellors telling us to mind our own business. It so happened that the only letter I did get was from a friend of mine at Tweedsmuir who didn't like the insinuations, so he said, that were made in this House against Indian agents. The only other letter I got was from an Indian chief, probably one of those who sat in these galleries and listened, and I want to read part of what he said:

Dear Sir:

I wish to thank you and other gentlemen who, have spoken from the Legislature, through the press, about how we Indians have been treated by the Government of Canada. The general public now read in the press that we Indians are not treated as they thought we were. We are looked upon the same as those prisoners in concentration camps, and I think it is real time now that we Indians should demand better administration and services.

Then he goes on, in this letter, mentioning — I don't want to expose the name of a certain Indian agent whom they had tried to get out of the Reserve, who in every way had been unco-operative. The writer states that they had taken the matter up with Ottawa, but the Indian agent is still there, he is still unco-operative and he is not wanted by the Reservation people.

That is the kind of reply that we get from these 'incensed' chiefs and counsellors to which my hon. friend in the Opposition referred.

I was not too much surprised at the statements he made in this House for the simple reason that he admitted that the only history he knew of the Indians and the Metis was the history that he has learnt during his lifetime. He regretted exceedingly that some of us on this side of the House had gone to the trouble of reading a little bit of history, and I think at this time I should tell my hon. friends opposite a little more about that history.

As I mentioned in moving this resolution, there was no conquest of Indians; there did not have to be any conquest. The white man came into this country, and in Canada the story is different from the States, because in Canada every live Indian was important to the white exploiters who came here. Every Metis was important too. They were the people who made profits possible for the companies by getting out and trapping and trading their peltries for a grubstake or maybe for some whiskey. This is the kind of history my friend knows. That is the kind of history I am quite sure that he and his group

March 18, 1954

supports when they talk about free enterprise.

One hon. member mentioned here that some of the people in Canada today, in this civilized age, in this Christian age, still look down upon the Indians and upon other people as only good to be slaves and labourers, people who can carry water and split wood. A great number of us do not look at other human beings in that light. You can call us Socialists; you can call us Christians. Whatever you may call us, we believe in one thing – that human beings the world over have the same rights, the same dignity, and should be treated equally, given equal opportunities in education and opportunities to make a living.

Mr. Ripley: — How about the 19 per cent profit in the Fur Marketing Service?

Mr. Berezowsky: — I have heard a lot of silly statements and I think this is one of the silliest ones I have hears. I answered my friend the other day when I pointed out that as far as the Fur Marketing Service is concerned, the natives and the whites and the Metis people get back every cent that the market can get for their furs, and if he isn't satisfied, well, there is no more I can say on that matter, and I don't intend to take up the time of this Assembly to discuss that matter any further. Surely he is not so dense that he can't get it through his head.

Premier Douglas: — He doesn't like the Fur Marketing Service.

Mr. Berezowsky: — No. He would like to go and buy furs himself to exploit, just as the Hudson's Bay and others, have been exploiting up to the present time; and he knows it.

I want to answer the hon. member from Meadow Lake in other ways. He made statements in this House that the Indian Department was doing great things for the Indians. They had spent, I think, about \$100 for each house, for each Indian farmer to repair his houses. I think he has a figure in here of \$222,000 for 222 houses, or something like that; it works out at about \$100 a house.

Mr. Lopston: — You are getting balled up. \$222,000 for 222 houses – that's a thousand.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Pardon me: 2225 houses – just a hundred. That's all it works out at. No. I'm not getting balled up. I have his statement here and it doesn't matter whether it is a hundred dollars or a thousand dollars. I refer to the statement that he made. But the fact is that there have been hardly any houses built ...

Mr. Lopston: — \$222,000 for 222 houses – that's \$100 a house eh?

Mr. Berezowsky: — If the hon. member went out into those Reserves as I have done and seen how those people live, they would be ashamed to stand up and say the things that have been said in this House. If you had seen 6, 8 or 10 people living in a log shack without any floor in it – I am not talking about the tents, I am talking about the cabins – without any floor, sleeping on the ground in the same clothes that they walked about in the daytime, then is it not a disgrace to this country with all its wealth and opportunities? Yet I have seen these things, and that is why I

speak in this House as I do. And when the hon. member opposite tries to make out in this Legislative Assembly that the Dominion Government, through its Indian Agency, has been spending all kinds of funds among the Indians, I am going to quote some of the facts as I have got them from a friend of mine working in the Indian Department. I vouch for what I say. These are for 1952, and I am going to quote one or two bands that I have marked down here: Band No. 29 – 208 persons ...

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — Better be careful.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Well, I am just getting a little angry about this situation, because I cannot understand people not supporting something that is for the welfare of these people. Band No. 29 – 208 people, 66 trappers; here's the total income, Mr. Speaker, that those people obtained in 1952 from old-age pensions, family allowances (because the hon. member mentioned these) from fishing, trapping, and all the other sources, and average of \$186 per person. I'd like to see my hon. friend from Meadow Lake, who is well padded, live for \$186 a year, and educate his children and give them the opportunities to which they are entitled. Take the band at Pelican Narow – I mentioned that in another debate: there are about 800 people there; exactly according to these figures there are 788 persons – 216 trappers, and the average income from all sources, old-age pensions, family allowances, fishing, trapping and a bit of work here and there and all that they made on an average as I have it here is \$195 per person. And those are figures compiled by officials of the Indian Department.

Mr. Lopston: — They must have been selling their furs to the Fur Marketing Board.

Mr. Berezowsky: — They were selling their furs to the Hudson's Bay Company. The only furs they did sell through the Fur Marketing Service, as my friends know, are the basic peltries of muskrat and beaver, and they catch all kinds of other fur. But they are now beginning to sell mink, weasel and squirrel to the Fur Marketing Service, because they are getting more money than they ever got before.

Now that should answer my friends very well, just what the income is. These are facts that can not be disputed.

I want to depart from the point for the time being, and I just want to point out and go back to something that you will find in the book on Indian treaties. Here is the attitude that the Dominion authorities took in 1871.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I must remind the member that he can only deal with what was said on the resolution. He cannot introduce new matter.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I am not introducing anything new, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to point out what I said before, because I want to leave the right impression in this House. In 1871, the deputy superintendent general of Indian Affairs stated that the policy of the Dominion Government was designed to lead the Indian people by degrees to mingle with the white race in the ordinary avocations of life. That was the attitude taken then. Then we find that, as we consider the Metis people we again have the attitude that the 'half-breed' (as they were called) of the Hudson's Bay Company territories were a remarkable people. That is the attitude taken towards them. My friend

March 18, 1954

doesn't think very much of the half-breeds, as he calls them. He mentioned in his speech, I think, on one or two occasions, that they were very simple and foolish people.

But here is what G. F. D. Stanley writes:

The half-breeds of the Hudson's Bay Company territories were a remarkable people. Children of the fur traders and the Indian women of the plain combined many of the best quality of both races. Physically they enjoyed the admiration of visitors. They were as much at home on the prairies as any Indian tribesman and in the elaborate organization for the buffalo hunt, they had a self-made military organization as efficient for its own purpose as the Boer Commandos.

I am just trying to point that out, Mr. Speaker, to show the hon. gentlemen opposite that men who know something about the Indian problem and the Metis problem recognize that these people have the potentialities such as anybody else has. Somewhere along the line, we failed. I have spoken about why we failed. The reasons are very obvious; we have wanted them to remain what they were. We have had a hundred years now to assimilate them. We have had a hundred years of time to do what was planned a hundred years ago. It has not been done – why? The simple reason why it hasn't been done is because the necessary steps were not taken to give these people the opportunities of education, to get these people to the state where everybody here in Canada would treat them on an equal basis and give them the dignity that they require. As long as they haven't got that dignity we will not solve the question. As long as you go down to a point like Lac la Ronge and you find that the whites have a school but the Indians haven't got a school, they cannot have that dignity. They feel inferior, and they haven't got the opportunities. And yet, the peculiar thing is, Mr. Speaker, that those people have come to me – they could have gone to the hon. member from Athabaska; but of course he is not too interested in their affairs as he has pointed out a number of occasions. So they have come to me. They would like to have dormitories. They don't want to take their children out on the traplines ...

