

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fifth Session - Tenth Legislature**

Wednesday, March 3, 1948

The House met at 3.00 o'clock p.m.

**ON THE ORDERS OF THE DAY**

**Mr. W.J. Patterson (Leader of the Opposition):** — Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I wish to make a correction of a statement which appears in the 'Leader-Post' report of the speech of the Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. J.L. Phelps), yesterday. He is reported to have said that the former Liberal Government never had a surplus in the Power Commission, nor was anything set aside for depreciation nor for sinking fund, in the first ten years of the Commission's operations. That statement is not correct. On December 31, 1939, at the end of the first ten years of operation, the Power Commission, as its annual Report shows . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker; What are we having now — a Budget debate? This is not a question of privilege. He can reply to the statement in the Budget debate.

**Mr. W.J. Patterson:** — I have already exercised my right to speak in that debate, and I am now exercising my right to correct a statement which I know to be incorrect.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I have frequently had to listen to statements that I knew to be incorrect, because I had exhausted my right to speak in the debate.

**Premier:** — The hon. member may have exhausted his right, but he has four other members of his Party who could reply.

**Mr. Patterson:** — I am doing what other members have done — that is, exercise their right to correct statements in the Press.

**Mr. Speaker:** — If the member is rising on Orders of the Day to correct a statement in the Press, I would rule that he is in order.

**Premier:** — If it were a statement of his own that was incorrectly reported in the Press, that would be right, Mr. Speaker; but it is not a statement of his own.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I understand that he is rising to correct a statement in the Press.

**Mr. Patterson:** — Thanks for your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Phelps:** — If it were his own statement he was correcting!

**Hon. Mr. Valleau:** — It would be quite proper for the hon. member to rise and correct what he considered to be an incorrect report of a statement which he made.

**Mr. Speaker:** — My understanding is that he is rising to correct a statement in the Press. My ruling is that he is in order.

**March 3, 1948**

**Hon. Mr. Valleau:** — On a Point of Order . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Patterson:** — I rise to correct a statement in the Press that the Power Commission had no depreciation reserves set up, prior to the advent of this Government . . .

**Hon. Mr. Phelps:** — I rise to a point of order . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! If you wish to go on record as saying that the statement in the Press is incorrect, it is your privilege to do so.

**Mr. Patterson:** — That is just what I am trying to do, Sir. The statement in the press is that the former Liberal Government never had a surplus in the Power Commission nor was anything set aside for depreciation nor for sinking fund, in the first ten years of the Commission's operation.

**Hon. Mr. Phelps:** — That isn't what I said.

**Mr. Patterson:** — Well I just quoted from the Annual Report of the Power Commission at the end of the first ten years of operation . . .

**Hon. Mr. Valleau:** — That has nothing to do with the Press report.

**A Voice:** — Oh let him go ahead.

**Mr. Patterson:** — . . . showing that the Power Commission had accumulated reserves of \$2,200,000; and if I was going to make a speech, I would go on to show that in 1944 those figures had grown to \$3,300,000.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — We have to give you credit for sticking with it!

## **BUDGET DEBATE**

The House resumed from Tuesday March 2, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (the House to go into Committee of Supply.)

**Mr. Marion (Athabaska):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in this debate, I have to admit it was the biggest disappointment I ever had. I have always made it a point to be in my Chair when the Hon. Premier spoke, and always got quite a kick out of it when he opened up on us and gave us the works; but, Mr. Speaker, this time I could hardly believe my ears, as all the Premier did in the former debate was to pass the buck on to the Federal Government.

The people know that this C.C.F. provincial government is not doing one-tenth for the people what the Federal Government is doing. I sincerely hope that before the Session is over the Hon. Premier will get on the beam, and at least make an attempt to defend his policies and those of his Government.

This is the best government Saskatchewan ever had for passing the buck. We have heard government speakers pass it to the federal government, to the departments, to the departmental stores, to the Canadian Pacific Railway and other corporations. We are not here to listen to that kind of talk, but to receive from that government an accounting of its conduct in provincial affairs, and to learn something of the future plans, if any — if it has a future, after the next election, which I doubt.

The only man, so far, who really tried to explain his Department, was the hon. Minister of Natural Resources, in his speech yesterday. We want to know what other steps are planned to bring about complete socialization. Apparently this government does not want to talk about that. They want to catch their victims unawares, as they caught the people up north.

The Hon. Premier's address was largely the same old stuff he has been talking about over the radio and at meetings throughout the province. It was dressed up with a new frill here and there, but the costume certainly did not have that 'new look' so essential for smartness.

I intend to devote my time to discussing conditions in the North. As the hon. members know, I represent the real North, the people who inhabit the north-western quarter of this province. Farming there is limited to a few garden patches in the rocks. Streams and lakes are our highways — and in this connection, I really have to thank the Minister of Natural Resources for getting as far as he did with that highway from Green Lake to Fort Black.

**Mr. Procter:** — Somebody has to build the highways, if the Minister won't.

**Mr. L.M. Marion:** — Dealing first with the subject of health, I note that the Government has extended the hospitalization scheme for the North on a voluntary basis. Those who issue this service can have it if they pay the annual \$5.00 tax. Very few of my constituents will be able to take advantage of this offer because they cannot spare the money for the tax — they just haven't got it. I notice a small percentage of the people of the North have paid the tax. That percentage pretty well represents the number who can pay. More people would have come under this scheme if the tax had been lower, say \$3.00, as suggested by me. I will say this Mr. Speaker; after we had had so much compulsion in the North we did appreciate that one word — 'voluntary' — in the extension of hospitalization in the North.

I note that the annual tax must be paid between September 1st and November 30th. Prior to seeding, after threshing, after selling his grains the farmer has ready cash to meet his obligations. In the North these are

**March 3, 1948**

lean months, the months of virtually no earnings. Might I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Government give special study to the problems of the North which differ from those of the agricultural South, to devise a hospitalization plan which will fit the needs and financial position of my people.

With respect to education, the Government appears to be doing its utmost give education to all the people. They have co-operated with us, and we with them. They have built new schools and teacherages.

In dealing with natural resources, I am very sorry to say that I cannot compliment this Department of the Government as I have the others. As far as the Minister and his Department are concerned, there is no such word as "voluntary." Whenever anyone in the South refers to 'Uncle Joe' you people immediately think of Joe Stalin. When the people of the North talk about 'Uncle Joe' they think only of another Joe, the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources — the "Dictator of the North", as we call him.

