

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Eleventh Legislature
9th Day

Tuesday, February 28, 1950.

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

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. T. C. Douglas (Premier): — I think hon. members will remember that last year, there was some discussion in Public Accounts committee when the Leader of the Opposition raised the question of trying to have a full Hansard available not for every member, but at least for each group. I would like to draw the attention of the members to the fact that, this year, arrangements have been made by which a Hansard is being prepared. We anticipate it will probably be ready by the day after the actual sitting. I believe six copies are being prepared: one will be available to the Opposition, one to the Government, one in the Library, one will be given to the person who made the speech, and two copies will be kept in the office of the Legislative Assembly. I think the members will find that Hansard available and if it is now, see the clerk of the House and I am sure you can get any information you may want.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. B. L. Korchinski (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to draw the attention of this House to an item appearing in the press: "Student Wins the Douglas Prize" . . . "William Minor of the College of Agriculture became the first holder of the T.C. Douglas trophy for public speaking at the University of Saskatchewan, Thursday night. He placed first over eight other contestants. Minor was the recent winner of the Hill cup for inter-faculty debating. The topic of his speech was 'The Speed of our Modern Age'."

I would like to congratulate 'Bill' Minor on this achievement, and I am especially pleased because Bill Minor comes from our district and he is my former Grade 12 student.

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Monday, February 27, 1950, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Wellbelove for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. A. H. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, firstly I would like to congratulate one of the new members we have on this side of the House. He made his 'maiden' speech, last night, and I think it is one of the best speeches we have heard in this House to date this year. He came right down to the problems that exist in his constituency, and I think he stayed within the province of Saskatchewan during the whole course of his remarks, which is probably a good thing. Many of us seem to wander down to Ottawa and such places many times, and I think that all of us would do well if we followed the example as set by the member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy).

February 28, 1950

I had not planned on taking part in this Throne Speech debate but, last Tuesday, when I interjected a remark about the Premier, he threatened to completely silence me. He said, in effect, that when he dealt with me in his next speech, which would be the following day, I would have very little to say about the hundred dollars or anything else. The Premier must think that I am very easily frightened. He greatly overrates his dexterous and wicked tongue. I anticipated that, as is frequently the case, he would talk himself into a very awkward situation. I confess I did not expect that he would make himself appear so completely foolish as he did when he discussed my small share in the Battleford by-election. The stage had been set for this occasion. The galleries were filled with C.C.F. supporters and the Premier gave full rein to his tongue, and I thought thoroughly succeeded in making himself look very ridiculous. He accused me of going to The Battlefords to help elect the Progressive Conservative candidate, and then on the eve of the election issuing a statement that double crossed that same candidate. Here is what he said:

“The Leader of the Opposition said yesterday that, frankly he was apprehensive of the results of the North Battleford by-election. Well, he must have been apprehensive when he had to resort to the tactics of getting the member for Moosomin, who had gone up to help campaign for the Conservative candidate, who then on the eve of the election issued a statement, not through his own political leader, not by himself, but issued a statement through the leader of the Liberal Party, calling on the people of North Battleford to vote for the Liberal candidate.”

When I asked if I rightly understood him he continued:

“That is exactly what I said, and that is certainly the impression that the Conservative candidate had, and the Leader of the Conservative Party; but I am quite prepared to agree now that he did not go up to campaign for the Conservative candidate, and I am prepared to say now that he double crossed the Conservative candidate and the Conservative Party.”

Now I don't know how he knew what the impressions of the Conservative candidate and the Conservative leader were unless he was doing a little double crossing of his own. It is regrettable, at times, that the Premier appears to make ruthless and unreliable statements. Last Wednesday, he seemed to completely lose his head. He used a complete falsehood to base a vicious and personal attack upon me. Has the loss of the Battleford by-election driven him to such a state of uncontrolled frenzy? One would scarcely recognize this to be the same person who, on Sundays, simply exudes charity, brotherly love and poetry.

Mr. Speaker, I was not at The Battlefords during the by-election, and I am not a double crosser and there is nothing in the statement made to the Press by the Leader of the Conservative Party to justify this personal attack on me. What are the facts? From my farm home, near Fleming, I made a statement issued for publication in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix; this statement expressed my personal views regarding the Battleford by-election. The following day, the province Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party issued a

statement objecting to the views I had expressed. He had a perfect right to do this, of course, but he implied that strong pressure had been exercised to get me to make that statement. That is not true. I made that statement quite willingly. It is a statement I have made on many occasions. Far from doing any double crossing, the statement I made was fairly consistent with the stand I had taken since I stood for nomination in 1948.

I was nominated, Mr. Speaker, by a joint Liberal-Progressive-Conservative Convention which met in the town of Whitewood.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Where have I heard that before?

Mr. McDonald: — You are going to hear a lot of it; it is going to be the end of you. You want to pay particular attention to what is coming now. That convention was convinced that the most effective way of ridding Saskatchewan of a Socialist government was to have the voters support one candidate rather than divide their electoral strength and permit a C.C.F. member to sit in this House although he did not have the will of the majority of the people behind him. The view of that convention prevailed and, during the election, I received the full and unqualified support of both the Liberal and the Progressive-Conservative organizations in the Moosomin constituency. Neither they nor I made any secret of my political status. I was nominated as a Liberal-Progressive Conservative, and that is the official designation I used on the ballot and that is the label under which I sat in this House.

In 1948, the Progressive Conservative Association at Battleford, decided that they would not nominate a candidate in The Battlefords seat. Well, now at least some of these Progressive Conservatives felt that by running no candidate of their own and in supporting the late Mr. Prince, they would strike a more effective blow against Socialism and take a step in the direction of providing good government for this province. They were successful. Mr. Prince was elected. In this by-election that we hear so much about, it was decided to run a Progressive Conservative candidate. I did not agree with this decision, and decided to publicly say so. I am not assuming to say that my speaking had much or any effect on the results of The Battlefords by-election. Evidently many of the Progressive Conservatives were still thinking, as they thought in 1948, that the best way to beat Socialism was to support the other candidate who was most likely to win that election. In the Federal election, when there was no chance whatsoever of the C.C.F. being elected to office, there were 724 Progressive Conservative votes polled in that area which constitutes the provincial constituency of The Battlefords. But in the by-election, the number of Progressive Conservative votes polled dropped to 381. This is when there was a chance of electing the C.C.F.ers.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — You sold the Tories down the river.

Mr. McDonald: — You sold yourself down the river, the other day, for about the fourth time in a row. I do not claim to have influenced the result of any vote in The Battlefords, but I do point out that a large proportion of these Progressive Conservative voters apparently held similar views to those of my own, and I think this is a fact that is annoying the Premier so much. In his reply to my statement, the provincial leader of the Progressive Conservative Party said that I was “politically immature, youthful and inexperienced”. I agree with all that. That is perfectly true; but the Premier – and I am not the only one in this House that says this – with his penchant for vulgarity had to go a little further, and he said I was still

February 28, 1950

“wet behind the ears”. Well, his mind runs much in obstetrics and related matters. After all, I am just an ordinary kind of a fellow, a farmer; and I do not possess the superb self-confidence displayed by the Premier, as he suggest that when he directs his oratorical blasts at me, I should shrivel up and crawl under the desk or something. When I speak I try to tell the truth in halting and commonplace words. I do not know how to utter these untruths and spout personal abuse with a voice which has been refined in theological colleges. My elocutionary efforts are somewhat restricted because I feel obliged to pay some attention to the humdrum consideration of the facts of the case.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Have you lost the place?

Mr. McDonald: — At least I know the difference between a point of order and a point of privilege, or no point at all. If I had made myself appear half as ridiculous as you have done, I would leave. I am not nearly so politically smart as the Premier, and as some other people on that other side of the House think they are. I will, however, have the Premier understand, and also the Minister of Social Welfare, that I was not born yesterday, and I am at least dry behind the ears, except sometime maybe when I am pitching a load of hay down on the farm. But having reference to my political status as a Liberal-Progressive Conservative, the Premier called me a ‘hybrid’. It is strange that he should afford himself the liberty of this kind of name-calling. In 1935, the Premier was nominated C.C.F. candidate in the Federal constituency of Weyburn. For the same election he was the official Social Credit candidate in that constituency. On top of that, he received the full support of the Communist vote.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, that statement is completely untrue, and I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw it.

Mr. McDonald: — I will certainly withdraw the statement if the Premier says it is untrue, but I have a little newspaper clipping and one thing and another to back this statement up with. I have a letter here that was published in the Regina Leader-Post on November 1, 1946, which was written by Mr. Nelson Clarke, the Provincial Leader of the Communist Party and I am going to quote from it:

“I see that Premier Douglas is telling the electorate of Portage la Prairie that the C.C.F. does not want any help from our Labour-Progressive Party. Perhaps he has forgotten that he himself climbed the first rung of the ladder to political success with the very active and devoted help of the Communists of Weyburn constituency, and that he was only too glad to get all the aid he could in a very hotly-contested election.”

Mr. Nelson Clarke, was Leader of the Communist Party in Saskatchewan and he, better than anyone else, must know what instructions where issued to the Communists in the Weyburn seat.

Premier Douglas: — Again, on a question of privilege, I repeat that neither Mr. Clarke’s statement nor the statement of the member from Moosomin is correct and I, therefore, ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. McDonald: — Certainly, I will withdraw the statement; but I have some more statements here that I do not think I will have to withdraw. In 1940, the Premier was again elected to the House of Commons for Weyburn. In this case, he had an agreement with the late Mr. Perley under which there were to be no Conservative candidate in Weyburn and no C.C.F. candidate in Qu'Appelle-Wolseley.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but that statement is not true, and if the hon. gentleman would take the trouble to check the returns of the election, he will notice that both Mr. Perley and I were opposed in 1940.