Mr. Ripley: — Great White Father.

Gov't Member: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Yes, they have come to me and I have taken it up with proper officials. Those are the things they want. They want the same things that I want. I want my children to have opportunities; I want them to be good Canadians, and I want them to be respected, and I want them to have a certain amount of dignity. And that is the purpose of this resolution. I cannot understand how anybody can come out with such statements as came from the other side of the House, the other day, still representing these people as inferior and not to be given the consideration that they should be given. That is all I wish to say, Mr. Speaker. I hope that the House will unanimously support the motion.

The question being put, it was agreed to unanimously.

NATIONAL LIVESTOCK MARKETING SCHEMES

The House resumed, from 9th March, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Feusi respecting the establishment of a national marketing scheme for the marketing of livestock, dairy, poultry and other agricultural products.

Mr. Lopston (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of being as long-winded on this resolution as my hon. friends have been on the last one, in spite of the fact that I think this resolution has more potentialities than the resolution just passed.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution is quite significant because it is directed to an authority that really has no authority to deal with it. It is typical of all the rest of the resolutions that are being moved by my hon. friends from the government side. They put me in mind of a spoiled boy who brags of how much he has been doing, and every time he sees something to do he goes crying to mama and asks her to do it for him.

This resolution asks the Federal Government to call a conference to decide on the advisability of setting up a Livestock Marketing Board, with no request or demand from any stock producer or stock-producing organization for doing so. Quite differently, they have made a request to this Government to set up a livestock marketing board and instead of them doing so ...

Premier Douglas: — Will my friend tell us who asked for this Government to set up a livestock marketing board?

Mr. Lopston: — I am coming to that. But instead of that, they have taken this usual step of asking the Federal Government to do something that they could not possibly do unless there was a request from the Livestock for them to do so. More than that, the request for a livestock marketing board is very limited. It is confined to the province of Saskatchewan, and only from a few producers in the province of Saskatchewan. For that reason I say the resolution has no meaning whatsoever.

I have noticed that the mover of the resolution spent quite a long time referring to a resolution that I had moved in this House some 16 years ago. It had nothing to do with the setting up of a livestock marketing board. It did have something to do with asking the Federal Government to set up a grading system of livestock. I don't know whether he knows what has happened since; I think if he had checked up on it he probably would not have spent so much time on the importance of the resolution that I sponsored at that time.

I am not saying that the resolution had anything to do with the improvement that has taken place since that time. But I can say that I did go to the trouble to find out just how we are grading our livestock at the present time, and I find that we are selling our hogs on a rail-grading basis, which means that the shipper is being paid for hogs on a dressed carcass basis, except for sows and boars which are sold on the hoof. I find, also, that there is a Federal grading of beef at the abattoir, on both No. 1 and No. 2 class of beef; I find, also, that any farmer can ship his cattle to the slaughtering house, have them slaughtered there, have them graded by these government graders and be paid on a carcass graded basis.

March 18, 1954

That is quite a change to what existed 16 years ago, so I would say that all the time he spent on the grading end of the argument has no basis at all. I had a talk with the grader in Regina in the course of which I asked him if it would be feasible to grade cattle on the hoof, and he said that it would be very difficult to grade cattle on the hoof and give accurate grading. He said, "You are getting them pretty well graded at the present time, for the simple reason that our marketing system at the present time, is to a large extent, done by auction bidding; and those who are bidding on livestock at the present time are bidding on them according to quality and quantity that that beat might dress out to be." So he says there is really no demand for grading cattle on the hoof.

In view of the fact that there is no particular demand for further improvement on grading, there is no demand for further improvement on grading, there is no demand from the livestock producer for the Federal Government to enter into the marketing picture, but that there is demand from the farmers' organization for this Government to set up a Livestock marketing board, I propose to move an amendment to this resolution so that it might mean something concrete. I am going to suggest, Mr. Speaker ...

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, before my hon. friend moves his amendment, would he mind telling me what he promised to tell me a while ago — what farm organization?

Mr. Lopston: — It's in my amendment.

I propose that all the words after "Assembly" be struck out [and] the following words be substituted therefore:

recommends that the Government of Saskatchewan establish a provincial livestock marketing board along the line requested by the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union in their brief of February 24, 1954, after satisfying themselves that the majority of the livestock producers are in favour of same being established.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that that brief was delivered right in this House when the Farmers' Union delegates came and presented their 'Rand formula' brief here. Part of their brief was for a livestock marketing board.

I am going to suggest that this Government should be very happy at having the producers support a movement of this kind, because it fits so well with their 'planned economy'. Not only would they be able to carry out some of their platform, which is in their 'Manifesto' of planned economy, but it would give them an opportunity to regain the British market for livestock, which they say the Federal Government has lost. I suggest that nobody ever loses the British market. That is nonsense. The British market is open to anybody, if they are prepared to sell their goods at the price the British are prepared to pay.

I would suggest that they go ahead and set up this livestock marketing board as has been suggested by the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union, and ship their cattle to Great Britain. I would suggest to the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) that he should have been sending his cattle to Great Britain for the last five years that he has been hollering about the British market being lost to our livestock producers. It has always been open; the Minister

of Agriculture could have been shipping his cattle there ever since the Federal Government quit having the contract or when the contract ran out. And I would suggest that all the other C. C. F. ers send their cattle to Great Britain and take what Great Britain is prepared to pay for them. My hon. friend has been up and down this province telling them that the British market has been lost to our people, and yet it has been open to send their cattle ever since the beef contract was completed.

That, Mr. Speaker, is about all I am going to say on this subject, and I would suggest that now is the time that the Government show whether they are only giving lip-service to the request of our farmers or whether they are prepared to do something that has been requested, and that might mean something.

I would say that I am not speaking in favour of or against the advisability of a livestock board. I am not convinced that it is a good thing, and I am not going to criticize it either. However, the creation of a livestock marketing board should be started in the provinces first and then, if it is a success, it will soon become a Federal board.

(amendment proposed)

Mr. Speaker: — The debate is now on the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, this amendment at least proves two things. It proves how little my friend knows about the legislation that is already on the statute books of Saskatchewan, and secondly, it proves how little he knows about marketing legislation generally.

First of all, there is no need for this House to recommend that the Government of Saskatchewan establish a provincial livestock marketing board along the lines suggested by the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union brief, because there is legislation now on the statute books of this province by which any producers' group ...

Mr. Lopston: — You have just put it ...

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — My friend has nothing more useful to contribute when he is sitting down than he had when he was standing up, so he might just as well keep quiet.

Mr. Lopston: — You didn't keep quiet when I was talking.

Premier Douglas: — I asked an intelligent question and am still waiting for an answer.

Mr. Lopston: — Well, I don't think mine was ...

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, if I can come back to the question. MY friends opposite apparently find it difficult to follow a reasonable argument; but there is, now, marketing legislation in this province by which any group of producers can submit to the Provincial Marketing Board a marketing plan. That marketing plan, once it has been gone over by the Board, will then be submitted to the producers of the province, and the producers of

March 18, 1954

the province will vote on it, and that the Board will be set up and the marketing of that particular commodity will then be conducted by that Board. That legislation was passed by this Government. A marketing board has been set up by this Government. The honey producers were the first group to formulate such a plan. They placed it before the Board. The matter was submitted to a plebiscite of the honey producers. They voted in favour of it, and the marketing of honey was set up under that legislation.

The livestock producers and the poultry producers of this province have also studied marketing plans. If either the S. F. U. or any other farmers' groups want to submit a plan to the marketing board, the marketing board will study it and submit it to the producers, and a marketing plan can be set up. As a matter of fact, not the Farmers' Union but the actual producers themselves, both livestock and poultry producers, have made lengthy studies and we have conducted studies for them on the whole question of livestock marketing and poultry marketing.