Now, virtually everything connected with trying to earn a living comes under the control of the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources. I will have more to say about this later.

First — dealing with trapping — this year foxes and long-haired furs have practically no market value. Squirrels, weasels and wild mink were the only furs worth any price. There was a fair drop of squirrels and weasels, but very few mink. The only thing left, on which we were depending, was muskrats, and it appears we will have a fair crop of them; however, there is a 'joker' in regard to muskrat. They must be sold through the Saskatchewan Marketing Service. The Government is trying to make it appear that the Service was established to help the trappers to get full value for their pelts; but if the Government is so kind and interested in the welfare of the trapper, why was this scheme made compulsory? A Field Officer once told me the reason why sale to the Government Service was made compulsory. It was to keep a check on the 'rat pelts, to see to it that no 'rats were bootlegged out of the province. There are more 'rats being bootlegged out of the province than ever before. Why? The trappers need the money — they get, generally, 75 cents or \$1.00 a pelt — and they get it in one payment, on delivery — but when they sell to the Government they get an advance of 25 cents on each pelt and have to wait for months for the balance. Because of their urgent need of cash, they take less than they would otherwise receive, to get them cash immediately.

**Hon. Mr. Phelps:** — Are you not aware — I think you are — of the initial price paid this year, of \$1.00 per pelt?

**Mr. Marion:** — I am talking about what I have seen, Mr. Speaker, not what I see later on. I am no prophet — I don't know what 'Uncle Joe' is talking about. The only advantage I see in this compulsory scheme is to help the large company we have in the North, the 'enemy' that was accused on the floor of this House of exploiting the people of the North, by the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources. I refer to the Hudson's Bay Company. Possibly my hon. friend, the Minister of Natural Resources, has had a change of heart,

because here is what has actually happened in the North: Muskrat trappers, after they get a few 'rats, say five or six or ten, take these to a Field Officer of the Department — or, where there is no field officer, to the Hudson's Bay Post. They receive an advance of 25 cents on each pelt from the Field Officer or from the Hudson's Bay Company, which acts as an Agent for the Government Fur Marketing Service. On ten pelts the advance would be \$2.50 which the trapper urgently needs to support his family. This is repeated as more 'rats are caught and delivered. At the end of the season, say the trapper has delivered 100 'rats — he has received an advance of \$25.00; then he has to wait until these rats have been sold at the Auction in Regina before he can get the rest of his money. Because of the difficulty in getting the pelts out, owing to the spring break-up, they do not reach the market until June or July, and it is not until later that the trappers receive the balance of their money.

Last year the trappers at Ile a la Crosse created such a rumpus that Mr. Tunstead, who is one of the government officials, had to come from Prince Albert and arrange with the trappers to pay them another 25 cents a pelt to keep them quiet; because they had to wait so long for their money from the Government, the trappers had to get advances in order to keep going, as the wholesalers will not advance goods to the 'free traders'; they cannot carry the trappers. The trappers are forced to go to the Hudson's Bay Company; which makes advances in the form of goods according to the catch each trapper has. The Company knows what each trapper has caught, and to get the advances the trappers have to sign their catch over to the Company. Eventually, the cheques reach the Company in five or six months.

I remember one occasion when Mr. Tunstead flew over from Prince Albert to hand out the cheques to the trappers. He called them all together give them a 'pep talk' about how much the government was doing for them through the compulsory Marketing Service. He had a fist full of cheques. Those which went to the Company he placed in a pile before him, and when he had finished his pile it had nine out of every ten cheques he had brought with him. We of the North describe the compulsory selling scheme of the Government in these words: "Help the big Companies and Make the Trappers Pay."

Under the old scheme trappers could sell where they wished. There was keen competition for their furs from the Hudson's Bay Company, the free traders and other fur buyers, which resulted in higher prices to the trappers. The trappers got cash on delivery. They did not have to wait for months and months for their money and be at the mercy of the Hudson's Bay Company for advances. They could sell for the highest price, and buy what they needed at the lowest price. As prices on the Fur Marketing Services have been going, the trappers would have been receiving, with no deductions, more for their muskrat pelts than they are receiving under this sale by compulsion.

**March 3, 1948**

With respect to fish, we have heard a great deal with respect to the way the fish policies of this Government are helping the fishermen. Mr. Speaker, that is just so much 'hot air' — the Government has not helped the fishermen, and I have yet to meet the fisherman who will say that the Government has helped him. We in the North know from sad experience that the Government does not pay as much to the fishermen for their catch as private enterprise pays. We also know that the Government would not have control of one lake in the North if the people had their say. We have a lake close to Ile a la Crosse, and if it were not compulsory to deliver the catch to the Government, the Government would not get one fish; in fact, the only reason the people fish for the Government is that they are hungry and have to do so in order to eat and live. They are not eating nearly as well as they would be, had the Government stayed out of the fish business and left it to private enterprise.

**Mr. Feeley:** — Would the hon. member permit a question? Is he speaking as a fish dealer, or does he actually fish?

**Mr. Marion:** — I have fished, and I have bought fish — I have done both. I hope you are satisfied. The people actually stopped fishing on another lake, after the Government had taken it over. The people realize the Government is taking advantage of them by using its power to create a monopoly which leaves fisherman at the mercy of low-prices, paid by the Government. This is the biggest piece of 'skull-duggery', one could imagine, to take advantage of the people of the North who are in the main, illiterate, Metis people. I suggest to my hon. friend, the Minister of Natural Resources, that he had better wake up and come down to earth, out of the socialist clouds — instead of blabbing away about what he is doing for the North.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I must remind the hon. member that he cannot use the word 'skull-duggery' in connection with a Minister of the Crown.

**Mr. Marion:** — I will it allow you to correct me at any time, Mr. Speaker, and I will take that back.

**Hon. Mr. Valleau:** — The hon. member has referred to the Metis people as being, in the main, illiterate. I wonder if he will tell me when they were deprived of the opportunity of attending school — was it since this Government came in?

**Mr. Marion:** — Mr. Speaker, as I have only so much time on the air, I will tell you exactly, at a later time. I suggest, even though it follows a profiteering formula more ruthless than the North has ever known, the Government Fish Board is losing money, — so we were told by the hon. Leader of the Government, the other day. Recently, someone left on my desk a copy of an elaborate propaganda publication, which this Government has published at a cost of \$500.00 to the people of Saskatchewan. This report of what the Government has done states that the Government Fish Board is handling about half the fish produced in the North. Most of the remainder is handled by private enterprise.