Mr. McDonald: — I would like to know who the C.C.F. candidate for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley was.

Premier Douglas: — Nobody.

Mr. McDonald: — In this case, Mr. Douglas sought to assure himself personal election by an alliance with the Conservatives, who he now despises. Then again, in 1948, he was elected with the full and unqualified support of the Communists again, and I use Mr. Nelson Clarke as my authority. In his report to the Provincial Convention of the Communists Party held in July, 1947, just prior to the general election, Mr. Clarke said; and I am quoting:

“I think it may be said that there are no substantial differences between ourselves and the C.C.F. Party on the main points of the programme above outlined. We are in complete agreement in our evaluation of the present Liberal Government in Ottawa as a reactionary government which is betraying the interests of the Canadian people both in respect o its foreign and domestic policies. There is a heavy danger hanging over this province, the danger of the return to power in the province of the Liberal Party, or a coalition of Liberals and Conservatives.”

Then Mr. Clarke goes on to say:

“There must be conducted during the election campaign and before, the most remorseless and ceaseless attack upon the old parties, especially the Liberals.”

It is customary for some C.C.F.ers to deny that they have received Communist support. We know that; but the one person who knew what instructions were handed out to the Communists, I imagine Mr. Nelson Clarke would know. In 1948, there was a Communist candidate in Pelly, and I guess that was the only constituency where they ran a Communist candidate in this last general election. In all other constituencies, including Weyburn, Communists were instructed to support C.C.F. candidates as was printed in black and white in the papers. So, speaking of a ‘hybrid’, in 1935, the Premier was mixed up with two or three parties. In 1950 again he is mixed up with the C.C.F.ers and the Conservatives and the Communists and in 1948, he gets down to where he is pretty nearly a pure-bred hybrid now – C.C.F. or Communists. He is the last person who should charge that others are not political pure-breds.

February 28, 1950

I think that the Premier is thoroughly conscious of the significance of the movement for which I stand. It is a movement having its aim to consolidate the anti-Socialist vote and establish sound government in this province. This movement is a grass-roots movement. It sprang up spontaneously among the people. The hon. members on the other side of the House do not want to believe this, because they know as well as I do that any grass-roots organization has much more effect, and is much more thorough about its growth, than any growth that starts from the top. This growth never started at the top; it started right out among the common people, as you fellows call yourselves. We are common people, too, and that is where this growth started. I know in my own constituency, before I had ever even considered going into politics, this growth was active and it was gathering force.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — High tariff.

Mr. McDonald: — High tariff, the Minister of Agriculture says. He has high something, but I do not think it is tariff. The majority of people in this province have had more than enough of this Socialist muddling. They are becoming increasingly aware that all they have to do to get rid of the C.C.F. Government, is to unite their effort and support one candidate rather than splitting their vote. This movement will grow, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that, in the next general election this Government will be swept out of office. The result of the Battleford by-election, only furnishes new evidence of the growing power of this movement. It brought to light all the tricks to which the Premier and his party resorted in their desperate effort to win that election, and I think that is why the Premier completely lost control of his senses in attacking me for the insignificant part that I played in this Battlefords by-election.

I said at the beginning of my few remarks, Mr. Speaker, that I had not intended to speak on this debate at all, but when I was attacked by the Premier of this province for something that I had never done, and there was a lot of mud slung across the floor of this House, I figured that I should answer. I certainly do not agree with this mud-slinging; I dislike it very much. I have enjoyed the speech of the Member for Cannington, as I have said before, and I think that he showed a good example to this House. If we could all get down to business, and stay in the province of Saskatchewan to look after our duties to the people whom we represent, we would be doing a much better job. The people out in the hustings of this province are sick and tired of this bickering, this arguing about Federal policies, something over which we have no control, and I think the sooner they get back into this province and do a little road work, increase a few school grants, build a few bridges, remove the Education Tax, cut down taxation on land, then they will be doing something.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture is away up to Ottawa again today. Well, I do not know why he does not go into Federal politics and run for a Federal seat where he can argue these things.

Mr. Speaker, I gather that everyone should know by now that I do not intend to support the motion.

Mr. A. C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal in this Legislature about international affairs, and a little bit of provincial affairs. Sometimes I question whether I am

going to be in order or out of order, because my chief concern in this Legislature is to lay before the House something which I consider is of provincial concern, and indirectly of a national concern, and I regret to some extent that as yet no one has seen fit to bring it to the attention of this House. I want to spend a few moments to lay before you in this discussion, the problems of the drought areas of the southwest, something of the conditions that the people there are facing, something of the needs that we think we should request from this House.

The southwest has far too long been the target of irresponsible statements – statements whose sole effect has been to discredit the southwest and to create within the minds of many people the opinion that we have out there the agricultural ‘slums’ of the nation. If we are to look for a solution of these problems, we must understand the problems and search for the solution with a proper perspective, and I was very pleased that, in the Gull Lake by-election, it not only gave us a new Minister of Health in the person of Mr. Bentley, whom I have known for some years very well, but it also was an opportunity to bring down into, at least, a portion of the southwest members of this Legislature and particularly members from the northern areas who in their constituencies have never known a crop failure I think that, with that knowledge, we should now be able to examine things as they really are.

The problems of the southwest are not to be minimized. I think we have experienced the worst crop failure since 1937. The soil has, of course, been dry and I think the moisture is at the lowest we have ever seen it in the west. The grasshoppers infestation, last year, was dangerous, and from all indications we will be threatened with as great an outburst this particular year. Because of the drought and the grasshoppers the pastures are in exceptionally poor condition. In fact so much so that it will take years of careful management and cultivation to bring those pastures back into production. The small cash reserves which the people have built up over the past few years of more plentiful crops is assisting, up to date, to bring them through this critical period, but when it comes to spring, many of them will need seed, fodder and repairs and, I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, not only a few of them will require some form of direct assistance.

In spite of these conditions, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that as far as the municipalities are concerned, and the larger school units, and the health region of Swift Current, we have found the record of tax payments is not below the normal of any year. We find, in that area, that the rural people of that area fully recognize that these services if they are to be carried out successfully are a joint effort between the rural people and those of the urban centres, and we realize that the city of Swift Current or the towns and villages within the whole area could not succeed on their own in carrying the burden of these services. So we have had splendid co-operation and the realization of the responsibility of the municipal men and the farmers concerned in seeing that sufficient taxes have come forth to carry on these services.

In this connection and the whole problem of the southwest, I would like to deal for a moment or two with the records of the two Governments. The Dominion Government, of course, came to the assistance of the southwest immediately, under the P.F.A.A. Act, and when it was noticed that conditions were severe they made a special effort to get the P.F.A.A. payments out before Christmas, which was accomplished. They likewise have instituted the long-term programme that will eventually do a great deal towards the stabilizing

of agriculture of that area. They have constructed, and are carrying out a policy of, dams, dugouts, and irrigation projects. We have the project on the Frenchman River and the storage of approximately 80,000 acre-feet in the Cypress Lakes. We have storage for 10,000 acre-feet at Val Marie, and West Val Marie and Eastend. All three of these projects have approximately 14,000 acres either under irrigation or about ready to be put under irrigation. Then in the Swift Current Creek system, I think we have approximately some 100,000 acre-feet of storage there which will eventually irrigate about 25,000 acres when the construction is completed.

In the matter of small projects, in individual projects on individual farms, some 3,800 of these were constructed in 1949, thus the Dominion Government is pursuing, each year, along this line of stabilizing the area of the southwest. while the method of proceeding is solved, we are sometimes of the opinion it is a slow process and that we should be receiving more interest in the matter from the Provincial Government. In regard to the Provincial Government's attitude in the southwest, this fall, when it became known that we would need a tremendous amount of assistance there, the Government came out and announced, through a pamphlet issued through the Bureau of Publications, that it would guarantee the bank loans for seed, and that provisions of The Municipalities' Seed Grain and Supply Act would be invoked. Municipalities in need of seed grain were urged to determine their requirements immediately, before seed supplies were moved out of the province. That is, that the individual farmer might appeal to this local municipality for seed and fuel and repairs for his machinery, and that the local municipality might supply such requirements. They might borrow the money from the bank, then in turn be guaranteed by the Provincial Government. That has been the extent of the assistance to date in the major form.

It is remarkable, Mr. Speaker, that in this, the worst year of our history, when we are called upon to come to the assistance and protection of the farmers of the southwest, the only thing that is left to do is to call upon The Seed Grain Act, which was established some years back under a Liberal Government. Now, in this connection we are placing the responsibility directly back onto the municipality, and we are asking the municipality to share the additional burden of supplying the seed and repairs and the fuel necessary for the coming spring.

We realize here in this Legislature that something has to be done to stabilize this southwest and in that connection legislation had been placed on the Statute books. In 1946, we established here The Grain and Fodder Conservation Act. That is the approach, and I think a good one, by the Provincial Government to undertake its contribution in this area. The purpose of this Act was to store grain and some fodder in times of plenty in order to have it where it was needed in times of scarcity; they were to establish fodder banks, and they were to establish bins which the municipalities could utilize to store grain in them.

In 1947-1948 and 1948-1949, over \$600,000 was voted for this purpose. Additional sums have been voted since then. When I check the Department of Agriculture report, it shows that 39 bins have been constructed to the assistance of the municipalities, and in answer to a question, we find that 4,717 tons of fodder are held in storage. When we asked how much grain was held in these bins, we received the answer that they had no report from the municipalities. And, Mr. Speaker, for over a half a million dollars that we voted to The Grain and Fodder Conservation Act, we have in return 4,700-odd

tons of fodder. When hundreds of farmers will require feed and seed in less than one month's time, this Government does not know but what these bins are all empty.