It is all right for my friend opposite to talk about the marketing of livestock in England. But the producers in this province who have studied the problem of marketing by a provincial board have backed away in every case from submitting a plan to the Provincial Marketing Board. Why? Well, I think the reason is obvious. First of all, the only provinces with marketing legislation such as ours have been British Columbia and Ontario. Alberta had marketing legislation but, last year, they took most of the 'teeth' out of it, so that it is purely a voluntary co-operative marketing proposition.

Mr. Lopston: — What kind has Ontario got?

Premier Douglas: — Ontario has pretty much the same as British Columbia and ourselves.

Manitoba has just the promise of getting a certain type of marketing legislation, but it is in a fairly nebulous state at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That's to be expected.

Premier Douglas: — Producers in this province who have been studying this question for three years with the assistance of the marketing economists whom we have loaned to them, have recognized that, since we produce far more than we consume ourselves, a lot of selling would have to be done outside our province, in Ontario, in Quebec and overseas. There is the problem of producers' marketing boards
...

Mr. Lopston: — There's nothing wrong with that.

Premier Douglas: — ... marketing in Ontario and Quebec, or across any provincial boundaries under legislation which is designed for the producers in those provinces and not for producers from this province going there to market. There are the problems to be faced of going into the British market, where at the present time the British have international currency control. Under this control the British purchasers are only allowed to buy when the British Government permits them to get dollars from the Bank of England, with the result that the producers recognize that it is virtually impossible for a provincial producers' marketing board or a provincial marketing board to carry on trade across the ocean. They have no control of fiscal policy. They have no ability to go into international currency control, and

no ability to enter into three-way arrangements such as can be done by a federal government. For that reason the producers have backed away from the problem.

I am one of the first to admit that they may be compelled, eventually, to get marketing legislation in all the provinces. That may come. Secondly, it may be necessary to set up some central marketing agency for all of Canada so that the producers in British Columbia, Saskatchewan and so on, could sell to a central marketing agency and that marketing agency would have the right to operate in any province in which there was marketing legislation. That would help the situation inside of Canada; but they might have to try it if the Federal Government will do nothing. However I will be one of the first to warn the producers of this country that if they do that, they will face exactly the same situation that the Wheat Pool faced when it set up a central agency in London, back in the 'twenties, but with even less protection than that central agency had, because that central agency was operating in a world which still had free trade, free currency and convertibility of currency. That situation does not exist today.

There is another factor which comes into this. A provincial marketing board operating in this province, or even operating in this province, or even operating for the three provinces that have marketing legislation – British Columbia, ourselves and Ontario – have no assurance yet that they would come under price-support legislation, no assurance yet that the price-support legislation would make it possible for them to take delivery at a certain price, and no assurance that if they had to sell their commodity for a lower price that the Agricultural Prices Support Act would make up the difference. They don't know that now. That is one of the things they have been negotiating.

So that I say this. If there has been no livestock or poultry products board set up in this province or in any other province, it is because of the producers themselves. Those who are actually selling these things – the Livestock Pool, Co-op Creameries, and other groups who are actually selling the commodities – recognize the difficulties.

I have no quarrel with the Farmers' Union for passing a resolution saying that this thing should be studied and that we should look at a marketing plan. That is fine! But the final decision will have to be made by the producers themselves whose commodities are going to be disposed of. Those producers, up till now, have not submitted a plan. They have studied plans; we have discussed plans with them; we have we have drafted material for them. But when they sit down and look at the difficulties of implementing such a plan, and the very small chances of their success because of the limited jurisdiction which such a board would have, they have backed away from it. They recognize that, under the British North America Act, a provincial board would have jurisdiction only within the boundaries of Saskatchewan ...

Mr. Lopston: — They can get all the authority they want.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — I listened very patiently to my friend, and he didn't display very much knowledge about the marketing powers which a board would have. You had better go back and study ...

March 18, 1954

Mr. Lopston: — I think I know more about it than you do.

Premier Douglas: — ... the federal marketing legislation and provincial marketing legislation. A provincial marketing board would have no jurisdiction outside of this province. Secondly, it would not even have jurisdiction within the province with respect to commodities coming in from outside the province. We could have, for instance, a livestock marketing board set up in this province that would have no jurisdiction over livestock coming in from Alberta or Manitoba and being sold in this province. We could not keep it out; a provincial government cannot put up a barrier to interprovincial trade. We have a honey marketing scheme, but that doesn't stop Alberta honey from coming in here, or Manitoba honey from coming in here. We can't stop it, nor have we any power to go into another province and exercise any control whatsoever with reference to marketing our farmers' products in their province.

If there has been no livestock or poultry marketing schemes set up, it is because the producers themselves, after studying it, have not expressed any desire for it. I say to my friends opposite, and to the Farmers' Union and to anybody else, that if the producers want a marketing scheme, all they have to do is submit it. The legislation is there, the marketing board is there ...

Mr. Lopston: — That's all the resolution asks for ...

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — But there is no reason to ask for it; the provision is there for it. That is why I could not understand my friend moving his amendment. He is simply asking us to do something that has already been done. But I will tell my friend why this amendment is moved. This amendment is moved because this is the subterfuge which the Liberal Party has used for the last quarter century to dodge the real responsibility which Liberalism has never dared to take up. This is exactly the kind of stories I listened to when I sat in the House of Commons in 1936, 1937, 1938.

Mr. Lopston: — No one better at that than the C. C. F.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — The Conservatives set up a Wheat Board, which had the authority to market wheat. When the Liberals came into office what was the first thing they did? The first thing they did was by order-in-council (they did not even wait for Parliament to meet) to tell the farmers, "You can't deliver your wheat to this Wheat Board; as long as the price stays about 90 cents you have to sell through the open market"; and they kept it that way. When I listen now to a lot of Liberal members of Parliament — Mr. Gardiner for instance — making speeches and talking about what the Wheat board has done, I go back and read the speeches they made in '36, '37, '38, and '39, when they made just the kind of speeches as that made tonight by the Leader of the Opposition, as to why the Wheat Board that the Conservatives set up should not be allowed to operate. They would not let it operate. They said, "Well, the Wheat Pool can set up its own central agency; let the farmers market their own wheat" — anything at all except to do the thing that needed to be done, namely, to sell the farmers' wheat through the Wheat Board that was already provided for in

the statute books of Canada. They stalled year after year.

The only reason, Mr. Speaker, that the Wheat Board was ever allowed to operate in this country was because the war came. With the war came the demand for wheat. When it looked as though the price for wheat was going to go sky high, the Wheat Board that hadn't been allowed to operate to keep the price of wheat from going down, was suddenly brought into operation to keep it from going up. They brought the Wheat Board into operation only under the pressure of the war. As late as 1943 we were still getting 50 cents a bushel for wheat at the local elevator. It was only when a delegation of farmers went to Ottawa and threatened to pull the roof down that they finally got it up to 70 cents at the local elevators. When I moved an amendment to try to get it up to \$1.00 basis Ft. William, you would have thought we were asking for the Crown jewels. The Liberal Party had paid lip-service to the idea of orderly marketing. It has never believed in orderly marketing. It has always believed in turning over to the grain trade, to the private entrepreneur, the right to sell the products of the farmers' toil ...

Mr. Lopston: — What has that got to do with the resolution?

Premier Douglas: — The member from Athabaska (Mr. Ripley), it doesn't matter what the debate is on, has to get back to the Fur Marketing Service. There is only one reason for this and it is because he and a lot of people whom he represents and for whom he speaks have not been allowed to 'skin' the fellow who skins the animal. The Fur Marketing Service has prevented them from doing that ...

Mr. McDonald: — You 'skin' them still!

Premier Douglas: — The Liberal Party doesn't want to face up to the basic fact that the day is past when the primary producer can get a fair return for his product by going like a little lamb to the slaughter in the field of the open free market.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Every year.