The Hon. Premier said the other day that the Government had rendered the people of the North a great favour by establishing fish filleting plants. Long before the Government plants were established, the private enterprise companies had built plants in the North — three of them — the same number that the Fish Board has. Now, let us compare the operations of the government enterprise with the operations of private enterprise. Both operate the same number of filleting plants. Both handle about the same quantity of fish. The private enterprise firms pay more to their fishermen for their fish; the private companies pay royalties of one cent a pound on trout, and half a cent on whitefish, which I do not think the government enterprises pay.

**Hon. Mr. Phelps:** — Mr. Speaker; may I correct the hon. gentleman? The Fish Board pay royalty the same as anybody else, just the same as the Timber Board pay stumpage — just exactly. Don't be under any misapprehension about that.

**Mr. Marion:** — Mr. Speaker, I did not say they didn't. I said 'I thought' they did not. Government enterprise also escapes all the other taxes which it requires private enterprise to pay. The private company operates its own aeroplane service, whereas the Saskatchewan Government Airways is at the beck and call of the Government Fish Board; yet, with everything in its favour, the Government Fish Board is losing money.

**Hon. Mr. Phelps:** — I rise to correct the hon. gentleman. I would inform him that whenever the Fish Board take an Airways 'plane, like everybody else they pay for it at the chartered rates. My hon. friend knows that.

**Mr. Marion:** — No, I didn't. Here, we have, side by side, a private enterprise, efficiently run, making progress under heavy handicaps — and a socialist government, with everything in its favour, losing money and at the same time cheating the fishermen of their just returns. I believe that we have had demonstrated to us the fallacy of this socialist government's claim that greater efficiency is obtained by turning an industry over to super-planners — the 'boys in the back room'. You see before you an example of what experienced private enterprise can do in the face of obstacles created by a government which is in competition with it. You also see before you the dismal failure of heelers and hirelings of this Government who are trying to run a business about which they know nothing.

I ask the people of Saskatchewan: which is better for this province — business efficiently run by experienced private enterprises, who pay the producers more — or wasteful and inefficiently-run state enterprise? The efficient operator contributes progress, whereas the other will eventually lead to stagnation and ruin. The people of Saskatchewan are being told that fishermen are paid more than ever before. That is just another fiction of this Government. Fishermen who are forced to sell to the Government are receiving from two to four cents a pound less for their fish than private enterprise is paying. They are supposed to receive additional payments from the government, but these have at no time been sufficient, in the few cases where they have been paid, to bring the total near that paid by private enterprise.

**March 3, 1948**

I have here an eight-cent cheque from the Saskatchewan Fish Board to George Belanger. It is supposed to be the second payment on his fish (or advance payment, either one). These cheques are becoming quite a joke in the North. Thank Heaven, the sense of humour of the people of the North has, so far at least, escaped restrictions imposed by my hon. friend, the Minister of Natural Resources — we still have the freedom of laughter left. We do not have newspapers in the North, but the children of the Ile a la Crosse Mission turn out a mimeographed publication — "Island Breezes". Permit me to read a few paragraphs from the last issue. This particular item is headed "For the Museum" and reads as follows:

"It would be worthwhile starting a Museum to preserve this rarity for future generations. This is no fossil we are talking about, but a cheque from the Provincial Fish Board, forwarded to Francois Bouvier at Ile a la Crosse in a sealed envelope bearing a four-cent stamp; amount of cheque, one cent only. It is worth framing along with George Belanger's cheque for eight cents only, and George Murray's for twelve cents only, all from the same source. It pays to fish; but who? That is the \$64 question in the North. One fact we cannot deny — the Board is honest to the last cent."

Also in the same issue, appears this breezy little item, headed -"Wanted — Dentist and Optometrist" — and by the way, I hope the Premier takes note of this one:

"Common sense and experience have long convinced the doctors, nurses and teachers, that it does not suffice for them to ascertain the needs of the children. Something must be done. Take for instance, eyes and teeth. What good does it do for a child to have on his community record — "Eyes 20-20, 8 decayed teeth" — if neither dentist nor oculist ever come our way? During December, another 64 teeth were extracted from the school children. Who will save the other decaying teeth, and the eyes? It is the very few who have the means to go to Meadow Lake, let alone Prince Albert, to see a dentist or an oculist. A twelve-cent cheque from the Fish Board does not help much, either. That will be a Red Letter day when the Mercy 'Plane drops a dentist and an oculist at Ile a la Crosse."

The people of the North, Mr. Speaker, cannot provide for their needs on twelve-cent, four-cent and one-cent cheques. In spite of it all, the Fish Board is losing money! I note that another Crown corporation in the North, the Saskatchewan Government Air Service, is making money. It is an occasion when a 'plane lands at Ile a la Crosse, similar to the arrival of a train at a small prairie town. Everyone flocks to the landing, in summer or in winter, to see who is arriving. Always, when a government 'plane lands, there is at least one northern government official, and often as many as ten aboard. By simply taking money out of one pocket and putting it in the other, the government is able to show a profit for the Air Service because of the horde of government servants who are flying in the North;



but the Fish Board, Timber Board, Department of Natural Resources, and other Departments, have to pay their salaries. One reason the Fish Board is losing money is the number of employees it has to carry on the payroll. The lakes seem to be filled with Fish Board officials, et cetera. That is good business for the Government Air Service, as I venture to say that nine out of ten of its passengers are government employees; but it is bad business for the fishermen who have to pay the shot, in reduced earnings. In the North, when a plane goes over, we say — "there goes our plane." It is ours, all right!

I wish to deal with one more matter concerning fish. On February 16th, the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources answered a question concerning prices being paid to fishermen at Snake Lake by the Government Fish Board. When I say he 'answered' the question, I am not really stating the facts. He evaded answering it by giving the prices f.o.b. railhead. He explained that yesterday. It happens that the nearest railhead to Snake Lake is Meadow Lake. The Hon. Minister was not asked what the prices were at Meadow Lake, which was the answer given, but at Snake Lake. By evading a direct and correct answer to the question, the Hon. Minister is trying to mislead the public. In the answer, the Hon. Minister said the f.o.b. railhead prices paid on frozen fish ranged from ten cents a pound for dressed medium white fish to thirteen cents a pound for dressed jumbo whitefish.

**Mr. Feeley:** — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member allowed to accuse the Minister of deliberately trying to mislead the public?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Your Point of Order is well taken. The hon. member must withdraw.