Hon. I. C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — On a point of privilege: I want to make this correction, that the \$600,000 voted is intended for reclamation, irrigation and general conservation work that is fundamental to the stability.

Mr. Cameron: — To get back, after that interruption, Mr. Speaker, I was saying, when hundreds of farmers will require feed and seed in less than one month's time, this Government does not know but what these bins are all empty. With half a hundred agricultural representatives in the field and a radio programme, they don't know if there is any wheat on the ground.

Then, last year, we passed The Conservation and the Development Act. This Act itself likewise was to serve a good purpose. Its purpose was to assist individual farmers and groups of farmers with small irrigation systems that were too small to be developed under the P.F.R.A. programme. They could form areas either individually or in groups. In other words, we were to tie in our Provincial programme with the Federal programme in getting down to the basic policy of assisting in irrigation and constructing dams and dugouts in order to conserve the moisture supply of that particular area. This Act gave the province, particularly to the Minister of Agriculture, very wide powers. It gave him every power necessary to actually get their teeth into this particular project and naturally, I was interested in asking them questions as to what has been done under The Conservation and Development Act. In answer to a question asked the other day, as to how many conservation and development areas have been established we received the answer: Established none, but exploratory surveys were undertaken in the Rural Municipalities of Arborfield, Moose Range, and Nipawin.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I toured all over the dried-out area of the southwest, and to my knowledge we have no municipalities in that area by those names. However, I do not think we should be too concerned about that in the southwest, because it is only 'exploratory'. Then we find likewise, that they explored the possibilities of 33 small drainage projects for individual farmers. They were not built, Mr. Speaker; but they possibility of building them was explored. After these exploration parties, and those established by the Minister of Resources, you will find the province is lousy with exploration projects. But I think that our people are asking for more than exploration. However, I must say it was not only exploration. I did find in the report of the Department of Agriculture that some irrigation was done in the southwest. The report of the Department of Agriculture shows that \$63,791 was spent on irrigation in the year 1948-49. However, the report goes on to state further, and I'm quoting from the report of the Department of Agriculture:

“In this connection it is significant to note that \$47,293.86 were spent on cost of equipment and \$23,697.50 were spent on actual field operations.”

Mr. Speaker, we have already voted them a half million dollars to machinery, three-quarters of a million under the Act. The Minister of Agriculture on every platform speaks of the half a million dollars they have in machinery in order to do this work, and yet we find that, in order to

February 28, 1950

accomplish \$23,000 worth of work we are required to purchase an additional \$47,000 worth of machinery. Mr. Speaker, does this Government merely love to purchase machinery? I think we have enough trucks and jeeps and tractors and bulldozers to quip a miniature army.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not criticizing the passing of these Acts. I think it was a step in the right direction, and I think that much can be accomplished under it; and these Acts were passed for a purpose. The purpose is good; but the Government forgets, that while we can give to labour any condition they may ask by legislation, we cannot legislate the farmers into any particular situation. We have to produce the goods. We have to get out into the actual conditions of the field, and assist those farmers in those particular areas.

While I am particularly concerned about the lack of action under these two specific Acts, something that troubles me even more, Mr. Speaker, is the manner in which some of our responsible Cabinet Ministers speak when they are out attending conventions on platforms in the southwest. I want to make myself clear that I don't say this is a critical attitude, but I say that the result of some of these statements has brought a definite detrimental effect to the people of the southwest, and I will tell you why I refer to the report quoting the Minister of Agriculture: "The southwest of Saskatchewan is over-populated," says Nollet; "but to move the farmers out is not easy because not land is scarce. They all call for the right kind of farming," says Nollet. "Too many farmers are beginning to look upon P.F.A.A. payments as permanent when they were designed to act only as a temporary solution during drought periods."

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that we have a series of articles appearing in the papers, today, in which they are beginning to question the purpose of the P.F.A.A. Act; in which we find the member from Caribou in the Dominion House suggesting to the Federal House that, instead of spending millions on doles in the southwest, they move the population to the Peace River district. And is it any wonder that you have books full of it from Alberta suggesting that the whole thing in the P.F.A.A. be subjected to a minute investigation. It says: "We doubt if the Act was meant for permanent agricultural slums in Western Canada."

Then we hear the Attorney General in his radio talks, "Your Attorney General Speaks", before the programme is even initiated, making the statement that the Province of Saskatchewan would be burdened with 50 per cent of the cost of the Saskatchewan irrigation development and pointing out what a shame it was that the Province had actually poured millions of dollars into this scheme.

What has been the effect of statements such as these on the thinking of the public? Today, we have aggravated the situation in the west because, in many instances, our credit firms are beginning to wonder if they are safe in advancing in that particular areas. We are beginning to find ourselves in the position where loans and assistance are becoming more difficult to secure because of the statements put out – I don't say insincerely or without some element of truth in them. But while they have been placed in the papers, we have not followed up to the programme of a corrective measure to take care of this situation, and in many quarters people are beginning to think that the southwest is simply an area where we stand ready to take any hand-out, any dole that may be given by some patronizing Government.

I will go on to say, Mr. Speaker, that in considering the whole area of the southwest, to keep it in its proper perspective, there are problems there, problems of great magnitude, problems which should be receiving the careful consideration of this House. We want this known, too in spite of the adverse criticism, and in spite of the adverse effect, we want it known that the southwest has always, carried and today is carrying, its full share of any and all taxes that any other region in the province has carried. We are carrying the larger unit; we are carrying the Swift Current health region, and I might say that this Government's contribution, is not so creditable. All we are asking is that the Province assume its responsibilities in constructing the laterals from these storage reserves of water that the Dominion Government has stored, in order that we can get these laterals constructed and get this water out onto the land. That is what we want. We can have hundreds of thousands of acre-feet of water stored, but unless we assume our responsibility and build the laterals and carry this water out on to the land, it will stay there stored and that does not bring crops to the southwest. What we want is an effort, leadership, shown and to work with our municipalities in order that we may undertake in each municipality a complete survey, in order wherever possible on an individual farm basis to capture the spring run-off with dams, to dam up the coulees, to drain the sloughs, so that we may seed every slough in which there is no alkali and to speak up this programme in connection with the municipalities. These undertakings are necessary on a municipal basis – that is, in co-operation with the municipal officials – so that we can get a survey in each particular municipality and do it quickly as the farmers, many of them, are looking into the field of putting up private irrigation systems. We are so short of inspectors and engineers that, after they have put in an application, there is months and years of waiting before it can even be examined.

Those programmes, I say, should be speeded up. Bring in these men, and let's get our teeth into this problem of irrigation in the southwest in order that the individual farmer will be in a position to seed five or ten or fifteen acres of land, in order that he can raise sufficient fodder for his cattle and his livestock. If we actually are interested in the problems, we will find, Mr. Speaker, that it won't be in the too great distance, where you will find the stock population increasing in the southwest, and each individual farmer will be able to keep sufficient cattle and hogs, and the Minister of Agriculture will have less cause to run to Ottawa and complain.

We realize that many of the people in the southwest are living on submarginal land. We don't deny that. But what we do say, Mr. Speaker, is that we do need some programme that, in the event that we are to move these people out of the southwest we must know where we are going, how and when we are going. We must have a programme whereby, after a survey is made of the particular municipality and it is decided that so much of that particular area is submarginal, that farmer who is asked to vacate the land should be at least paid for the improvements that he has placed upon that land, and he should likewise be paid over and above that something for the years he spent in developing the country and adding to the national wealth of the nation. And, likewise, he should know before he leaves that the Minister of Agriculture of the Provincial Government or of the Federal Government is not going to ask him to go up into the northern parts of Saskatchewan in the bush to start to pioneer again.

Those people came out there in 1908, 1910, 1911, and pioneered

in the southwest, and those people, today, are middle-aged people. They have not been established long enough yet for the younger generation to take over nor for the first generation yet to have retired. If we are to move these people, we must give consideration to the fact that they have spent 30 years of the best years of their lives in developing this particular area. We have heard the Minister of Agriculture say that he hopes to open up eventually some 250,000 acres in the north; that after the need of returned men and the surrounding people of that area are provided for, then they may be able to move some of the people up there. But I say, Mr. Speaker, that until such time as we are going to find a place to which we are going to move those people, we should be very careful in peddling the remarks that the southwest is over-populated and that it is the agricultural 'slums' of the nation.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I would like the hon. member to inform the House if he is inferring that I made the statement that the southwest of Saskatchewan is going to be a permanent slum area, because I made no such statement.

Mr. Cameron: — I did not state any such thing. I said that such statements that the southwest is over-populated, that we should keep such statements soft-peddled or in the background until such time as we can find the place to which we are going to move the people of the southwest, and that, instead of talking about the over-population, we actually get out and do something to remedy the situation.

I said, Mr. Speaker, in this connection, that I would like to place on record in this Legislature, that the people of the southwest are becoming very tired of constantly being the topic of everyone's speeches when they want to become very patronizing about the southwest. We have received, Mr. Speaker, no favours that I can see in our particular area, and I know that we were having a highway constructed when I was elected, and a fine highway it is, it's got 40 miles, and I know that, the day after, the crew was withdrawn; I also know that in the village of Fox Valley, 45 miles from Maple Creek, we have two miles yet to be graveled to complete the gravelling from Maple Creek to the village of Fox Valley, which was to be done that particular fall or the next spring. That gravelling is not yet done. I know too, Mr. Speaker, that the 25 miles going further north from Fox Valley on to Leader has been inaccessible to traffic all winter and, unfortunately, we have had the most snow — I should not say "unfortunately", because it probably will turn out to be very fortunate in the spring; but we have had more snow than we have known in a great many years. There is an area out there, in my constituency, between Maple Creek on the main line and Leader on the north, some 765 miles across, and those people have been snowed in all winter; I think it is three times. I remember Highway No. 21 has been open from Fox Valley to Maple Creek; once it was open from Fox Valley to Leader, and I will tell you how that came about. There is a little place called Liebenthal, 16 miles south of Leader, on No. 21 highway. There are no train connections and those people had been snow-bound so long there was no fuel in the town for the oil burners, and coal bins were short. It got so bad that some of the farmers were actually burning straw in their homes. Then we got the highway opened once. If you go down to Robsart and the south part, you find the same story: 50 miles removed from a hospital and the highway is not open. I can give you instances. One member was bemoaning the fact that some little area of 25 people was not able to get access to a highway. In fact, when I left to attend the Session, I had to have an aeroplane come in and pick me up and take me to the main line in order that I could get in here. Those are the conditions there.