Premier Douglas: — He hasn't got a chance in the world. If he is to get any chance at all, it must be on the basis of orderly marketing through government boards and through long-term agreements.

Mr. Lopston: — That's what this asks for.

Premier Douglas: — Now we have it in wheat — not because of the Liberals, but in spite of them. Even after they had been in office for years they still denied the farmer the Wheat Board that the statutes of Canada said he had; but they now have it. All this resolution (which my friends are seeking to avoid by amending) says is that the Federal Government should now do for livestock and poultry what they have reluctantly been compelled to do for wheat and coarse grains.

We had the same battle with coarse grains. It was only the fact that the three prairie governments put the pressure on them that they agreed to handle coarse grains. We listened to exactly the same kind of arguments as my friend used tonight. "Why," they said to us, "we haven't the authority to touch coarse grains; coarse grains are different from wheat; we can't handle coarse grains." But when they were pressed hard enough, and when we

asked why it was different, they said, "Well, wheat is mostly exported, but coarse grains are consumed in Canada." Then they thought they would get around it by saying, "the only way we can handle coarse grains is for each of the provincial governments to pass the necessary enabling legislation." Imagine, the provinces passing enabling legislation for the Federal Government! They were surprised, of course, but the prairie governments actually managed to get together in spite of the fact that one was Social Credit, one was Liberal and one was C.C.F. We did manage to get together, and the three prairie governments did pass enabling legislation, and so they had to handle coarse grains.

They could do exactly the same thing with livestock and poultry, Mr. Speaker. If they need enabling legislation, I am sure this Legislature will pass enabling legislation. I am sure the other provincial governments will pass enabling legislation. Most of the members will remember that, two years ago this last February, the Minister of Agriculture and myself, along with representatives of the Pools, the Livestock Board and the Co-operatives, went down to Ottawa to a marketing conference, called by the Federal Government. The provinces indicated to Ottawa at that time, "we are prepared to pass whatever enabling legislation you think you need to enable you to set up a livestock and a poultry marketing board and to use, in conjunction with those two marketing boards, your Agricultural Prices Support Act, by which you can say to the farmer, 'we will take your commodities at a certain price and the Board will sell at that price, plus handling charges, and if it finds that it cannot sell on the world markets at sufficient prices to compensate the farmer, then the Agricultural Prices Support Act will come in and support those prices'."

That was the plan to which the provinces agreed, but the Federal Government has never acted on it. They can't hide behind the constitution. The Federal Government, tomorrow if it wanted to, could declare every packinghouse in Canada works for the 'general advantage of Canada' just as they have done with the grain elevators and the terminals. They could get enabling legislation from the provinces if they wanted it, by which the provinces would surrender to Ottawa the necessary power to handle inter-provincial marketing. They already have the power, of course, to handle international marketing.

I think the time has come when we have to speak plainly to the producers of this country with reference to this whole problem of marketing. I know that, before we get a Federal marketing board to handle livestock and poultry produce there is going to be a lot more of the squirming that this type of amendment symbolizes. There is also the danger that some people, either by design or by sheer ignorance, may try to lead farmers down the 'garden path' towards producers' marketing boards and provincial marketing boards that have a very small chance of success. In the 1920s, it was possible to have producers' marketing boards; but I want to repeat what I said before, that in the 1920s those producer marketing boards were operating in a free market with a convertible currency. That day is gone. One had only to look at how trade agreements are made, today. How are they made? They are made with a country like Great Britain who has blocked currency all over the world. Britain only has so many dollars; therefore, they say, "We will trade from this country to that country to another country." The result is that some tin which they own in Malaya is sold to somebody in South America who in turn will give them some dollars which are changed into Canadian dollars to buy some Canadian wheat.

Now that can be done by governments; that can be done by negotiations between the Bank of Canada and the Bank of England. But that cannot be done by a producers' marketing board or a provincial marketing board. Such a producers' marketing board or a provincial marketing board could very well find itself in a straitjacket in a world of blocked currencies, a world of three-way trade agreements, and in a world which, by bilateral agreement, has almost been reduced to barter. In that kind of a world the only kind of marketing board that has any effectiveness whatsoever will be a marketing board under Federal jurisdiction with all the control over tariffs, fiscal matters and convertibility of exchange which only a Federal government can have.

I hope that our producers will not be fooled by any specious arguments or specious reasoning such as is contained in this amendment. We will continue to ask for the only thing that can ever be any salvation for our farmers, namely, a Federal Board, with the packinghouses of Canada named to be 'works for the general advantage of Canada' and coming under Federal jurisdiction, and with the Agricultural Prices Support Act and the \$200 million that was put in that fund standing as a solid bulwark behind those Boards. That is the hope for the western farmer, and I do not believe he is going to be fooled and taken down any 'primrose path' by any talk about producers' marketing boards or provincial marketing boards that have little hope of success in the type of international trading situation which we have today.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I would say that this amendment simply asks that the Government do what it is doing now. The Government now has a marketing service, and it will set up a marketing scheme if any producers ask for it. The producers haven't asked for it because, I think, most of the producers want what this resolution asks for — a Federal marketing board, with an Agricultural Prices Support Act to guarantee the farmer at least a minimum cost of production.

Mr. Cameron: — I would like to ask the Premier if he has had representation or resolutions from the livestock men asking for this particular resolution. Is it backed up by resolutions from the Livestock Association?

Premier Douglas: — The resolution which is being debated?

Mr. Cameron: — Which you presented in the House, yes.

Premier Douglas: — Well, I did not present the resolution, therefore I would not know whether representations were made for this particular resolution, but I do know, however, that a conference was held in Winnipeg just a matter of two or three months ago. There was one in Saskatoon and one in Winnipeg. The general consensus of livestock men who have studied this matter is that they would like a Federal marketing board. They are quite prepared, if we never get one, to study the other as a very poor second alternative. But I think you will find that the minutes of both the Saskatoon conference and the Winnipeg conference indicate that the organized producers want a Federal marketing board with the Agricultural Prices Support Act behind it.

Mr. Lopston: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask one question. You just said that the conferences came to the conclusion that they would

March 18, 1954

never get one from the Federal Government. Why then should you send a resolution of that kind when you know it is not going to be acted on?

Premier Douglas: — I'm sorry, I didn't get your question.

Mr. Lopston: — You just said that a conference of livestock men had been held and they have approached Ottawa and they have come to the conclusion that there was no chance of getting a board through Ottawa. Then I ask why would you move that kind of a resolution to send to Ottawa, when you know it is of no value?

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I did not say that they knew they would not get it from Ottawa. Two years ago we approached Ottawa on the question and no results have been forthcoming. As for these recent conferences, I doubt if their recommendations have yet got to Ottawa.

Mr. Lopston: — I thought you said they had.

Premier Douglas: — No. With regard to the conferences in both Winnipeg and Saskatoon, I imagine their representations are before Ottawa at the present time, and I think this resolution which is on the Order Paper would greatly strengthen their hand.

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I certainly cannot let this opportunity pass without comment on the amendment.

First of all, I was not a bit surprised that the hon. members opposite want the Provincial Government to now assume additional responsibilities ...

Mr. Lopston: — They haven't assumed any.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — ... responsibilities that are really in the field of the Federal Government. They have asked this House repeatedly to assume responsibilities for municipal road construction, for education. In fact, the Provincial Government is supposed to do everything, and now, to my utter amazement, the Opposition is suggesting that we have provincial livestock marketing boards.

The hon. Minister of Telephones (Hon. Mr. Kuziak) was speaking in the House, a few days ago, and he mentioned that the Liberal Party was somewhat progressive back in 1906; but in the past two years they have made a complete somersault, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has overlooked the fact that this House unanimously supported a resolution, and I think the records will so indicate, on two different occasions, and, when attending the production conference in Ottawa, I mentioned to the conference and to the Rt. Hon. Mr. Gardiner that the Legislature of Saskatchewan had, on two occasions, unanimously passed a resolution asking for a Federal Livestock marketing board. They have retreated completely, Mr. Speaker.