**Mr. Marion:** — I shall withdraw, Mr. Speaker; but I can explain what I happen to know are facts here. In the answer, the Hon. Minister said the f.o.b. railhead prices paid on frozen fish ranged from ten cents a pound for dressed medium whitefish to thirteen cents a pound for dressed jumbo whitefish. Six cents a pound was the price for dressed and headless jacks. In a footnote, he said deductions were made from these prices for transportation to the f.o.b. point, boxes, et cetera. As a matter of fact — and this is well-known, throughout my constituency, fishermen on Snake Lake actually receive only four cents a pound for whitefish, regardless of whether they are medium, large or jumbo. Fishermen are paid one cent a pound for jackfish. These are the prices paid to fishermen when their fish are picked up at Snake Lake. Why did not the Hon. Minister give us the correct information instead of trying to bury it in prices quoted for an f.o.b. point 135 miles away?

**Hon. Mr. Phelps:** — Mr. Speaker: I rise to correct the hon. gentleman. The fishermen on Snake Lake do not only receive four cents a pound for fish irrespective of grade. I state again, that the fish are graded according

**March 3, 1948**

to government inspection, and they are not paid four cents on a flat rate.

**Mr. Marion:** — I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that is the information I have — that they are not graded on the lake as they are caught. There is a terrific spread between the f.o.b. railhead prices quoted and the prices actually paid to fishermen. To give the government the benefit of any doubt, I will use the lowest price quoted on whitefish — ten cents a pound. At the very outside, the cost of transportation to railhead, and of boxes, is two cents a pound. The fishermen are paid four cents a pound, for either jumbo or small fish, whichever one he wants. Add your two cents for transportation and boxes and that brings the total to six cents. That leaves a border margin of four cents a pound on medium whitefish. The margin on larger fish would be five cents. If you say I am wrong, well I am wrong, that is all — and on jumbo whitefish, seven cents. The f.o.b. price, on jackfish is six cents a pound. Deduct the one cent paid to the fishermen and the two cents for transportation and boxes, and that leaves a margin of three cents a pound for the Fish Board. Let me repeat, on whitefish the Board's margin runs from four to seven cents a pound, depending on the size of the fish; on jackfish the margin is three cents. There is something wrong with the Fish Board when, acting as the middleman, it is losing money, especially when it has such a margin as this to work on. Where does the money go?

**Hon. Mr. Phelps:** — Will the hon. gentleman permit a question? Does he not know, Mr. Speaker, that these prices are f.o.b., and the fishermen on Snake Lake or any place else can avail themselves of that price at any time, if they want to look after this transportation. I think the member knows that. If he does not, then I think he should — and they can always take advantage of that f.o.b. price. In fact we prefer to take delivery of our fish at the railhead.

**Mr. Marion:** — We also know, Mr. Speaker, that any place where the Fish Board operates, we cannot sell our fish any other place. We have to sell to the Fish Board — so what are we going to do there? I paid a hurried visit to Ile a la Crosse in my constituency a week ago, when I confirmed what I already know to be a fact — that the government was only paying four cents a pound for whitefish and one cent a pound for jackfish, on Snake Lake. I also learned that there were only two fishermen left on the lake. The rest had quit — they had left because they could not make any money at the prices being paid by the Fish Board. As the Fish Board has a monopoly, no one can fish there unless they sell to the government. Snake Lake is an "A" Lake. For inferior fish, from "B" lakes which are just as accessible, private buyers are paying six cents a pound for whitefish and four and a half cents for jackfish. If they could find better fish at Snake Lake, private buyers would be paying nine cents a pound for this whitefish, and four and a half cents for jacks. It is ruthless exploitation such as this, under socialism, that is reducing the standard of living of all people to the lowest level I have ever seen. That is the situation now, when fish prices are high on the retail market. What would it be like if prices for equipment

and everything else go up, and the fish prices drop? They are not so well off fishing today for the Fish Board as they were in the darkest days of the depression when they were getting two cents a pound. That, Mr. Speaker, is socialism in its application to my people. The security promised by the C.C.F. has turned out to be a greater security than we have ever known.

You may have noticed from the Press that a cavalcade of nine trucks, two snowmobiles, two jeeps, recently left Meadow Lake, carrying 51 men to Great Slave Lake for fishing there. These are men who are being driven out of the province because they cannot make a living under this so-called 'Humanity First' government. Private enterprise offers the little man an opportunity to get ahead if he works, but under socialism the little man is kept down. The good jobs and the good pay go to the C.C.F. Party 'heelers'.

The Hon. Premier the other day spoke about the profits of \$236,000 which had been made by the Timber Board. He suggested that the profits of Crown corporations, which formerly went to Montreal and elsewhere, were being kept in the province — the profits — which this government has credited the Timber Board with having made, do not come out of the people of Montreal but the people of the North, sawmill operators and so on. They are producers of half of what their lumber is worth, and pocket the difference; force all the producers to sell only to the Board. The only achievement of the Timber Board is that it did not eat all the profits up in wages, otherwise it could not lose.

We in the North have been looking forward to the development of our mineral resources. As you know, there are 8,000 square miles of mineralized area in Saskatchewan's North, and about half of it lies in my constituency. There is great activity elsewhere in Canada where there is similar formation, but prospectors in our North are scarcer than the proverbial 'hen's teeth'. There once was a prosperous mining village in our constituency, but it remains a ghost-town — we spoke about it the other day. The Minister of Natural Resources recently announced, through a junior official of his Department, that the Government is going to try to interest private capital in developing these resources. Apparently an effort is being made to convince the mining companies that the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources is only fooling in all his talk of ownership, control and operation of the people's mine by the people. I do not think that private capital will be convinced of a change of heart. They know that the Minister of Natural Resources will not change his policies any more than a leopard can change his spots. There is every reason to believe that the true policy will remain as it was outlined by the Hon. Minister at the C.C.F. Convention in 1946. It stated, briefly, that the socialist government would watch and take action at the appropriate time. In other words, private companies will have to risk expropriation by the government, if they successfully invest money in the development of mines.

**March 3, 1948**

I would like now to deal briefly with the administration of social services in the North by the government.

**Premier:** — Mr. Speaker: I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend, but while he is making a break in his subject, I wonder if I might ask him a question? Do I take from his remarks, made so far, that he is in favour of abolishing the Fish Board and the Timber Board?