I want to say in this connection, when I am talking about the patronizing that we have received from this particular Government that in the matter of the Saskatchewan River, 12 miles north of the town of Leader. the river has been running very low, this year, as you are probably aware. It got so bad that the ferries could not operate, and in that particular area there are many people who live on the south side of the river and farm on the north, and who bring their grain in to the town of Leader. We found the situation, in the fall, where combines and machinery were on the north side and the farmer over on the south and the ferry not operating, and, in order to get his combine and his machinery across the river to take off his crop, he had to go over the Empress and around, a distance of 30 miles to drive his tractor, to get over to his own farm. In response, we had the engineers come out to survey the level of the river at that particular point and the ferry was moved a distance temporarily. Now understand, Mr. Speaker, that cannot be on a temporary basis and it is a problem that must receive attention. Those people cannot continue under those conditions.

Considering it all once again, I would repeat that we are carrying our full share of our responsibility in the province; that we are carrying our full share of our social services, and that we are making a definite effort to pioneer the way in Health Regina No. 1 in order to supply medical attention to the people of the area. We have asked for no particular favours, but we do ask that these Acts which we placed in the legislation should be started, and that definite activities should be taken under them in order that we may get down to the problems of the southwest. In that connection, if we could not have him on our side, we are very pleased that the Minister of Public Health is Mr. Bentley, a man from the southwest, because I think that Mr. Bentley will agree with me on the most of what I have said: that we must get down to an active policy stabilizing the southwest. We must cut out this idea of constantly painting it as the agricultural 'slums' of the nations; we must get sympathy and understanding in this House, and a proper perspective of the whole situation, and then go in to that particular area with a definite concerted notion of what is to be done, and carry it through. In that respect, Mr. Speaker, because of the inactivity, I do not feel that I am in a position to support such a motion.

Mr. J. R. Denike (Torch River): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the member for Maple Creek that it would be well that we should get better acquainted. I do not know whether it was by accident or by design that the member for Maple Creek and I should be positioned to speak one after the other.

It just happens that I have had some occasion to visit the town of Maple Creek and I must say that I sympathize with the member for Maple Creek that this area is in dire need for support. But the same might easily apply to my own particular area in the vicinity of the municipalities of Arborfield, Moose Range and Nipawin, which he apparently has not heard of. It might seem strange that I should say that this area which embraces the municipalities of Arborfield, Moose Range and Nipawin should be in need of support, but such is the case, and I have lived in that area long enough to know just how much those people do need support. It just happens that certain of those areas are extremely productive and, through good luck and good management in some places, the farmers in that area have attained a great deal of wealth; but we have others in that area who are just getting by. Those are the people

February 28, 1950

that should be considered, and my impression is that those people have a prior claim to consideration over such people as those needy ones in the Maple Creek area.

The reason I say this is because the units of agriculture in the north-eastern part of the province, are in general too small. People have gone into those areas some twenty years ago and have settled on homesteads, and we find that, in many cases, they are still there. People of more recent immigration have also settled on quarter-section units, and they are also just getting by. For that reason, it is necessary to see that those people are established on economic units, and each farmer should have not less than a half-section of land.

There is a special reason why some of the more wealthy farmers in that particular area have had such good luck and I would like, at this time, to make reference to a well-known seed grower who has established himself in the town of Nipawin – Mr. H.G. Neufeld, who operates the Neufeld seed plant. This seed plant has assumed considerable proportions over the past three or four years and, at the present time, it is a quarter of a million dollar enterprise. It is rather unfortunate that Mr. Neufeld during the past year or so, has been rather unfortunate in his endeavours. One of these unfortunate circumstances concerned the state of the country of Czechoslovakia. Mr. Neufeld had extensive contracts in Czechoslovakia and at the time that the Communists had took over the country, Mr. Neufeld lost those seed contracts to the tune of some one hundred thousand dollars. The people of Nipawin recognize the very great service that Mr. Neufeld has provided for them. He has introduced them to the seed-growing industry and has helped them along to such an extent that there are many prominent seed growers in that district in their own right.

A few days ago, a group of farmers in the Nipawin area took over the Neufeld seed plant. These farmers have organized a company and are busy selling shares with the idea of preserving this industry for the people of the Nipawin district. The board of directors is considered to be a group of very strong men, one of whom is a former member of the Legislature, Mr. J.D. MacFarlane. These people recognize very well the great service that Mr. Neufeld has given to the district and they have faith in the seed business. One of these directors, in discussing the matter with me, seemed to be under the impression that these shares would assume excellent proportions in the course of a very few years. This seed plant involved holdings in Nipawin and also at Carragana, Porcupine Plain and at Hudson Bay Junction.

The present crisis which is shaping up in agriculture led me to look back over some notable documents that have appeared in the past few years, and I came across a statement in connection with agriculture which I would like to draw to your attention. I think that all of you are quite familiar with this.

First of all, we believe that farmers should have the highest possible returns, on a stabilized basis, for their produce and lowest possible taxation consistent with the providing of essential educational and social services which are desired and approved by the people I think that farmers and all members on both sides of the House will subscribe to this as an objective, and we all agree that the farmer should have security of tenure for because of dangers of recurring drought, it is necessary to safeguard farmers against the loss of their farms through no fault of their own. Other points are: the utilization of all available water for irrigation to counteract recurring drought;

farm electrification.

As I glance through this I come across something in the form of an enigma. I was not able to follow this through to its conclusion. There was no answer for it as far as I could see, and yet the question is left there and apparently the solution is that the Liberal Party would provide for this problem which is upon us. Here is a statement with which we agree: "The depression, it will be remembered, was brought on not by a production problem but of distribution difficulties, and Socialism with all its super-planners, where it has been tried, has failed to measure up to production records of free-enterprise countries such as United States and Canada." I think that we have done very well. Socialists have not had much of a chance in Canada yet, but production in Saskatchewan has assume notable proportions. Ours is an agricultural efforts and say that we have been found wanting. I think that we have produced.

Then there is another statement: "Until the Socialists have proved their ability to match or exceed the production record of private enterprise, how can they expect the people to place reliance upon their unproven ability to solve distribution problems, which in some ways, are the most difficult." First of all, the Liberal Party says that the "depression, it will be remembered, was born of production problems, but distribution difficulties". That is the crux of the whole matter. But now, apparently, distribution problems in some ways are the more difficult, sort of tapering-off. I read farther, but was not able to find an answer to this distribution problem. The Liberal Party has no answer for it, and if they have no answer for it, why mention it? Of course, the Minister of Social Welfare says "Wars" and of course, that is the impression that I have also. But if there is no war in the offing, what will the Liberal Party do? We have a solution that there is no distribution problem as far as we are concerned. We certainly would not pile products up and burn them as the free enterprisers do. I wonder if any of the free enterprisers on the opposite side of the House will attempt to offer an explanation as to why food products should be destroyed while there are people in the world who are suffering from hunger.

The Leader of the Opposition and one of his excellent satellites, Mr. A. Embury, a former member of the House, have taken great exception to the efforts of the Saskatchewan Government to assist veterans to establish themselves on co-op farms. I would like to tell you just how the members of the co-op farm take to the suggestions on the part of the Liberal Party, represented by the Leader of the Opposition, that co-op farmers are of Communist origin and they are not true co-operatives. Just recently, I had the opportunity of discussing with a young gentleman about an affair that took place in Carrot River just before the 1948 election. This was one of the young men who had been described as a "Zombie" by the Leader of the Opposition. He was inveigled into a fracas, into an argument in a hall, and those who were arguing with him finally got outside. A charge was laid against this young gentleman for disturbing the peace. He had also a counter-charge which he decided not to press. The whole matter was dropped, but the veterans on these co-op farms, who have made excellent progress in the past few years, are none too well pleased with the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition and with Mr. Allan Embury. They think that they are privileged to operate as they wish. Besides that, they have the backing of the Canadian Legion who passed a resolution to the Federal Government asking that grants made to veterans be allowed for use on co-op farms.

February 28, 1950

There is one thing that I am very pleased to see and that is that the Leader of the Opposition and his friends, who like to wave the famous textbook "World of Today", have given up the idea. I think that their wrists have been severely slapped. However, an editorial from the 'Star-Phoenix' might do them good to peruse carefully. This concerns the activities of the Un-American Activities' Committee:

"This Committee is carrying its beachfront into the field of education, motivated by a petition from the Sons of the American Revolution. It asked for most of the textbooks in general use in American Public Schools and Universities. Copies of the books will be obtained from the Library of Congress and checked for Communist propaganda. The Committee will find a good many of heresies in the school textbooks. Allergic to all ideas as its members have shown themselves to be, it will probably be immeasurable shocked by anything more advanced than the Reader for Grade 1. They will, no doubt, when they are finished, find themselves confronted with a subversive textbook problem national in scope. And this is only the start. What of the libraries, which many institutions make available to their students, for random and reference reading? Some of them contain volumes crammed with ideas much more dangerous than those expressed in the formal required texts. Will the Committee investigate the libraries of America next? No body of scholars, however learned, possesses the wisdom necessary for their frightening responsibility of censoring and banning books. Of all bodies, the Committee on Un-American Activities is the least qualified for the task."