I want to make some reference to provincial marketing board under Bill 82. Bill 82, in my opinion, and as a result of the experiences of those provinces who have tried it, is simply a Bill of abdication of jurisdictional power by the Federal Government, by endeavouring thus to throw this burden on the provincial governments where the jurisdiction does not lie, as the Premier has indicated to you.

During my attendance at the production conferences at Ottawa, we had the Ministers and Deputy Ministers coming from the Maritimes, every year, pleading on behalf of the apple growers, pleading on behalf of the potato growers who are well organized in the Maritimes on the basis of provincial marketing boards. As a matter of fact, the Deputy Minister from Nova Scotia, at the last conference, drew to the attention of the conference that on the way to the conference the price of a meal on the train was \$3.00. He told the conference it would take 14 bushels of Nova Scotia potatoes to pay for that meal, so he settled for an 8-bushel meal instead. This is a typical example of the operation of provincial boards. There is no organization under which the commodity can be taken into inter-provincial trade in an orderly manner and into the export markets of the world.

When the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked me why I did not send my livestock to Great Britain, he was asking all the cattlemen of Saskatchewan why they did not send their livestock to Great Britain, and he also supplied the answer completely, to the intent of this resolution — that this is a Federal responsibility and cannot be discharged by a provincial government.

Mr. Lopston: — There's nothing to stop you.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition not know that in the Wheat Pool we had almost a similar marketing agency, with broad powers and a powerful agency, and they failed so badly as a result of the drop in world prices of wheat that the Provincial Government had to come to the rescue of the Pools, as the hon. Leader must know? I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, that he hasn't suggested that the Wheat Board system of marketing should be turned back to provincial governments again.

Mr. Lopston: — There is nothing to stop you from selling your cattle.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I'll get around to him in sufficient time, Mr. Speaker. The best that provincial marketing boards can provide is a floor price and that is doubtful. The poultry producers were challenged by the Federal Minister of Agriculture that if they didn't get organized on a provincial basis there would be no more floor price benefits to them. They endeavoured to organize on a province-wide basis for three years, and endeavoured to get all of the provinces (that was one of the conditions) to pass similar legislation, which was a complete impossibility because, as the hon. Premier has pointed out, Alberta does not believe in this legislation. Furthermore, it had to go through the whole process of a vote and in addition to that, many of the other provinces, like Ontario, would not come into that kind of a scheme.

We should not forget that the three western provinces are the big exporting provinces for agricultural commodities, particularly livestock products; and for that very reason we cannot operate on a provincial board basis and at the same time guarantee to our producers a set price. This must be done by a Federal agency as has been so well pointed out by the Premier.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition says, "Have any representations been made to you?" This is a typical Liberal attitude. I mentioned in a previous debate in this House that strong representations had been made to Liberal governments in the past for certain measures that would be of benefit to the farmers and a deaf ear was turned. A deaf ear was turned so persistently, Mr. Speaker, that they got thrown out on their ear; and if their colleagues at Ottawa do not wake up pretty soon they will be out on their ear, too! It is precisely because of that attitude ...

March 18, 1954

Premier Douglas: — They'll land on their deaf ear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Yes, the deaf ear over there, apparently.

But the attitude, Mr. Speaker, that they have over on the other side of the House is the precise reason that we are moving very rapidly into an agricultural depression. They have not done a single thing or made a single move that would implement policies that would take our exportable food commodities from this country to the nations where the need is the greatest.

As I stated, in regard to representations directly, the interprovincial Farmers' Union had a meeting during the summer in Winnipeg, at which time this matter of livestock marketing was discussed, and, as the Premier informed the House, the Government here supplied them with much research information in regard to marketing plans. A second conference was held in the city of Saskatoon, which I attended, and the reason they did not want to press for a Federal livestock marketing board was put bluntly to that meeting. It was because they said the Ottawa government would not give it to them.

Mr. Lopston: — Well then why this resolution?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — So they suggested, Mr. Speaker, that they would start on a provincial level. If some of these hon. members opposite would do a little bit more homework and a little research, they would know what they were talking about; and they would not have to make those funny noises that we hear from that side of the House.

Mr. Cameron: — Like the Minister is making.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The member for Maple Creek ought to know that this administration has passed the necessary legislation. All the livestock producers need to do is organize and go out and get a vote; the legislation is there and we have told them that if they want to start on that basis, they will have our full support. We pointed out to them, also, as the Premier has done to this House, the limitations on a provincial livestock marketing board and the problems involved; but they are hopeful that perhaps they can at least get floor prices under our livestock.

Mr. Speaker, we have had surpluses of livestock products in this Dominion of Canada, particularly in this province, during all of the post-war years. Nothing practical has been done. The only thing that has been done — the Rt. Hon. Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa expects that we ought to eat all the surplus beef and all of the surplus pork in Canada. That has been his policy, which indicates a complete bankruptcy of ideas towards finding export markets for these agricultural commodities. You can go over the history of agricultural exportation from this country and you will find exports going down, down to zero.

Mr. Lopston: — Where have you got surplus beef to export to Great Britain right now, or even pork?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asks me "where have we got surplus beef to export to Great Britain." We are just through handing them the leftovers from a few years ago of some millions of pounds of beef that went to Great Britain at a greatly reduced price.

Mr. Lopston: — I am asking you now.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And we have the cattle, the livestock, in the country right now, waiting for export markets. That is precisely the reason why good steers are selling for 12½ cents a pound on the domestic market at a time when the employment level in Canada was never as high and the consumers' have had purchasing power to pay better prices than they had in the past.

Mr. Lopston: — I would like to ask my hon. friend another question. What is the price in Great Britain on that same beef?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to enter into a debate with the hon. member opposite, because I know it is impossible to convince him of anything; but we have surplus cattle, and just you wait, Mr. Speaker, until next fall, and we will have a lot of them on the domestic market. What happened when we had surplus products just a year ago on the domestic market? These products were fed back onto the domestic market at a greatly reduced price, particularly pork products. We all remember the pork business, the pork that was offered in the stores right in this province. I went back to my own little hamlet and I found my farmer friends buying 'Jimmy' Gardiner's pork at a reduced price, in cans, and I told them then that every time they eat a couple of cans of this pork the price of the pig in the pen goes down. And that is exactly what happened, Mr. Speaker. And Mrs. Housewife ...

Mr. Lopston: — It didn't go down very far.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — ... is inclined to look for cheaper meat. To accommodate the situation the Federal Minister of Agriculture announced, a year ago last October, that the price supports on hogs would be reduced by \$3.00 per cwt as at January 1, 1953, so our farmers went out of hog production. That was well timed, because it came at a period of time when our swine producers were beginning to plan their production programme for the next year. The result of that was a 21 per cent increase in bred sows that went to the markets and it created a temporary artificial scarcity, particularly in Ontario. I think it was the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) who mentioned, a day or so ago, he was eulogizing (or someone was) the fact that the Federal Government was paying a premium on bacon hogs in Canada. The Rt. Hon. Mr. Gardiner took \$3.00 per cwt off just like that! The premium plus a little besides was rubbed out, and our hog producers were again liquidated. But the boys are all out for pigs again, and next fall it will likely be the same old story; we will have too much. I wonder if the Rt. Hon. Minister at Ottawa is again going to put it in cans and offer it at a reduced price on the Canadian market.

I want to say this to the 'Leader-Post', and to the 'Star-Phoenix', too. They had the audacity, Mr. Speaker, to suggest to the general public of this province that this was a producer subsidy — the subsidization of this 80 million lbs of pork and some millions of lbs of extra beef that we had on our hands. This was a direct consumer subsidy and the result of it was that the price of both pork and beef went down very drastically.

We talk about unfair labour practices. Well, you have a government in Ottawa with the same type of mind as the other side of the House. Little wonder that the agriculturist is in trouble in this great Canada of ours.