**Mr. Marion:** — I would not say that I am against abolishing any of them; but I will tell you this much — if we could abolish that one word, "compulsion" —

**Hon. Mr. Phelps:** — Might I ask the hon. gentleman a question? He says, "abolish compulsion". How could we have the Canadian Wheat Board without compulsion?

**Mr. Marion:** — I am not worried about the federal affairs of the province right now, Mr. Speaker; I am talking about my lousy little constituency of Athabaska.

I will now discuss the administration of social services in the North by the government. In the past, under this government, before my hon. friend, the Minister of Natural Resources, took over the northern half of this province, the Minister of Municipal Affairs had representatives in the North to see that the Indians and sick people were looked after. Since my hon. friend took over the North, a person would starve to death before relief or aid was given to him or her, were it not for the Missions and others interested in the welfare of the northern people. My hon. friend, the Minister of Natural Resources, has what is called a coordinator, but Administrator is his real title. This man's title is much more impressive than are his qualifications. He is supposed to coordinate government activities in the North, and so forth. I understand he is a former school teacher, who left teaching to sell insurance, before he was rescued by the Government with the northern appointment. I doubt if he ever set foot farther north than the Prince Albert National Park before he received the appointment; however, I understand that his wife is a very charming person who served energetically as Secretary of the C.C.F. Constituency organization in Prince Albert during the last provincial election. It would not have been fit and proper to have appointed her, so her husband was chosen. Mr. Wheaton, the northern Administrator, may be the best planner in the world, but he has no actual experience in regard to matters of the North. He does not know conditions there, and when I talked to him recently at Ile a la Crosse, his biggest worry seemed to be that the farmers of the Prince Albert district had not harvested any crops. We all feel sorry for these farmers who did not get any crop; but we of the North have not had a crop since the present government took over. You people of the South should know that our people in the northern part of the province have been used as guinea pigs by this government. How are we getting along? I tell you frankly that were it not for the family allowances which are paid in the North by the Dominion Government, this socialist government would have a big relief problem on its hands.

This provincial government is taking our money in its craze to make profits for the Fur Marketing Board — too bad they did not make any on the Fish Board! — and the Dominion Government is keeping us from destitution and starvation by payment of family allowances. What I would like to know is how the farmers in the South figured they would get away scot-free without being included in the pet socialist schemes of this government? How would you like it if the government told you, the people of the south, how to run your farms? How would you like it if they took your crops and paid you only a fraction of their value?

The Minister of Natural Resources says the Wheat Board, the Fish Board and the Timber Board, are all the same. That is just so much more fiction. The Wheat Board is being continued at the request of farmers, and the farmers receive for their wheat what the wheat is sold for, less the small deduction to cover administration coats. They do not make any profit on that. The Wheat Board does not do as the Fish Board does — pay a person three cents per pound for fish which retails for more than five or six times that amount. The Wheat Board does not do what the Timber Board does — pay a lumberman half the retail selling price of their product. If it did, it would pay the farmers \$1.00 for their wheat and sell it for \$2.00. True, an agreement has been made with Great Britain to sell wheat at a figure which has been below the world market price; but that was done at the request of organized agriculture under a plan which provides guarantees of a stabilized price over a period of years, regardless of drops which may occur in the world wheat market. If the majority of farmers were opposed to marketing through the Wheat Board, the Dominion Government would meet their wishes and return to open market trading.

If we had the same privilege with respect to compulsory marketing of our products through the Fish Board, the Timber Board and the Fur Marketing Service, there would be an immediate end of compulsion. The marketing of our crops would be placed on a voluntary basis, and I have no hesitation in saying that if the people of my constituency were given an opportunity to vote for or against compulsory marketing system, foisted upon them by this government, there would be virtually no votes for compulsion. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have said little since I was elected in this House, but I have listened a great deal and pondered at length over the policies of this government and where they were leading us. What I have given you are facts, spoken by one who, as their elected representative, has a duty to perform in speaking on behalf of those he represents — the people of the northern constituency of Athabaska. I know that my people of the North will agree with me in the expressing of the hope that the people of the South will wake up, and at the forthcoming provincial election show these socialists that they are not wanted; and if they want to keep on with their theories they should go to Russia or somewhere else where the people are not so adverse to being pushed around as we, who have known freedom, are. I will not support the Budget.

**March 3, 1948**

**Mr. Howell (Meadow Lake):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like at the outset to congratulate the Hon. Provincial Treasurer on his very fine presentation of the Budget a few evenings ago. On this occasion I would like to avail myself of the opportunity that the debate presents, to say something with respect to the constituency, which I represent. Before I do that, I want to make a few remarks regarding the speech of my hon. friend who has just spoken.

I hope that everyone here will realize that the hon. member for Athabaska, in speaking on Fish, Fur and Timber, is speaking from the viewpoint of fish and fur dealers, rather than from the general viewpoint of those actively engaged in doing the fishing and cutting the timber and trapping the fur and so on. I believe that when he admitted that there was a large percentage of illiterate people among the Metis population in the far North, he was giving here the most damning indictment ever given by any speaker here because there has never been, in this province, a more neglected corner of the province, so far as education is concerned, than the corner of the province represented by the hon. member for Athabaska, until a few years ago. Until, in some cases, one, two and three years ago, several districts with large numbers of children of school age, had no school whatsoever.

His alarm over the small cheques which some of the people received reminded me of the days when I first came to Saskatchewan, pretty close to 25 years ago. I remember the farmers sitting around, telling about the days that they sent carloads of oats down to the Winnipeg Grain Exchange and got a bill back for some of the excess freight — no cheque at all, simply a bill for the freight.

I do not know who all the people were who left Meadow Lake on this cavalcade — I know who some of them were — but I submit that those who led the cavalcade may have a great deal of difficulty, as usual, this year with their income tax, and that those who went along to do the work will do well, in many cases, to come back and find that they are not in debt to those by whom they were employed.

The trapping industry occupied considerable attention of the hon. member who has just spoken. He seemed to have the greatest complaint with regard to certain features of the present trapping industry, which he calls "compulsory". I would like to say a little about the trapping industry. The trappers, in my opinion, have wanted three things: one is, to have an annual trapping business; they wanted protection on their own trapping grounds from outside, non-resident trappers; and they have wanted fair prices in relation to general market conditions. In the opinion of a great majority of trappers, the Fur Marketing Service has given to them a fair price in relation to market conditions.