I think that the Opposition will be well advised to take note of what the editor of the 'Star-Phoenix' has to say.

At this point, I would like to commend the Minister of Social Welfare and the Leader of the Opposition for the departure that they have taken in inviting university students to attend a sitting of the Legislature. I think this shows an excellent trend in education. It was rather odd, thought, that the first group that came here should be the ones privileged to hear a lecture on Socialism given by the Premier of the province. It was asked for by the Opposition, and the Premier made a good job of presenting the 'Regina Manifest' to the university students and to the members of the Opposition. The hon. member for Arm River, (Mr. Danielson) offered his contribution to the story of Socialism on the following day. I will leave it to your good judgment, Mr. Speaker, as to which professor does a better job.

There is one more point that I would like to draw to your attention and seeing that the Minister of Natural Resources is here, it comes into his field as well. On the same day, I came across two news items dated January 23, concerning a sale of uranium to Russia. This is rather interesting. I think it rather worthwhile hearing. A Canadian firm shipped 1,000 pounds of uranium compound to Russia in 1943, although United States' atomic authorities had taken rather strong measures to shut off such exports, as an Atomic Energy Commission Official testified, Monday: "The half-ton shipment went through, despite the fact that we thought we had the Canadian supply to

Russia shut off.” Says Lawrence C. Burman. Said Burman: “My director of the Commission, the Licensing Division, was associated in wartime with the Manhattan Project which turned out the Atom Bomb.” He testified, Monday, before the House of Representatives Committee on the Un-American Activities. He was referring to a consignment of uranium oxides and nitrates from the Canadian Radium and Uranium Company; that is a sales agency for the Eldorado Mining and Refining Company of Canada, which has mines at Great Bear Lake. Burman said he did not learn of this shipment until 1948. “Russian requests for Uranium were filed with the Lend Leases Administration which passed them on to the proper government officials”, Burman said. “The issuing of any export licences were the responsibility of the Board of Economics Warfare. The first Russian request for Uranium Compounds came through from Lend Lease after a supplier had been consulted and the Russians knew the materials were available. To keep the Soviets from becoming suspicious about the importance of Uranium, Lieutenant-General Leslie Groves, Head of the Atomic Project, approved the shipment. This was early in 1943 when the Russians got 200 pounds of oxide and 220 pounds of nitrate. After the first shipment, the Manhattan District took rather strong measures to shut off any additional export. For one thing, a contract was signed with the Canadian Radium and Uranium Company for the Manhattan District to have first call for a period of a year against other uranium the company had to sell. The contract was made in March, 1943. About two or three months after, the Russians got a second shipment of 1,000 pounds of uranium oxide and nitrates. This was arranged through the Canadian Radium and Uranium Company.”

I was just thinking of what took place in Canada just before Japan entered the war. The other item that I have of the same trait, are the “Watchful Eyes on European Trade”: “The Right Hon. C.D Howe, Canadian Minister of Trade and Commerce, is spending the next month in France, Belgium and the Netherlands on a combined holiday business trip. En route aboard the Queen Mary, he admitted Canada’s trade prospects were not too bright.” We could sell uranium to Russia and the Hon. C.D. Howe is shouldering Trans-Continental Resources which backs uranium exploration.

Mr. Speaker, I support the motion.

Mr. J. G. Banks (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, this is my second visit to Regina to attend the Session and I believe I notice quite a change. The three gentlemen who have spoken from our side of the House, I believe have really excelled themselves and I would not want to say that the gentleman across in the Government ranks have not improved a great deal, also.

I have enjoyed myself to a certain extent, because I made a lot of friends on both sides of the House. I hope that if some of you do not agree with what I say, it will not interfere with that, because we are down here to do a job and not to argue personal matters.

I felt very badly when those two gentlemen in the House, whom I sat with, last winter, passed on, particularly Mr. Prince, who was quite an inspiration to this side of the House. No doubt, Mr. Murray was to your side.

I can welcome our friend, Mr. Bentley (I see he is not in the House), for he was the Wheat Pool agent up in our district for many years, and when he had that public office he did his work well, and people spoke highly

of him, so that we will expect in this House the same thing.

I am going to say, Mr. Speaker, as one of the older men in the House, that I am extremely proud of that half-dozen young men that we have here in the early 40's. I believe that we are going to develop some parliamentarian and, as we old ones pass on, we will hear from the younger ones like Mr. John Egnatoff and all these others who are just at the right age to go into that.

I would like to correct one or two things that do not do good when they get out, and I refer to the statement which was made in respect to the old age pension and there were two speakers – the hon. member for Canora and the hon. Ministers from Tisdale – who said, that because this man could not speak English his pension was refused. That has never been the case in Saskatchewan under any government. For very many years a man had to have Canadian papers. But insofar as language is concerned, or even ability to read and write, if he had the qualifications which enable him to satisfy the residence test and the property test there was no question in the world about language.

The other one was with respect to property. Somebody made a statement about that, too. That is pretty well worked out. On the question of property, the inspector goes out and if he is not satisfied with his own valuation, he goes to the municipal office. I will grant you that this assessment is very fair, even in the town of Canora – the town we heard so much about, last winter. I believe the assessment is all right, and if this property is worth \$600 it will be assessed for \$600. How, with that set-up, is there room for these misleading statements? I do not think it is possible, and I do not think it is a good thing, and I don't think it builds up the confidence that your Government needs.

Still, I was quite interested, Mr. Speaker, seeing that I was out to Gull Lake, about that little-mentioned question, of the pink ribbon. I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that there are enough men on the other side of the House who have been Liberals in the past, to know that the pink ribbon is not the colour of the Liberal Party. I believe that most of them have been Liberals in their day, and they know that.

Now, I just want to add another little bit. I came back to Regina with three or four little matters which came up in my investigations out there, in connection with P.F.A.A. I had intended to hand them to an inspector, if I found one out there, but I did not find one. All this talk about the inspectors being out there – I must say that I did not see them, because I wanted to hand this in, and I was obliged to hand it in to the office in Regina. You see, gentlemen, it was not the Communists of Czechoslovakia who wrecked that government; it was what they call the "Socialists". Do you know what we call them here? We call them the 'pink Communists' these chaps that are in there, and I believe that both Mr. Lloyd and Mr. Kuziak were out there and I do not say that they took any pink ribbon out there but I know . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. May I remind the hon. member that it is the custom in the House to address members by their constituencies not by name.

Mr. Banks: — Oh, yes, I beg your pardon. The hon. member for Biggar (Hon. Mr. Lloyd), I think, and the hon. member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak), were out there, and let me explain this question of the pink ribbons. I don't know just what to say with respect to the hon. member from Hanley (Mr. Walker), I

understand he is a lawyer and, knowing the attitude of the Premier towards all lawyers in general (or it might be only one lawyer), I would like to say a word to welcome this young man, as a member of the Bar, one to another, and I guess it will be up to him to help the Premier live down this antipathy he has to the legal profession. I don't know whether he bears that, or that it was caused by reason of him not having very many of the legal profession in his party. They do not fall for his party very heavily; but in any event we have got two members in the House now and that is all I have to say about it.

In my own constituency – I just want to report, as the year goes by, that we had a very nice crop. We had a very good crop. We also had an election there, and do you know, Mr. Speaker, since that election we have no more talk of depressions. And we have got no champions in 'liberty' up there. Everything goes along so serene and quiet that you would think there had never been any of that there. These stories about the 'Big Interests' have all vanished and, I believe, one of the reasons for that is that Mr. Nicholson has retired to the farm up in Sturgis. You know, that is a wonderful place, because it is going to afford a place for those C.C.F. members who have done well and can retire when they happen to be defeated.

Now there is one thing I was a little disappointed in – and I see that the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) is not in his seat. I came down to this Session hoping that he would present to this House a report of that Agricultural Dominion-Provincial Conference that was held at Ottawa from the 12th to the 14th day of December. I expected that he was going to do that when he made his speech. He is the only connecting link we have, and I believe that he was there with all the other ministers of agriculture. The question they were discussing is that which is on the minds of everybody; are we going to be able to sell our wheat and all these products we have? He passed it by with a simple reference that did not mean anything.

In view of that, Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask permission to read something about that conference, and I am glad I have it here, and if the other side of the House don't want to hear it, this side will present it. Now, this is the report:

“The representatives of the four countries outside of Canada in their statement have illustrated very well the present trade situation. The Netherlands have always purchased wheat from Canada since we became an exporting nation, until this year. The reason they have not done so, this year, is because they have no dollars which can be used for that purpose. They no doubt have been able to buy wheat elsewhere, possibly with dollars and if so, the present controls over trade make it that much more difficult for Canada to receive the dollars with which to purchase from the United States. On the other hand, Belgium, which lies alongside the Netherlands, does not appear to have the same problem and is purchasing wheat from Canada. Both of these countries are selling food products in accordance with long custom to the United Kingdom. Some, at least, of these products are being sold under contract in competition with Canadian food and in certain cases, as listed earlier, at lower cost to the United Kingdom. During the past year they have been supplied – many

have been supplied – by Canada. It may be that Canada supplied them at lower cost than others could have earlier.