March 18, 1954

When I was in attendance at the conference, backed up by other provincial Ministers of Agriculture, we asked for a conference of the Dominion Government and the provinces to discuss this whole matter of livestock marketing. Every one of the provincial Ministers was concerned over the situation. We asked for such a conference, and we were turned down cold. I so informed the interprovincial Farm Union meeting, and I urged them to again make representation to have a conference of this kind called. I believe this matter is so serious, Mr. Speaker, that it calls for a conference at the national level in order that we can bring in a livestock marketing plan, similar to the Wheat Board which has proven itself, proven its ability to stabilize prices to the producer. This a provincial board will never do. The most we can hope for is a floor price, and with mounting costs, I have said repeatedly a floor price is simply not good enough. If we should tell the munitions makers to produce at a floor price, we would not have munitions, guns or anything else for the defence programme. How can we expect our farm people, in the face of high production costs, to produce and stay in business at a floor price?

This floor price talk, Mr. Speaker, is just a whole lot of 'eyewash' and nonsense, catering to the thought that has been foisted on the farmers that 'half a loaf is better than none'. However, if the Farmers' Union or the Livestock Co-operatives want to start on a provincial basis and then endeavour to work up to a Federal marketing board, well and good. The Farmers' Union and the Livestock Producers here have said that this is exactly their objective. They do not expect that provincial board will solve their problems; but they feel that it is a little step in the right direction, and they are hopeful that after tremendous campaigning and pressure, they may get the Ottawa government to come into that kind of a marketing scheme. Mr. Speaker, I certainly will oppose the amendment. I am very sorry and regretful that the hon. members opposite cannot, once again, support a motion that they have, I think, on two previous separate occasions, supported unanimously; but apparently, for political expediency, in order to place onus and responsibility on this Government, they are prepared to sell the farmers of this province 'down the river'.

Mr. Cameron: — I would like to ask the Minister the same question I asked the Premier. Have you had representation from the livestock producers asking that you sponsor a resolution like this?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Are you talking about the livestock grower?

Mr. Cameron: — The livestock men, yes.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The livestock men, not the livestock growers?

Mr. Cameron: — The livestock men.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — They are the 'preferred children' of the province. They operate on Crown land.

Mr. Cameron: — No, no! I have asked you if you have had representation from them to sponsor this resolution in the House?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Oh, Mr. Speaker. He asked us did they come to us. We are not Liberals, Mr. Speaker. I come from the ranks of the

farm movement. I have been in it all my life. I know pretty well what the battles of the farmers are, and the farmers expect me to take the initiative and to take leadership in this House. I don't have to wait for them to come and tell me; they expect me to do that.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a few minutes. I don't say that I am against the Federal Government going into the marketing of livestock, but the thing that interested me was the remarks of the Farmers' Union, and if we are supporting the Farmers' Union with this amendment which we have submitted, then I presume that the Farmers' Union can be classified by the same type of terminology that has been applied to us here. I want to read what they have stated in the appendix here, why we brought in this resolution:

We wish to comment briefly upon another important matter, important particularly to small livestock producers in Saskatchewan ...

(taking the stand that they are speaking for the fellow on the farm, not the livestock men themselves, who is in it as an industry, but for the small farmer who has a few head of stock each year to market; and it is on behalf of those people that Mr. Phelps and the Farmers' Union says they are speaking. And the situation demands immediate attention. Both the Provincial and Federal Governments should be asked to take some concrete and constructive steps to assist the farmers in this respect.)

As members of the Legislature no doubt are already aware, the Farmers' Union have taken the lead in calling two livestock producer conferences, one in Winnipeg last fall and the other in Saskatoon in January. At the latter conference the producers decided by a substantial majority vote to organize provincial producer boards for the purpose of marketing livestock, then with a further objective, of inter-provincial and national co-ordination. The province of Manitoba is proceeding to launch an educational campaign to popularize the idea and have their farmers study the details of a plan for marketing and suggest desirable amendments. We are desirous of taking similar action in Saskatchewan and as a beginning the S.F. U. has contacted the Saskatchewan Livestock Pool, seeking co-operation on a programme of joint action, and we urge the members of the Legislature, particularly the farmer members, to make a special study of such a plan with a view to endorsing the principles by a resolution of the House during this Session, and that when the plan is finally worked out in more detail and is ready to be launched on a provincial basis, we trust the Government will, as an investment in the livestock industry of Saskatchewan, assist by helping to finance and otherwise help support the educational campaign as was done for the honey producers, and thus put the provincial livestock marketing plan in operation and provide for the livestock industry in 1950s what western farmers did for cereal grains in the 1920s.

March 18, 1954

This is the considered opinion of the Farmers' Union. They had a conference in Winnipeg; they had a conference in Saskatoon and I don't think that Mr. Phelps and the Farmers' Union are afraid to present their requests to Ottawa, as was suggested here, that they wouldn't go to Ottawa because they knew there was no use going.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — They were turned down.

Mr. Cameron: — Well, they were turned down. He says, regarding this convention in Winnipeg, that it was a majority vote. A large majority of these people wanted a provincial marketing board, and to work for assistance to popularize the idea among the farmers.

I asked the Premier if the livestock producers themselves had asked for any such a resolution. He said he was not too sure, because I think the member for Pelly (Mr. Feusi) had introduced the resolution. Then I asked the Minister of Agriculture. His answer was that he was not waiting to be asked; he's leading the thinking in agriculture and livestock problems.

Mr. Lopston: — Yet he knows it's no good.

Mr. Cameron: — I am not saying other than this: Why haven't the livestock producers made their wishes known?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — May I ask the hon. member a question? Do you not know that this Farmers' Union is made up of livestock producers?

Mr. Cameron: — You are asking that as a question? My answer is yes; but I thought, Mr. Minister, I had made my distinction when I began, in that the Farmers' Union as stated here were speaking on behalf of the small individual farmer with a small number of cattle, whereas the livestock industry and the livestock producers took in the ranchers and the others who were operating as an industry in itself. That's where the Farmers' Union were making the distinction.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — What percentage of the livestock are raised and produced by the stock-growers' association membership?

Mr. Cameron: — That particular thing does not enter into this. You have two organizations.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — How many are there?

Mr. Cameron: — You have two organizations. You have the livestock men in their organization and you have the Farmers' Union who says it speaks for the farmers. Surely to goodness we are not going to classify the Farmers' Union with the strength that they represent in the province as having asked for a resolution such as this merely to embarrass this Government, for political propaganda! We are condemned because it is said we do nothing for the farmers. Here's an amendment that we moved in support of a petition sent here by the Farmers' Union, to get a start made towards the solution of this whole problem. That's why we introduced the amendment.

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — A start has already been made.

Mr. Cameron: — We did not introduce it as political propaganda. If the amendment fails here, we are still free to ask likewise that Ottawa

do something about it; but we are asking that some start be made at home, and the Farmers' Union must have made some study of the situation or they would not have prepared such a carefully worded brief to submit to the Government asking for that particular action.

Premier Douglas: — May I ask my hon. friend: where is there a request for action by the Government? They have never asked the Government for a provincial livestock marketing board.

Mr. Cameron: — I read it very carefully. They are even asking for some financial support to help to organize and popularize it with the farmers.

Premier Douglas: — There's no request there for a plan. They have never made a request to the marketing board to set up a livestock marketing board.

Mr. Cameron: — Let me read again, Mr. Speaker, what the request is. I will try and find it in here:

At the latter conference the producers decided by a substantial majority vote to organize provincial producer board for the purpose of marketing livestock, (provincial producer board) with a further objective (afterwards) of inter-provincial and (even) national co-ordination.

That's right, but they are making the stop here at home.

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — A start has already been made. We've got the marketing board.

Mr. Cameron: — The Minister said he did not ask for the livestock men to come to him. He did the thinking. And yet you have marketing legislation which permits them to do it if they so wish, but yet they have to vote to come in under the scheme and the Premier says, they have been backing away from it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You're having a hard time making a speech, aren't you?