Through the conservation areas, and through the trappers' councils, the trappers are being protected from non-resident and outside trappers who, in the past, had been able to come in and take out the whole harvest for

themselves, without having done anything to help put that harvest there. The Conservation areas, from what the trappers say in the parts of the country that I represent, are eminently successful; but they expect that this year there will be an increase of fifty percent over last year, so far as the muskrat catch is concerned; and I know that last year was larger than the year before, and that that year was larger than the year before that. I think the almost unanimous opinion among trappers would be that the conservation plan, as carried out by this Government, is largely responsible for that success.

The great Liberal criticism, of course, in that there is something in there called "compulsion" that is involved. They say the trappers are being told how to trap and where to trap and so on, and all about it; that is to say, Mr. Speaker, that if the Department of Natural Resources sends out to the trappers a pamphlet illustrating approved methods of trapping and skinning and all these other trapping techniques, according to the Liberals who are now out of power, they say that is compulsion and regimentation — that they are telling the trappers how to trap and all about it. I am sure that if they were in office, and encouraging the trapping industry in that way, they would call that "encouragement" to the trapping industry; but because they are out of office and trying to think up a scheme of how to get back into power, they call it "compulsion". I think it would be just as absurd for anyone to get up and say that the universities are regimenting the people, the young men and women of Saskatchewan who are there because they are instructing them according to the best techniques and the best knowledge available. I think it would be just as absurd to say that the Normal Schools are regimenting prospective teachers by instructing them in the best-known teaching techniques.

When the Liberals tell us that the trapping scheme is fine, but we should take away the "compulsion", we should allow the trappers the right to sell their muskrats and their beaver wherever they like — they are going against the grain in two ways: first of all, they are in opposition to the Federal Liberal Government, which pays sixty percent of the cost of rehabilitation projects, provided the provincial government in Saskatchewan will look after the complete sale of all muskrats and beaver taken on those areas; and so, when the Liberals, like the previous speaker, the member for Athabaska, gets up and decries that policy, he is simply openly opposing the policy that Tucker and other Liberals are carrying out at Ottawa at the present time. Then, there is a second thing wrong with this talk of "compulsion" and the suggestion that trappers should be allowed to sell muskrats and fur where they like. I am going to read something to the members, which is rather brief, and I am sorry that the hon. member for Athabaska has left the House, because in view of what he said, he may have thought that I was reading from the Communist Manifesto. Here it is:

"The fur trade is far from being satisfactory, and requires a complete reorganization from trapper to dealer. The present method of trapping is fast depleting the province of its fur" — this was written in 1935 — "and

**March 3, 1948**

present unethical methods of a percentage of fur dealers warrants the conclusion that government control of all raw fur" — this doesn't just say muskrat and beaver, but says all fur — "is essential if the province is to reap the benefit of its fur resources for any length of time."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a very revolutionary statement, in my opinion, and I hope that no one here will feel too much of a shock when I tell them that that statement was tabled in this Legislature by the gentleman who is now the official Leader of the Oppositions and who, at that time, was the Minister of Natural Resources. Just how he arrived at that pinnacle of revolutionary thought is more than I know, and just how he has descended from that revolutionary pinnacle to his present state of reactionary bliss I think he should tell this Legislature.

So, Mr. Speaker, when some Liberal gets up and, over the radio or on the public platform, says that we should give the trappers the right to sell their muskrats and beavers from the conservation area, wherever they like, he is going against what his House Leader in Saskatchewan said was necessary back in 1935, and did not have the courage to carry out; he is going against what the present Liberal Government, which has Mr. Tucker in it, is carrying out at Ottawa.

So far as fishing is concerned, I think the fundamental problem here is one of orderly marketing. The fishing industry in Northern Saskatchewan has been a difficult situation right from early times. The fish market has been one that has fluctuated very widely. In a week of certain religious holidays, particularly Roman Catholic and Jewish, the price for fish has always been high, then possibly, the week after, there has been no price at all, giving very wide and rapid fluctuations to the fish market; and as a result there have been many hardships thrust upon the fishermen who see that the price is high, they get a lot of fish ready for market, and then probably the next week cannot sell them at all or have to sell them at a very low price. It is just like the story of western farmers some years ago, before the days of the Wheat Pool, and before the days of the Canadian Wheat Board. They had to sell their wheat in the fall to pay their threshing bills, store bills and so on; and as soon as they had sold, the price invariably went up, and those who had the wheat then could reap a handsome profit. Now, we have — thanks to the Canadian Wheat Board — a policy whereby the farmers get the same price for their wheat, not only over a one-year period, but over a five-year period. The Fish Board is simply carrying out the policy that throughout the fishing season, which may be either a summer fishing season or a winter fishing season, for the period that the lake is open, that there will be a flat rate given the fishermen that will be the same throughout their whole season; so the fishermen know that, regardless of the poundage of fish they get, there is going to be that set price there for them — they are guaranteed a fair return. One of the main problems is: are we going to maintain orderly marketing in the fishing industry, as we have in the wheat industry, or are we going to do something else? I think the Liberal Party should come out and tell the people exactly where they stand with regard to orderly marketing.



I think too, they should come and tell the people exactly where they stand with regard to protection of resident fishermen. I know that in my constituency there are two lakes that are important from a commercial fishing viewpoint. I know that in both cases which I think is typical of lakes in the province, especially where there is a local settlement of any great size, that the local fisherman has a prior right to fish there provided he is able to take out the fishing limit; and I know that in these cases the fishermen there are protested from outsiders coming in, or who would like to come in and take out the whole fish harvest and leave the residents stranded.

I know that, at Green Lake, the fishermen have always been satisfied with the Fish Marketing Board, and they are tickled to death to have their natural resource there protected for the benefit of the residents of Green Lake.

I know that at Chitik Lake the fishermen have received protection in the same way. I know also that a few of the fishermen at that Lake, but not at Green Lake — at Green Lake the support for the Fish Board has always been unanimous — but at Chitik Lake there has been some difference of opinion, and I know that three or four or five fisherman there have been playing the game with the Liberal Party and trying to get the Fish Board upset. I hope those fishermen at Chitik Lake know that it is a policy of the Liberal Government to let anybody and everybody come in to Chitik Lake and fish all they like, whenever they like, regardless of conditions; because that most certainly is the policy of the Liberal Party, if we are to believe their radio broadcasts. If anyone here, sitting in the Opposition, wishes to challenge it, I will take from my desk a recent radio broadcast, sponsored by the Liberal Party, and ask them if they are standing behind what one of their members said in a broadcast. Certainly the Liberal Party cannot say one thing on its radio broadcast and put another thing in its platform; and I want the people of Chitik Lake and other lakes to know that.