Mr. Klutz and his assistant, speaking for the Department of Agriculture for the United States, whose government is in a position to exercise greater influence on trade than any other government in the world, have given the answer to those, who have suggested during these discussions that the United States' wheat acreage is high by stating that they are reducing their acreage by ten million acres, this year. I may add that I have placed on Hansard, last Saturday, in an interview given during the F.A.O. Conference by Mr. Andres, who is Mr. Brehmen's chief advisor (this Mr. Brehmen is American) at the Conference and to the representatives of the Sifton newspapers. In the interview he stated that their objective over three years is a reduction of 24,000,000 acres of the area seeded to wheat as of last year. Both Mr. Klutz and Mr. Andres have given the reasons for the Department. They have stated that the reduction is being made because of their fear, because to do otherwise would return certain areas to the conditions which prevailed in the 'thirties when they had the dust bowl. This is the answer to those who have been saying that we must have wheat or someone is going to starve in Asia or some other place. They have concluded they must stop growing wheat or someone will starve because those who are attempting to continue to grow it will be driven out by the blinding dust which will turn the area into a desert. If the world is going to be fed through the production of that area it must be taken out of wheat and returned to grass for a period.

That argument is much more likely to be heeded in the United States than the one we put forward, namely; we need the market for our 25 million acres which is now supplied by the extra 25 million acres in the United States. The fact is, however, that the result will be the same, no matter the reason for trying it out, provided that the land now growing wheat in the Central United States is returned to grass. The market now supplied by the United States, possibly including The Netherlands, will again be supplied by Canada. But, we who have listened should learn from the decision arrived at by the United States, and that is that the argument which applies in favour of good farm practice in the United States applies with equal force in the prairie provinces of Western Canada. The only difference is that we on the Canadian prairies have not so many alternatives to boot, as in the more southern areas of the United States. But we must find alternatives and utilize them. If we raise livestock, we can put more fibre back into the soil which we do cultivate. If we are going to raise cattle, we must put more land in grass. If we raise more pigs or poultry we must have more land in oats and barley. If we are

going to assure success in raising either oats or barley or wheat we must put an average of one-third of our land in summerfallow. The fact is, we now have a least 66 million acres under cultivation in the prairie west. The records introduced to this Conference contain the information that this year 21 million acres are in summerfallow, while it is said at least another million acres at least should be in summerfallow, whether kept blank or converted from waste. The practice which best conserves the moisture for one season to be utilized in the next should be fallowed in each district. We should remember at the same time that when we reduced our wheat acreage to this one-third level in 1942, we produced our greatest wheat crop – 27 bushels to the acre – while at the same time we produced our greatest supply of feed grain and grass. With that feed grain and grass we produced for three years more livestock products than during any other period either before or since. If we answer experience and practical agriculture with argument based upon some theory relating to trade or lack of nutritional foods in China or India, the world will in the long run be short of the foods which our climate and fertility of soil provide for.”

This, gentlemen, seems to be very pertinent, today, and there have been some comments on this by various newspapers. This is what the ‘Leader-Post’ had to say:

“The explanation for the fall in our general trade policy since 1945 is examined. (Now, I’d like you to follow this.) Not only has the Canadian Government insisted upon selling these farm products to the United Kingdom under government-to-government contracts, despite the United Kingdom’s lack of dollars, but all other export markets have been shut off by embargoes enacted by the Canadian Government. Throughout the whole period it has been a crime punishable by a fine up to \$5,000 or two years in prison, for anyone to sell food products abroad except under these British contracts. Only under extreme pressure such as the cattlemen exerted in the early month of 1948, have the Canadian Government lifted these embargoes. Both the cattle, beef and lamb embargoes were lifted in 1948, but the hog and pork embargo, not to mention embargoes on a hundred other products still remain. To repeat, since the war ended in 1945 the Canadian Government has exerted all its influence to persuade the British Government, since 1947 under its better judgment, and in respect to the dollar problem to continue these food contracts throughout this period. Other markets with good prices have been available but have been denied our farmers by law.”

I have no doubt the members opposite agree with that; I don’t know, but we’ll see.

“The Government, of course, must bear its share of the blame. So that is now happening. The farmers should be

quick to identify the real authors of this mistaken policy. They are the so-called leaders of the farmers: The head of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, of the three Prairie Wheat Pools, who, contrary to every prudent consideration, insisted the Government stake everything on the British market. Each time a British contract was signed the Federation, with Mr. Hannon as leader and Mr. Weston and other members of the Pool, leaders or their deputies, led the cheering. When the Wheat Agreement was signed, Mr. Hannon and Mr. Weston at once proclaimed it as a pure and undefiled wheat policy. Without the support of the Federation and the Wheat Pools every step of the way, this disastrous policy could never have been carried through. The reason for the constant pressure of the Wheat Pools and the Federation of Agriculture for Government contracts which made necessary the outlawing of all other markets, is readily identified. It is their opposition to the market system of doing business. By persuading the Government to enter into these unwise and exceedingly costly contracts, they made the closing of the wheat market and the strangling of other export markets inevitable. To service these contracts it was necessary to shut down markets and to block all other outlets. And now, when the failure of the British market is staring them in the face, these misguided people are not criticizing the Government at Ottawa – note Mr. Hannon's almost daily charge for failing to pen up export markets long closed; they are attacking the Government for not granting costly subsidies to farmers, either by direct government payments or by high floor prices, as if it were the duty of the taxpayers and the consumers to compensate the farmers for the costly mistakes they have made. Errors of this kind could not have happened a generation ago when farm leaders stood for free trade and its open market." Now it seems to me . . .

Premier Douglas: — May I ask the hon. member if he agrees with those quotations he has just read.

Mr. Banks: — I was coming to that, and I was going to say that we were all pretty ignorant of that situation. I know that I was. I put every confidence in this policy and I have not, strange to say, any fears yet but what we will sell wheat and continue to sell wheat. We have that promise from England that within two years she will be in shape to buy all our wheat, and I am not alarmed. I did not know of the situation, that is my answer. I felt though, seeing that the Minister of Agriculture was Saskatchewan's representative, that he should have told us the very things I am telling you now. We heard considerable, but apparently he does not want to discuss it. I am not going to say that I am an authority, but I consider it my duty to place the matter before this august body here, and let them digest it. Let some of our wheat men come up and tell us what they think about it! They will pass the buck by saying what happened in 1921, when, after that election, the Rt. Hon. Mr. MacKenzie-King hung on with four of a majority and the C.C.F. Party had 69 members in the House. Do not blame them for the drop in markets in 1921, because as far as that is concerned the Progressives of that date certainly would not get very far in forming pools or farmers' markets with the

man that they had leading the Progressives at that date, the Hon. Mr. T. Crerar. We know that he was an elevator man, he was a Grain Exchange Man and that was all he was at that time.

Premier Douglas: — And a Liberal.

Mr. Banks: — Not at that time. I feel sorry for the Premier. I think he got his ribbons crossed about that pink ribbon. He does not know the colours of the Liberal Party. They are not pink. So we just have to take things as we find them, and we find echoes of 1921 here. In Mr. Nollet's speech, he was throwing mud.

In the Minister of Agriculture's speech, he was throwing blame for no Wheat Board at that time. We all know, Mr. Speaker, that at that time the Tory Government just opened the thing wide open, and let everything seek its level; but here we are, five years after the war, after peace has been proclaimed, receiving a price for wheat which is compensating the farmers and, I believe, satisfying the farmers that wheat producing is not a bad job after all. Now why these people in power here opposite do not come out and discuss this question I cannot understand. Why should we have to go — I went for this report to the Hon. James Gardiner, Federal Minister of Agriculture. That is his report I read here; but why should not our own Agricultural Minister come up and tell us all about this? I wonder if he will.

We are going to leave that subject and I guess we will hear a lot from now on now that this question has been brought before this House; and I think it should be. I don't think, when we are facing national problems of this magnitude, Mr. Speaker, that it is enough to get up and blame some other political party and say what they have done. I think that the people should come forward with advice; that it all goes right back to that same song we have here every day, the same song you had at that conference in Saskatoon. We are aware that they are under a terrible handicap on the other side of the House, every man (and rightfully so), wants to make a little stake in this country; he wants it for his own; he believes in that. Why not? Of course, he should have that, and all thirty of them over there — twenty-nine to make it correct; they all believe in this. They want to make some property of their own, but they cannot let that theory go to the public; they have to tell the public something else. They are labouring under that hypocritical position all the time: "We are Socialists, but we are not Socialists as far as our own property is concerned. Oh, no! We want to accumulate, within the law; but otherwise we are Socialists" — and doesn't that cause all this confusion in the conventions? I don't think our esteemed friend the Minister of Highways, complained to that convention at Saskatoon that it was not correctly reported. I don't think he did — he has sometimes but he says that this one was not; but we know very well that the powers that came through to put him back terra firma. They needed them all — and he reminded me, Mr. Speaker, of that old story they tell of when the Tuscans were going to sack Rome — at that C.C.F. convention we had this little thing, and those behind cried "forward" but those before cried "back". Yes, the Cabinet Ministers, they cried "back" — they had had enough Socialism, but they just could not hold their own people, for a time at least.

I can only say that the same conditions prevail in my constituency as do in Cannington. I wanted to be very tolerant to the hon. Minister of Highways. I have been to see him quite often, and I asked for two bridges. I was there in 1948 and again in 1949. I did not ask for the

whole six. These little bridges have a 40-foot span and I picked out the important ones where there is more traffic and he promised me consideration. Oh yes; he was very nice about it – but we did not get the bridges. Our constituency pays a lot of money for the gasoline tax, pays a tremendous sum of money. I have an idea we may get those two, next year, because I adopted new tactics. this year, Mr. Speaker, I took photographs of the bridges and sent them in, and they are right in there and I guess the poor chap is a little bit tenderhearted because I believe he has given the assurance now that these two bridges will be in. I am going to suggest right here that for one year this province has got to cut out all highway construction and take a year off and build these bridges that are needed. That is the only thing I can see for it, because it is not going to take hundreds of thousands of dollars, it is going to take millions of dollars to get those bridges in shape again and we'll forget about Weyburn for one year, and turn some money over to the Highways Department and say 'Now restore those bridges'. I have not very much hope that that will be done; but I hope it will be done.