Mr. Cameron: — I'd get along a little better if you would just sit quiet, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. Cameron: — And I want to point these things out. Great fun was made of the Liberals, for instance, for their larger unit legislation. It is supposed to have been passed with the idea that if ratepayers wanted to form themselves into a larger unit they were permitted to do so. They could take a vote and, if it carried, they were permitted to do so. It was greatly ridiculed that it was not solving the situation at all. The same thing is applicable right now to your marketing legislation in that they may take a vote (if they so wished) to come in under it. Here some action is being asked of the Provincial Government, and this amendment is not intended to embarrass the Government. We are trying to draw to the attention of this House, in this amendment, the statement that is produced here on behalf

March 18, 1954

of the Farmers' Union, and prepare for further co-ordination with the Federal Government.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You don't have to tell us what to do. We're going to do it.

Mr. Cameron: — You're going to do it? What are you going to do, Mr. Minister?

Mr. McDonald: — Talk, mostly.

Mr. Cameron: — Those are the things, Mr. Speaker, that I wanted to point out and put on the record. Here is your petition behind it. You have had no representation asking for your resolution, but here is definite representation representing the farmers of Saskatchewan asking for this particular amendment, or a resolution along the lines of this particular amendment. Because of that I am going to support that amendment.

Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, I am not just exactly sure what the hon. member from Maple Creek was attempting to prove ...

Mr. Lopston: — You're not expected to be. Your Minister does the thinking over there.

Mr. Brown: — I think I could say of this side of the House, I don't know in what classification we would put the attempted thinking which apparently the member for Maple Creek has undertaken to do. If the hon. member for Maple Creek wished to do something for the livestock producers of this province along the lines of this co-called amendment, then all he has to do is get the livestock producers to submit a plan to the board, and the board is under obligation to have a vote taken of the plan. It's as simple as that. And when he attempts to create the impression that this submission which the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union made to the members here is asking for the implementation of the amendment which was moved by the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Lopston), he is attempting to read something into their brief which is definitely not there.

Premier Douglas: — They haven't a plan prepared yet.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — That is right. They point out that they haven't got a plan as yet, and as the hon. member read it, he must have realized that they realize that as yet they haven't got a plan worked out, but they are (as they say here) working in conjunction with the Saskatchewan Livestock Pool in an attempt to work out a plan, and once the plan is worked out, then they are going to come to the Government when they have their marketing plan worked out, they will come to this Government and ask this Government to undertake and assist them in an educational campaign among the livestock producers of this province. When a plan is submitted to this Government by the livestock producers of this province, a plan which they think is feasible, one which they think will work, you can rest assured that this Government will do all in its power to undertake the educational campaign and, if necessary, to assist them in financing the educational campaign and, if necessary, to assist them in financing the educational campaign to get the farmers interested in an orderly marketing of their products.

Here is the point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman suggested that he was not bringing this in for political purposes or for political propaganda. Well, I suggest that that is exactly what he is doing.

When he brought in his amendment he wiped out all the requests that we were making in respect to asking the Federal Government to assume any responsibility. They are asking by their amendment that the Federal Government be relieved of any responsibility whatsoever, and that all the responsibility will be on this Provincial Government, and as such they are not suggesting any concrete solution to this question of orderly marketing.

I suggest that they are moving it strictly for the purpose of political expediency and I want to further suggest that if they vote for the amendment which they brought in, then, on the basis of logic, they can do nothing else but vote against the original motion. They cannot have it both ways. They cannot possibly vote for their amendment and vote for the resolution on the Order Paper, or their logic is beyond anything ...

Mr. Lopston: — That doesn't mean anything.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — It was suggested that I should know them better than that. Well, I will have to wait and see how they do vote on the original motion, because I assure you they will have an opportunity because I will most firmly oppose the amendment and support the original resolution.

Mr. F. A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a word or two to this debate. The member for Maple Creek spent considerable time reading over the appendix of this brief. Evidently the explanation that the Premier had given, pointing out that British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Ontario had legislation on their statute books enabling producers to have a producer board if they so saw fit, escaped the notice of the member for Maple Creek altogether. He was reading about the conferences being held in Winnipeg and again in Saskatoon and he pointed out that they wanted to organize producer boards for the purpose of marketing livestock. He read there also that Manitoba is proceeding to launch an educational campaign. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the members across the aisle would have thought of what had happened in this House they would know that this Government is just about ten years ahead of Manitoba. We carried out that educational campaign some years ago, when we put on the statute books our legislation enabling them to set up producer boards if they so saw fit.

He refers to the Liberal larger unit legislation. I believe he and his colleagues have had considerable say about education in this House on previous occasions. He should be well aware of the fact that education is a provincial responsibility. We do not educate the children in this province and sell them outside of the province like they do in some other provinces of Canada. We are not exporting babies from this province; but we are exporting livestock from this province, of all different kinds. It is quite one thing to pass larger unit legislation, but it is another thing altogether for livestock legislation.

I cannot, for the life of me, follow the mentality of member who proceed to follow the lines that we have heard here, this evening, from across the floor. Anybody would think that we were part of Russia or something, in Saskatchewan, when we were asking the Federal Government to treat Saskatchewan in a fair and just manner and to give to Saskatchewan some of the things that we have a right to expect, as one of the ten provinces of this great country of ours. Surely we have a right as a province, to expect that Ottawa should

March 18, 1954

have some responsibility for the people of this province; yet every time a resolution is moved in this House that they think embarrasses their colleagues at Ottawa, they say, "Oh, you should have the responsibility for that."

We have, under our B. N. A. Act, certain jurisdictional responsibilities, certain things we are responsible for, certain things for which we are not responsible; certain things Ottawa is responsible for, certain things we are responsible for jointly. If there was ever a case where a Federal government (not only of this country but of other countries) is responsible for legislation, it is our Federal Government when it comes to the handling of export commodities. The only thing they are trying to do is to take the embarrassment away from the Federal Government. They do not like to see the Federal government put on the stand for election promises they have made in years gone by, and are deliberately trying to evade the issues altogether, when it comes to that responsibility.

We could have a marketing board in this province and throughout Canada and have a basic price within our boundaries for commodities, but as the member for Shellbrook (Mr. Larsen) has said on previous occasions, if we only export 3 or 4 per cent of our commodities on overseas markets, immediately the attitude they adopt is that that becomes our internal price instead of just the price for our extra surplus. The time is long past due when we need in this country a board which will handle livestock products as the Wheat Board is now handling grain.

I am going to oppose the amendment and vote for the motion.

The question being put on the amendment, it was negated by 33 votes against 7.

Mr. Speaker: — The debate is now on the main motion. Is the House ready for the question?

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to just say a word before the question is put. I want to say that we on this side of the House support this motion because we believe that the marketing of farm products through a Federal agency is the only solution and offers the only permanent solution, to the problem of the agricultural industry in this country. I would point out that even the Farmers' Union brief recognizes that problem and says that the ultimate hope, of course, is to get some type of national marketing scheme.

I want to say this also. If we do not get a national marketing scheme, then of course I think agriculture is going to pay a pretty disastrous price as a result of the failure of the Federal Government to act on this question.

I had hoped that the Opposition would support this because on two occasions in the past a resolution of this nature passed unanimously. The Opposition, of course, cannot vote for it now, because they just voted for an amendment to strike out all the words after "Assembly". I regret that very much. I think that will weaken the case which we are now going to try to make to Ottawa. The farm organizations in this province, the co-operative organizations in this province and in other provinces, have been asking Ottawa, and we will continue to ask Ottawa, to set up federal marketing agencies along the lines recommended in this resolution. It certainly would

have strengthened the hand of the farm organizations if the whole House had been unanimous, as it has been in days gone by; but in view of the fact that my friends want to strike it all out, of course they will not be able to vote for it now.

But I would like to say, if the Federal Government does not set up a federal marketing agency ...

Mr. Lopston: — You said it was useless; that it didn't mean anything.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Speak out loud!