When we come to the problem of lumbering, we have an industry here that needs, and has needed for some time, careful supervision, to make sure that we are going to have and maintain a lumbering industry for a long time. Before I give you my views, I want to read to you again, from the gentleman who was Minister of Natural Resources back about 1934 and 1935, the gentleman who is now House Leader of the Official Opposition. This is what he said with respect to the forests, that spring of '35:

"The forest is capable of permanently supporting its fair share of the province's population, if managed on a sound economic basis, and is capable of producing crops of timber, fur and game, with revenue to support many more people than they now do. To accomplish this, lands must be kept productive, and forest resource managed on a sustained yield basis rather than as mines."

That is very fine, Mr. Speaker; but I wonder how it is that that policy was not carried out by the hon. gentleman when he was Minister of Natural Resources or during the time that he was Premier of this province? I would like him to tell us how it was that forests continued to be used as

**March 3, 1948**

mines, and when this Government took over we found ourselves in this position — that there was a tremendous demand for ties and lumber and box wood — wood products of all kinds. On the other hand, there were people who were anxious to go to work and slash down whole forests while prices were high, export the goods to other parts of Canada and other parts of the world, and reap an abundant harvest for a short time. We had to keep in mind, too, the war needs, and against all this we had to stack the need to retain in Saskatchewan, for the generations to come, a permanent timber industry; and I am glad to say that this Government has decided to maintain a permanent timber industry in Saskatchewan, and that those merchants who may now want to criticize this Government have not been allowed to ship out of the province at least as much of the timber as they would have liked to do; for if they had had their way and shipped all the timber out of the province that they could get their hands on, we in Saskatchewan would now be importing our timber from the United States and possibly from other countries, and would certainly have had to pay very handsomely for it. As a consequence, the present Government has maintained the timber industry of the North, and it has retained the products at home and sold them at ten percent under ceiling price, which, in my opinion, is a very good social service.

A few days ago, Mr. Speaker, I was talking on another resolution which had to do with hog production. At that time I said a little bit about my constituency. I want to say a little bit more, today, about my constituency with respect to agriculture, because agriculture there is definitely the most important industry. I do not want to repeat very much of what I said the other day, but do want to say again that my constituency is divided, essentially, into two parts — there is the northern part, centering around Meadow Lake, and then there is all the rest of it that is on this side of the Forest Reserve. In the northern part, we have been successful, year after year, in having moderately good to excellent crops, but in the southern part they have suffered greatly from crop failure, due to drought, and in some years due to frost. As a consequence, the farmers in the southern part of the constituency have had to depend, more than ever, upon livestock for their living. I am sorry to see, as a result of federal government policy, that many of these people have had to go out of livestock production, or at least, to reduce very greatly the amount of the livestock kept. Farmers in my constituency, as in other places, have suffered greatly too from the decontrol policies of the federal government. They have had to pay a lot more for farm machinery, a lot more for binder twine, and a lot more for gas and oil; and all of this is directly due to the decontrol policies of the federal government.

The provincial government has done a good job in encouraging agriculture in various ways. The Department of Municipal Affairs has assisted farmers in new districts to get more land under cultivation so that they could grow more crops and get into livestock, and so on. They have reorganized the Agricultural Representative Service, so that as a result all over the Meadow Lake constituency, farmers now know that we have an Agricultural Representative Service, and it means something to them that there is an Agricultural Representative to whom they can go and consult on their various problems.

I do not think any discussion of my constituency would be adequate without saying something with respect to the town of Meadow Lake and the district nearby, because it has come into the newspapers and into the radio quite often. Every time that I come from my home district to Regina I meet with people on the train and other places, and naturally we get talking about where we come from. Mention Meadow Lake, and invariably they will say — "I would sure like to know the truth about Meadow Lake, I have heard so much about that place," — and so I proceed with great delight to tell them what I believe is the truth about Meadow Lake. Last fall, near Meadow Lake, we started drilling operations in search for oil. I was amused, in one of the early speeches in the Legislature, to hear the hon. Leader of the Opposition try to tell us that there was no prospecting for oil in Saskatchewan since this Government took over, because the people of Meadow Lake had tried to do that very thing, last fall, near the town of Meadow Lake — about six to ten miles south-east of the town. So far no success has been attained, but some people there would like to drill again and drill much deeper.

The town of Meadow Lake is going ahead by leaps and bounds, like most or all northern towns, in spite of what the Opposition have said. Last year, we built there an indoor skating rink, which I understand, is second to none in the province; when one compares any place of comparable population. There is another thing, too, that I think should be drawn to the attention of this Legislature — that since the last Session of the House we have had established in Meadow Lake, new bank. I know, Mr. Speaker, that in the depression years, many small towns lost the only banking services which they had. If one had listened to gentlemen like the one who represents Moosomin, last year, and the present Leader of the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan, talk about Meadow Lake, people here would have expected Meadow Lake to lose its one and only bank before very long; but instead of that, we have gained an extra bank since last year — yes, the Royal Bank of Canada has now moved into Meadow Lake to set up business there alongside the Imperial Bank. Now, the Royal Bank of Canada is operated and looked after by men who know the score — they do not go into any town or any district with their eyes shut; they have the reports of Dun & Bradstreet; they have the statements of transportation companies, of wholesale houses, of business firms, and know general business conditions; and on the basis of that information the Royal Bank has come to Meadow Lake. On the basis of information which the hon. member for Moosomin got from two or three of his disgruntled friends — and they were disgruntled, I presume, about this government — he decided that the economy was all ruined. I leave it to the members of the Legislature to decide who had their opinions based more firmly.

**Mr. A.T. Procter:** — Your people will decide that!

**Mr. Howell:** — Yes, my people will decide very well, and let it be very soon, to satisfy everybody!

**March 3, 1948**

There was another thing that my hon. friend from Moosomin told us, last year, that amazed me very much. He said that he read a report which stated there was only one sawmill operating within thirty miles of Meadow Lake since this Government took over. Well, to start out with, the information was incorrect, but that did not matter very much. Essentially, the area within thirty miles of Meadow Lake is an agricultural community, and as a result Meadow Lake is now the busiest shipping point of grain in the whole province of Saskatchewan, and has been for the last few years. I was very surprised, because I know that the hon. member for Moosomin was once a Minister of the Crown; a very able Minister — I know that he had travelled to Meadow Lake, and had seen the fields of wheat waving in the breezes, and all that — and then to think that someone would write a letter to him, telling him there were no sawmills out in those wheat fields anymore — he should think that there was a good occasion to criticize the present government! I think he would have been on just as safe ground if he had gone, say, 400 miles south of here (Meadow Lake is approximately 400 miles north) — or across into the United States — and told the people that since this Government took over there were no sawmills operating within fifty miles of Regina. The people who had not seen Regina would have imagined that there was a big forest around Regina, and there should have been sawmills here.