We have another matter and that is the lumber industry. I made a few remarks on that, last year, and I do not think the Minister of Natural Resources said much about it – it is just because it is attributable to my own corner that I know this. I thought he had done a good job when he got out these and I want to commend him for it. We had an application up there for a sawmill site. We have no saw mills up there at all, and in that area up there in which we are interested I was so careful that I got all the political parties interested – the CCF's were in it, the Liberals were in it, and I don't know whether they were any of the other parties or not; but they came at this thing as a community, and I am going to state this in the House, because I do not believe the Minister knows a thing about this. After a while, the Minister granted a sawmill site to this man, whom he found out his Deputy had known for years, and I think he believed the man was quite qualified to handle this important position; there was no question of the custom of cutting for the Government, we are too close to Manitoba for that; you know, you get a little better price in Manitoba. It was working along very well, the mill was set, the saw was going and do you know what happened? The hon. gentleman from Canora visited that district (he is not present in the House, I am sorry; I cannot help it though). He visited that district, and the next thing I heard he was going to give a second sawmill site, but one of the conditions that I had with these people was that there was only going to be one mill, then we had somebody responsible for it. If you get two mills, they will haul in twenty-thousand feet off the stump and cut it and it is gone before you know where it is, unless you have somebody responsible. But I want to give the Department credit they turned it down. They would not give him an application, so the other man still has the sawmill and possibly, on investigation, the Minister may be satisfied that this is going to be a good deal, because I am going to tell him that there may be some of their C.C.F. Party salvaged up there; they are interested just as much as the Liberals are that they get a square deal here. But if they don't – why they don't seem to go up and hold a meeting at all. So I am hoping that this summer they will get this because immediately this other mill they dealt with and so forth, then they issued the order "no more permits", and after the mill had cut a thousand feet permits were cut off, and the fellow had to pack up and go home. That is the way they run the lumber, and I would say that this lumber business, is so far as private industry is concerned, is completely socialized. There is not one tissue of private ownership left in the lumber business.

I am going to deal with something that I have quite an interest

in, and that is this question of education. In a personal way I have always been interested. I came to Kamsack in 1917, and in the election of 1917 I was elected to the school board and I served on it until 1935, which makes seventeen years and fifteen years of that I was chairman so I know something about it. As a matter of fact, the man in charge of education today will be very small people; the men I knew in those days, Dr. George Weir, Dr. Schnell, they were starters of the system of education we have today. Of course there is, today, quite a fissure of feeling and I am just wondering, in my own mind, whether or not we will, in the next period of twenty-five years, have one-half of the province under the larger school unit and one-half under the little schools. I have an idea that this question of the large unit was precipitated on the people a little too fast. Much has been said in the newspapers. Now the hon. gentleman from Rosetown had a vote in his district and so had the hon. gentleman from Watrous and I know it carried; but still there was a substantial minority vote against it and in these things such as education, it is not the best thing in the world to have that situation. Everybody believes in it; and if you can go and say to them “this is a good system, a better system than the other”, you will get a hundred per cent behind it. On this question of votes – I am not taking about those that went by default; but on the actual votes I believe it was about fifteen to fifty (that is, where there were votes taken), about half was defeated and the other half carried with a substantial majority. I don’t say that this is any reason, when the prestige of a cabinet minister in his own seat is used to carry that through, that that says it is going to be a permanent thing. The main thing is that we have to give the people something that they can use and that they can improve themselves with.

I want to give my attitude in the matter and I am going to read it. You cannot have a school until you have competent teaches. There is not question about that; and we have to pay the money to get them. I will say that in order to have competent teachers, you have to pay adequate salaries, and I want to say that my own town has taken the lead in that. The Kamsack School Board (and they are not in the larger school unit; they have a unit all around them) starts a teacher for the permanent professional Grade 12 at \$1,500. Now that just does not mean very much; it does not mean that if this girl came in there and had three years’ experience teaching elsewhere that they would only give her \$1,500. If she had three years’ experience she would get credit for that, because they allow for experience \$100, each year, of an increase. I do not know what that word would be in school parlance until she gets to \$2,200. Now the temporary, that is those who have written Grade 12 and who have not got permanent certificates, they start at \$1,350 with a \$50 a year increase. I am informed that the reason for this is to spur them on to get permanent certificates and, just as soon as they get their certificate made permanent, then they come under the Grade A class. I want to say that I am in favour of raising that maximum, if it is necessary, to hold a young man or woman in the profession. We must not be outbid or let ourselves be outbid by business or other agencies in retaining the bright young men and women of the community in the teaching profession, and I say the question of the quality of the teacher is first all the time in having a good school, a forward and progressive community and very often in setting the standard of morality, progress or even godliness in the community where they happen to be. In this a teacher very often sets the quality of the district. We had that one time – there is no question about that. We had that class of teacher here at one time, and we may have a great many yet. I believe we can have. I want to call the attention of this House to something I read in the newspapers. This is

February 28, 1950

from London, Ontario, January 14:

“Deacon W.A. Townsend, local public school trustee and a member of the Ontario Royal Commission on Education blamed teachers themselves for the shortage of qualified teachers. Teachers have succeeded so well in convincing the public that teaching is such a grim profession and has so many unattractive features about it and the pays is so poor that young people think it is a good thing to stay out of.”

Pretty alarming, isn't it? Now there is another one here, and this comes from the Yorkton Enterprise and it is headed “Meaningless Diplomas”:

“Chambers of Commerce, the Government's Publicity Bureau and other organizations interested in presenting Saskatchewan's institutions and opportunities in the best light to the outside world, will find little satisfaction in the publicity this province's educational institution received in the “Across Canada” columns of the last issue of Maclean's magazine. The readers of this national magazine will be amazed that Saskatchewan educators, and they may well lower there heads in shame – at what was disclosed in the item in question, which we here reproduce without further comments:

Don Greene, instructor in English in the University Saskatchewan, dictated to 94 freshmen a short dialogue. When he checked what they had written down he was appalled. Some of the results showed 61 per cent with misspelled words, words they were supposed to have learned in grades two, three and four; 18 per cent failed to distinguish between 200 and 2; only two of the students didn't make some error in the use of the apostrophe; more than half of them mixed up ‘who's’ and ‘whose’. Judged by American standards, it is agreed that English standards of Saskatchewan high school graduates are down in the basement. They call the Grade 12 diplomas meaningless.”

Now, here is one, I am sure that the gentlemen opposite have heard it before and might be glad to hear it again, and that is the dear old Kamsack ‘Times’. This is by a school teacher. She took exception to something I had said, and this is what she said:

“There is another point in Mr. Bank's statement which I would like to call attention to. By implication Mr. Banks indicates the teachers have been partly responsible for the lowering of educational standards. The question of lowered standards is open to debate; it is an old story about responsibility. When university professors blame the high school teachers, the high school teachers blame the public school teachers, the public school

teachers blame one another in the downgrade sequence, then finally the poor primary teacher blames the parents and then mothers say to the wide-eyed child ‘You must take after your father’.”

I am afraid, gentlemen, the schools of Saskatchewan have paid a tremendous price for having such things the Adult Education Branch and others, purely political. This statement is attributed to the hon. Mr. Fines when he went to Edmonton, to something up there:

“85 per cent of the teachers of Saskatchewan support the CCF Party.”

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, to keep the records correct, I would like to inform the hon. gentleman that Edmonton is one city where I have not had the pleasure of being yet. I would like to go some day, but I have never been there yet.

Mr. Banks: — Well, it may have been one of the others, but that statement was in the press and came from Alberta someplace.

Mr. Speaker, I don’t think the majority of teachers wanted the fact that they did have some suffering in the depression made public nor made an issue of in an election campaign to elect a party who claimed to be their champions. We had that in 1944 when they went around – and it was not the once that suffered. These ones that were agitating had fine positions in Regina, Saskatoon and the leading towns of Saskatchewan, and they never knew the hardship which the country teacher went through. Let me give you a case. In one of these districts, in the time that the C.C.F. love to talk so much about and before the advent of the larger school unit, the board of this district were up against it; they had no money and had about decided to close the school. The teacher came to the board and offered to stay. There were seven families in that school district who had children going to school, and they worked out this formula – it was her own idea. She said: “I will board with a family for a week.” That is, in other words, she would go around and in three weeks, or rather seven weeks, she would have passed around the families and then she would start back with the first one and each one of those families was to pay her \$5.00 a month and, of course, she got the Government grant. Now that teacher took the matter to a public meeting of the ratepayers and stayed on on that basis, and continued there until times became better and the school finances were able to come ahead.

You see, this is what was said: “If you will just elect us we will raise this question of teachers’ salaries. You have been trodden on.” I do not think there are many of the teachers who want to be the spearhead of that, in that larger units of Sturgis there are four or five of them up there who act as the ‘bosses’ or ‘bull mooses’ at all these teachers’ conventions. They are clever fellows at Sturgis.

Mr. Kuziak: — Were you there?

Mr. Banks: — My learned friend was there; he can answer that. I go if I am invited, but I don’t go to conventions for political reasons. Oh, no! I have too high a regard for education. But he was there, and it was these four or five gentlemen who presented all the resolutions and here there

is the great proof of young people coming along who were never at a convention before – but they are leading them. I want to say that this has not been a good thing for schools. This has brought about the situation in towns like Kamsack, yes, and in Yorkton where these schools are independent of everything, independent of politics, too. There never was any politics in our School Board. They are overcrowded with people from the country who send their boys and girls in there to get an education, so that they do not want to use the country schools. I repeat again, that until we get away from that we are not going to get anywhere.