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — If the Federal Government does not set up such legislation, I say we will pay a pretty serious price. Then the producers will be left with no alternative but to look around for some other method of marketing. The Farmers' Union have suggested that they are going to look around for some other alternative. They, too, would prefer a national marketing plan such as we have advocated; but if they don't get it, they say here in this statement which was read:

We want to make a special study of a plan with a view to endorsing the principle by resolution in the House during the session and when the plan is finally worked out in more detail and is ready to be launched on a provincial basis we trust the Government will, as an investment in the livestock industry of Saskatchewan, assist by helping to finance and otherwise support the educational campaign.

We have already indicated to both the Farmers' Union and to the Poultry Producers and to the Livestock producers that we will not only be glad to help them, but we will be glad to give them whatever technical assistance they need in preparing a plan, in examining it and in studying it. We are prepared to do for them exactly what we did for the honey producers; that is, give them a vote of money to carry on an educational campaign. We will be glad to conduct the vote so as to save them the expense of doing that. We are prepared to do that. The fact is, of course, that they have not got a plan yet that has been approved by the various producers. If they get such a plan, we will be glad to consider it. We will be glad to assist them in popularizing it. We will be glad to assist them in getting a vote, and if that vote is successful such a plan will be set up.

I must say, however, that such a plan, if it is presented, will be a second choice and, in my opinion, very much a second choice, to what is contained in this resolution. We are asking the Federal Government to give us the only kind of marketing legislation that can possibly serve the producers in the kind of world we live in, today. I am only too sorry that the members opposite have not seen their way clear to support this resolution.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I would just like to make a further comment for the benefit of the House. We have been working with the Co-operative Livestock Producers and the Farmers' Union for the past year and a half, studying marketing legislation. When I

March 18, 1954

met the livestock producers they stated that they wished to have a scheme similar to the Wheat Board. We undertook very extensive research into the matter and made the material available to the Co-operative Livestock Producers and to the Farmers' Union as well. It has been under study now for the ultimate, the most satisfactory board will be a livestock marketing board similar to the Wheat Board.

That is well understood between ourselves, the Co-operatives and the Farmers' Union. So we are just simply expressing the original hope that they had when they entered this matter of developing support for a livestock marketing board. It will be well understood when this Legislature favours this resolution to Ottawa, that we are asking for the ultimate.

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say on this resolution, that I can disagree with the Premier that because we moved an amendment we cannot support the original motion.

Premier Douglas: — Oh! Did you read the amendment?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Cameron: — And I want to tell you why.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Oh, that's a hot one.

Mr. Cameron: — Because, as the Premier said ...

Gov't. Member: — Oh, is that ...

Mr. Cameron: — When you are finished over there I will continue. The Premier said, "We will appeal to Ottawa first, and if they don't give it, it will be a sad day for the farmer; then we will have to consider some other alternative; then we in the province will enter into the picture." That is his reason for voting against the amendment. Our reason is that they are asking that the province take initial steps now...

Premier Douglas: — No, they didn't. Where? That is not in the brief.

Mr. Cameron: — It is in the brief and in the amendment ...

Premier Douglas: — That's not in the brief.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Leave him alone, and he will hang himself.

Some Hon. Member: — Read it!

Mr. Cameron: — We have lots of time. We have five minutes yet and that is more than I need. I want to say this, if I can get my thoughts back together again, after all that.

Premier Douglas: — What thoughts?

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — We can't wait that long.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Cameron: — Let me say this. You are doing exactly the same thing; you are asking Ottawa to do it. I agree with you perhaps, Ottawa should be committed to this. But why should we not attempt to do something at home as well, and do it first? That is what the amendment is asking for; and that is why we can support the main motion as well. There is no question about it. We have supported it in the past; we have sent these resolutions down to Ottawa ...

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member doesn't need to convince them of your right. You know your right and the House knows its rights.

Mr. Cameron: — What is the point, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: — The point is your tedious repetition, because what you are saying now you already said before.

Mr. Cameron: — I was speaking to the amendment before, Mr. Speaker. If you would just give me attention I would have been finished a long time ago, but for all those interruptions. There are only about five of us here, and we can't even get a word in because there are 42 over there.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Well, speak out loud, Alex!

Mr. Cameron: — You wouldn't be interested in what I am saying anyway, Tom, so there is no use me talking out loud.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Gov't. Member: — Go ahead, it's your nickel.

Mr. Cameron: — And we have passed these resolutions. We have not changed our opinion on the matter at all. It is just that we are taking the most essential step here at home as well as continuing to urge Ottawa. There is nothing contrary in that logic; nothing whatever. The Premier says, "if Ottawa won't do it, we probably might be forced to do it" ...

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Typical Liberal footsy!

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I did not say the Government would be forced to do it. The Government has done it now. The Government set the legislation up. The producers might be forced to do it. As far as the Government is concerned we have done everything now; we have laid up the Board, set up the machinery ...

Mr. Lopston: — But you said that Ottawa would not do anything about it.

Mr. Cameron: — That's right; so there is nothing contradictory in our stand at all. We still urge them to do it, but we want action here at home first.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this motion before the vote is taken. I know I haven't very much time, but I notice the amendment to the motion, and I am trying

March 18, 1954

to get an understanding of the logic of the members of the Opposition on this question.

What the hon. member for Maple Creek said just now was that they wanted to get some action at home but they are in favour of this motion as it is here today. If that had been the case, Mr. Speaker, they would have moved an amendment by an addition to the motion, not by striking out and substituting. That was a clear indication that 15 minutes ago they were opposed to a national marketing board for livestock. They may talk themselves blue in the face but they can't get around that fact.

Mr. Lopston: — What are you so worried about, if we are with you?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — All of the words of the motion were cut out and something completely contrary was put in, which would have become the whole motion had they won the vote on the amendment.

Mr. Lopston: — Why are you so anxious that we vote against it?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — And nothing else at all.

Mr. McDonald: — Why do you want us to vote against it?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I just want to show the hon. members ...

Mr. McDonald: — We just want to see your reaction.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — ... how illogical they can be.

Mr. Lopston: — Now he's trying to get us to vote against it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — As a matter of fact ...

Mr. Lopston: — Usually they are trying to get us to vote with them.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — ... they are afraid to maintain the stand they took 15 minutes ago, and to vote against this motion; and this is complete confirmation of what has often been said in this House about the stand of the Liberal Party on marketing primary products. They never support it until they are in a corner. Our hon. friends over here are now in a corner, and they are going to have to support orderly marketing on a national basis ...

Mr. McDonald: — We always have.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — ... and that is the only time they ever give support for it. In 15 minutes a change has taken place.

Mr. Lopston: — You just said that. We passed it twice.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker...

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Let's hear 'Hammy'.

Mr. Lopston: — You already said that we passed unanimously twice — on two

previous occasions. It is because we want action at home...

Mr. McDonald: — We on this side of the House have been unanimous in our thinking for, I think, ever since I came into this House with regard to this marketing legislation, as the Premier said.

We have voted on several occasions for this amendment, or at least for this motion; and as far as I am concerned I will vote for it tonight. I haven't changed my mind one iota in the past 15 minutes or in the past five or six years; and maybe more...

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Changing your watch, Hammy?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, it is rather curious to see these people squirm, when they are put on the spot. They have done a lot of squirming this evening, because we have asked the Government of this province to implement something that has been asked by a large number of producers in this province who were represented by the Farmers' Union. They have turned that request down, so now we are back on the main motion and, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation as I said before, in supporting this motion, because if our Provincial Government is not prepared to go ahead then I am prepared to send all the strength that I can, with all members of this House, to Ottawa asking them to implement the request of the main motion. I sincerely hope that all members on both sides of the House will support this motion, because I believe that if this Government is not prepared to act as they have been requested by a large group of producers who were represented by the Farmers' Union, then we will have to go to Ottawa again, this year, and ask for it and I will support the motion.

The question being put on Mr. Feusi's motion, it was agreed to unanimously.

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