Then, too, we had the case of Chitik Lake come up, last year, in the House. Chitik Lake, according to my hon. friend for Moosomin, was situated about forty miles north of Meadow Lake. Of course, it is about forty-five or fifty miles — something like that — in a south-easterly direction. I do not think it is reasonable to expect the Liberal Committee around Meadow Lake to write to the official Opposition here and give them authentic and unbiased reports on the activities of this Government, so far as affecting the Meadow Lake area is concerned, but I certainly think, Mr, Speaker, that the very least they could do would be to make sure that they get their lakes in the right location.

No comments on Meadow Lake would be complete without saying something about the one-time mayor of the town, because he has certainly attained a lot of fans in the province. A year ago last fall, a wave of enthusiasm swept the town and they decided they would let the Returned Men run the town; so the Returned Men put up a slate; no politics were mentioned at all, and the Returned Men were eminently successful — I think they were all or nearly all elected, and this included a certain man by the name of J.A. Davis. I had no idea that there were any political complications involved until I came down here and the hon. member for Moosomin started to talk about it, and I had a hunch then that he regarded it as a great Liberal victory. The people of Meadow Lake soon found that they had, in their highest office, a representative, not so much of the town of Meadow Lake, but of the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan. The story of his radio broadcasts and press reports and so on, is something that is generally known throughout the province.

When the next election came along, the one last fall, it may have been a political election, all right, because the issue then was — "Will we

or will we not endorse the radio broadcasts of the present Mayor of Meadow Lake" — and I think everyone here knows that he went down into oblivion — "unwept, unhonoured and unsung".

**Mr. Procter:** — You didn't run a candidate for the C.C.F., did you?

**Mr. Howell:** — Now the hon. member for Moosomin wants to know if we ran a C.C.F. man this time. In the past, the C.C.F. have not taken any part in the municipal election in Meadow Lake, but I would tell him that if they did on this occasion they made an awfully good job of it.

There are a few things of general interest throughout my constituency that I would like to comment on. We have, as a result of the assistance given by the Department of Health, two new hospitals. Both received very substantial grants in order to equip them and get them on their feet — -that was at Spiritwood and at Leoville. At Meadow Lake, we have had assistance, to enlarge very substantially the hospital that has been there for some time. We are going ahead each year, improving and building more and more roads, and each year as new machinery and more machinery becomes available, I am confident that our road building program will be speeded up from year to year.

Every school in the Meadow Lake constituency is in a Larger Unit of School Administration, including the Town of Meadow Lake. People there are realizing that we have raised our sights, so far as education is concerned — that we are on our way to improving . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker: May I ask the hon. member a question? Is it correct that the town district of Meadow Lake came in at the request of the people in the district — into the Unit?

**Mr. Howell:** — That is right — it came in at the request of the local Board, and with, I might say, the generally unanimous approval of the people of Meadow Lake, and they are still unanimously behind the Larger Unit, with the exception of a certain man, who, as I told you a few minutes ago, went down "unwept, unhonoured and unsung".

We have Health Units operating, covering most of my constituency. There is one at North Battleford and one at Meadow Lake. Some of the constituency is in another Health Unit which has not been organized yet, but people there approve generally of the program that is being carried out, and a large number of immunizations and inoculations are taking place that should have been done a long time ago, especially among school children.

Telephone services have been extended, too, in the Meadow Lake constituency. One of the first things I did after I was elected to this Legislature, was to ask the Department of Telephones to put a long distance telephone branch into, or near every Post Office that did not already have telephone service. So far, we have made a start in that direction, and I know that before long, the Telephones Department will be able to complete the job.

**March 3, 1948**

The Air Ambulance Service has done its work in the Meadow Lake constituency, and people there know what that means. It may not have happened to us as individuals, but it is certainly happening to us on a community basis. While we have not had it happen to us, or to our friends, we know of others who have received the benefit of the Air Ambulance Service.

In conclusion, I am glad to say that I have in my constituency what I understand is the most successful Metis colony in the whole of Canada, so far as rehabilitation measures are concerned. That is the Green Lake settlement. The people there are working hard, developing the natural resources that are there; some of them are learning new trades. They built schools there, the buildings of the Department of Social Welfare recently. I have seen some of the workmanship of some of those men who came in there to work, men who had not had the opportunity before of probably not any more than swinging a hammer, men who had never used a plane or a saw — that is men doing any fine work. There, they learned their trade and went ahead and did the work.

These, Mr. Speaker, are a few of the things that are going on in the Meadow Lake constituency, and I am confident that when an election comes along, come when it may, we of the C.C.F. are going over the top in Meadow Lake, bigger than ever before.

The Debate continuing, it was, on Motion of Mr. Willis, adjourned.

## **SECOND READINGS**

### **Bill No. 59 — An Act. to amend The Co-operative Marketing Associations Act.**

**Hon. L.F. McIntosh:** — I do not think there are any principles here but what can be dealt with fully when the Bill is in Committee. I might just mention in passing, that the amendments set out are largely for the purpose of stabilizing the finances of the Co-operative associations and making provisions whereby the Boards of Directors, as a result of a decision by the Annual Meeting, can pass bylaws that will assist in stabilizing the finances of the Co-operative Associations. I therefore wish to move Second Reading of Bill No. 59.

### **Bill No. 60 — An Act to amend The Co-operative Associations Act.**

**Hon. L.F. McIntosh:** — This is a Bill to amend The Co-operative Associations Act. I might just mention that the Horse Marketing Co-operative Association are endeavouring and have made some progress in arranging protection for their three hundred odd employees, and in looking over The Marketing Associations Act under which they are organized, they question very much if they have the power, as an Association, to set aside funds for the purpose of superannuation of their employees or members. This amendment suggests that those organized under The Co-operative Associations Act be given the right, if they so wish, to set aside moneys to build a superannuation plan for their members and employees; therefore, I wish to move Second Reading of Bill No. 60.