I asked a question in this Legislature on March 7th, of the Minister of Education, if there were any petitions received for the larger school unit in Canora. His reply was, “yes” and he mentioned one district that had declared themselves in favour of it. Then I asked him another question, did they contemplate a vote, and he said yes, and added that the reason they had not given the vote before was that they were waiting until such time as the sentiments in the district became favourable, because they had petitioned against it in the year 1946 when all the others were formed. Then I asked when they vote was likely to be and he said that is Government policy.

There was a very innocuous amendment introduced to the Legislature on April 2nd. Under the old system the larger unit was supposed to be the cradle of the poor schools, mother, and father; the stronger districts would have enough money to carry the poor ones. It was rumoured, firstly to the country schools and villages; but in this amendment – and for my life I did not know what it meant at that time, I didn't connect the two – there was a provision that when the original school district was proclaimed, they could not go to town unless permission was granted, and that is the law today. Under the old law, the town might come in after the district had been proclaimed and got going and was in business. Well, we soon found out what it meant. It meant that the town of Canora needed a big school, and I think they have a right to a school provided they pay for it themselves; but I do not think they have a right to that school and have the farmers around there pay five-sixths of the cost. I understand Canora is less than one-sixty of this larger school unit which embraces my constituency, 10 miles on the west side of my constituency, so I know what I am talking about. But that leaves it open to these abuses. I have looked into the statutes and I wanted to find out whether under this larger school unit Act, unlimited expenditures could be made – \$20,000, \$30,000, or \$100,000 for schools, but the only thing it says is that the provisions of The School Act with respect to capital account shall apply to the larger units. It does not mean very much, because I don't think you could apply it at all, and, so far as I know, in the larger units, there has been no distinction between capital account and current account. Under the old law, the distinction was as clear as they sky, but there is not any distinction in the larger unit and we have had districts stepping out and paying six, seven and eight thousand dollars for a school and charging it to the larger unit. This is the way they put it. One of them said, “We're lucky. We got our school; we don't care anymore. We can vote it out if we want to.” A whole lot of them have done it; but there was never any question or distinction made in these larger units between capital account and current account, and I want to say that a lot of dissatisfaction has arisen by reason of the fact that there is too much of this money being frittered away on capital account. They made an awful noise down around my town because I criticized them putting a new school where the district school was good enough and could have been repaired and made better than the school they built, for less than a thousand dollars – better than the one they spent \$4,700 for; that is not

business. But that doesn't matter; they are running the thing. They are on top now, and we can't say a word about it so that is the situation we have.

There is something a little bigger in this question than whether you could carry a large unit board at Watrous, that is not the issue. That issue is a lot bigger than whether you can carry one in Canora. The question is, here: Can we get the business of the school districts economically carried out? Can we get this teaching of a school in the hands of a competent teacher so that it will have the confidence of the rest of the district and they will believe in it and send their children to it, believing that they are going to get the best there is in that line? That is the question here, Mr. Speaker. This question is an awful lot greater than whether a lot of school teachers were elected to the Legislature. It is much more important than that, because that was the predominant issue in 1944 all over Saskatchewan; but these teachers have got their eyes open – 85 per cent belonging to the C.C.F. Party!

Now I am going to bring some things out here and I want to say that what I am going to show you here is open to anybody who wants to see it after I am through, and this is the accounts of one school district. The Kamsack Larger Unit, No. 35. I have here two statements: this is the authentic one; this is the one which was given in the school district at the annual meeting; they are pretty nearly all the same. In April, 1946, when this larger school unit operated they had a teacher in this school who was received \$1,200. The tax rate averaged between eight and ten mills; in the year 1946 it was ten mills. The assessment is \$154,800. That raised from the taxpayers, \$1,548 by way of taxation. So the school grants are able to pay their way. Out of the \$1,548, they paid the teacher \$1,200. In 1949, they paid the teacher \$1,490, up \$290. Well, we don't see anything wrong with that. Teachers' salaries have undoubtedly gone up \$300 in the last five years. Why have not they gone up more? But that is all they are paying this teacher, an advance of \$290. This is what I want to get at. About 20 mills, that is what they are paying this year, was raised in 1949, an increase of 100 per cent. There was raised by way of taxation, \$2,941.20, but the total school revenue was \$3,309.20 under 20 mills. A grant was then made. The tuition fees in these country schools are fixed at \$50 for Grade XII. In this particular year, there were five high school students. The tuition fees would be \$250. We have that in the statement that will go to the meeting of the ratepayers, but we certainly have not got it in the other one; that is kept in the other school district. Do you know how much they put in for tuition fees, \$495? The school in town showed its Unit Administration cost as \$85. In the other one, Unit Administration – nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say that there was any money taken, but I am going to say that this statement was cooked up for the ratepayers to believe in, and the statement is untrue. Do you know why that extra amount was there? In every case in this larger unit, they tried to show an expenditure for that particular school of more than they raised. In that district there are 82 schools and 97 rooms, and eight out of those have overpaid; they have raised more money than they have expended. The funny thing about it is this. The amounts seem to be so out of reason: Spring Valley overpaid \$1,714; Bonnybank, \$839; Truedale, \$632; Devonshire, \$599; Leonard Valley, \$547; Poplar Point, \$523. I ask, where are all the others in between \$400 to \$1.00? I am sorry to say, Mr. Speaker, that in every one of those cases, the statement that the ratepayer was reading was cooked up so as

to make him believe that the larger unit board was spending the full amount of money they had been raised in their district plus the grant.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Would the hon. member tell us who it was who cooked up these figures for these meetings? Are you suggesting that the secretary for the district cooked up these figures.

Mr. Banks: — I did not say that. I did not see him do it. I just said they are out of the district. Somebody made them up, somebody that knows the whole thing.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — You would be willing to table it so that the Minister of Education could look into it, would you?

Mr. Banks: — The Minister can see the originals; I can have copies made. I think that this is the over-ardent political board. There are places in this province where you have boards that are exemplary, that have the interests of the teachers and pupils at heart; but there are boards where the C.C.F. 'machine' politics have got into it, that would go the lengths it has gone here to cover up and make the picture appear bright. That is the situation here. That is the only charge I make here. I make that charge in this House that this particular statement was deliberately made for the purpose of proving to the district that the larger unit had spent all the money. It is apparent for two reasons; and if my friends want to see this, they are quite welcome to see it. I cannot open my mouth up there. If I do, "I am against education". We do not know where we stand, I brought this up here because a gentleman who has been with that board for 35 years asked me to put it before the Legislature even though the task was distasteful to me.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it not only happened in that school, but it happened in every school of that larger school unit of Kamsack No. 35 where the overpayment was between \$1.00 and \$500, that they padded this thing up so that it would look good.

I have nothing more to say but I will, I hope, have something to say later on about the question that my friend, the hon. member for Cannington brought up, last night. But I find here that the Government had already been worrying about the financial responsibility of this province. I will just read it:

"The subject of provincial-municipal relations may generate some heat during the coming winter. The financial position of the rural municipalities in Saskatchewan is considered as satisfactory by the Provincial Government. They are worried over what might occur should a series of crop failures hit the province. This is one of the reasons for the preparation of the Britnell Report on Provincial-Municipal Relations aimed at a definite allocation of financial responsibility of municipalities and the Province for the services affecting both. The report which was been expected for months, has still not been officially presented to the Government. It is understood to be almost complete with only a few parts not finished. The Government has told the Urban Municipalities' Association, which will meet with the Cabinet, Friday, that it does not wish to use the report as a basis for discussion until complete."

A report from Saskatoon says the Government wishes to have the report dealt with before the January 10th, Federal-Provincial conference on constitutional matters. Meanwhile, the meeting between the Urban Municipalities' Association and the Cabinet will probably deal only with the resolutions passed by the association at its convention last June. The Department of Municipal Affairs is not worried about the cities of the province, which are in fairly sound financial shape, although mill rates are at record high levels. The rural municipalities, however, have been spending in excess of revenue for the past few years. In the last Annual Report for the Department of Municipal Affairs, the Director of Municipal Auditing and Accounting said: "The tendency of rural villages and towns to spend in excess of current revenue can only lead to disaster. The Provincial Government is believed to urgently want some kind of solution to the problem, possibly based on a new Dominion-Provincial Agreement."

Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley): — Will the hon. member tell the House what he is quoting from?

Mr. Banks: — I am quoting from the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix.

This is something that must be watched. We do not want a repetition of what happened here 25 to 30 years ago. I cannot see every many signs of that just now, because in those days the land was all encumbered. There were too many private debts, too many mortgages, and when the revenue started to get smaller and prices went down, people simply were not able to pay their debts and they went to the wall. This time we have not got those debts, at least not in my district; and I was really astonished at the Minister of Agriculture making that almost crying speech about some of the articles that have gone down in price. At a time like this, business men like him must expect prices to go down. I expect them to, and so does everybody else and we are prepared for that time. The Dominion Minister has told us that in two years, the British market will again begin to function and be in just as sound a position as they were before the war.

Mr. F. A. Dewhurst: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

CORRECTION

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, when the member from Moosomin was speaking he made a statement to the effect that Mr. Perley and I had sawed-off seats and I said that to the best of my recollection Mr. Perley and I had been opposed. I find that my recollection was wrong on one count. Mr. Perley was not opposed by another than a Liberal candidate in the 1940 election, and I find that I was opposed by two candidates, a Liberal and a United Reform Candidate, and, therefore, my recollection with reference to Mr. Perley was

February 28, 1950

incorrect. However, I wish to reiterate a point of privilege I made, namely, that there was no saw-off between either Mr. Perley and myself or between the C.C.F. organization in Weyburn constituency and the Conservative Organization in the constituency of Wolseley-Qu'Appelle.

The Assembly adjourned at 6:00 o'clock p.m.