

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**THIRD SESSION — ELEVENTH LEGISLATURE**  
**14th Day**

**Tuesday, February 20, 1951**

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

**DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY**

The House resumed, from Monday, February 19, 1951, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Howe for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Korchinski.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, I wondered for a little while whether or not I would be able to get away today at all, but anyway we finally got into the debate again. One of the outstanding things about this debate is the amount of time that the members of the Opposition have spent in discussing matters outside of this province. I would point out to the hon. members opposite that on this side of the House the Premier took less than one-third of his time making a statement in regard to international affairs, and with that statement I am proud and quite happy to be associated. On the other side of the House, one member in particular, the member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski), used 90 per cent of his time (and his time was quite a bit) on international affairs. The newspaper report of the speech that the hon. member for Arm River made yesterday is over one-third of it on international affairs. It is an exceptionally good report considering the kind of a speech it was. And so I think we can only draw one conclusion, Mr. Speaker, and that is that the members of the Opposition would rather talk about anything else in the world than their record as a Liberal Party in the province of Saskatchewan.

In this Debate they are following the regular Liberal line of carping criticism and fault-finding, The hon. member for Arm River yesterday chided the member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) because the member for Canora had said they had not made any positive constructive suggestions Then he points to the fact that they moved an amendment to take off the Public Revenue tax and pay taxes on the Crown Corporation property, and classified that as a constructive proposal; a constructive proposal to take two million dollars away from revenue and to put nothing in its place. That was as destructive as anything that they have suggested. They make suggestions to reduce revenue; they make suggestions to increase expenditures; they make all kinds of suggestions, some of which they hope will be adopted, and being adopted, will get the Government into difficulties, financial or otherwise.

The member for Melville (Mr. Deshaye) wanted a lower licence for farmers and lower insurance on account of the winter roads. The hon. member is still living back in the good old days of Liberal government when the roads closed up with the first blow of snow in the Fall of the year, and stayed that way until the sun took the snow away in the Spring. He does not know, and neither does the member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) apparently, that there are thousands of miles of roads being kept open by the Department of Highways and also thousands of miles being kept open by those poor down-trodden municipalities in the province with whom they

sympathize so much. The road situation is much different from what it was. I believe it was the member for Melville who regretted that this Province was not matching dollar for dollar the health grants, the grants for construction of hospitals in this province. I want to remind my hon. friends, and some of them were sitting in the House, in 1934, when the then Hon. Dr. Uhrich, who was Minister of Public Health, promised to the Association of Rural Municipalities that his Government would bring in State Medicine. What did they do about it? They took Liberal action, and did nothing. They did nothing about it at all. The Federal Government, the Liberal Government at Ottawa, did not make any grants for the construction of hospitals until the example of the C.C.F. in this province forced them to it. That is a fact. My hon. friends try to laugh that one off, but it isn't easy to laugh that one off throughout the Province of Saskatchewan. No Liberal government in the Province of Saskatchewan ever gave a nickel to help community-built hospitals. That was started when a C.C.F. Government came into office in this province. Let my hon. friends not forget that. And because the Liberal Party, when they were in power, never did anything to help students in this province continue with their school, the hon. member for Cannington thinks that that gives him complete free licence to get up and say that the present student aid is not enough. See, that is Liberal philosophy. If the Liberals have not done anything and then somebody else does something, they are fully competent and fully licensed to get up and grumble and complain about it even though they did nothing about it in the first place.

The hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) got out the C.C.F. Handbook of 1933 — I don't think he told us whether it was the original or the Liberal reprint.

**Opposition Member:** — They were the same.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — No, they were a little different in a rather important way. And he quoted about social ownership of resources. I am not too sure that it will have any good effect on my hon. friends opposite, but I do not think we should ever give up hope that some of them might learn what social ownership really means. They jump to the conclusion, not because they have not been told differently, that social ownership means that everything is owned by the State. They never got that information from any Democratic Socialist. That is something they cooked up in their own imagination. Trestrail is one of the persons that did the cooking-up. Social ownership is not one type or form of ownership. Social ownership is many forms of ownership; and it does include private ownership, and it does include co-operative ownership. Would my hon. friend for Arm River say that co-operative ownership is anti-social?

**Mr. Danielson:** — I would not say anything foolish like that.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I don't think he would dare. Social ownership includes municipal ownership. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Arm River said he would not say anything foolish like that. It is a good job he added the two words "like that". The power plant in the City of Regina is socially owned. The Saskatchewan Power Corporation is socially owned. You see, even the Liberals, when they cannot help themselves, believe in a certain amount of social ownership. I suppose we could call the Wheat Board social ownership of the facilities

of marketing Canadian wheat for the Canadian wheat grower. And so, when we talk about social ownership — we are not talking about one kind of ownership, but definitely about a type of ownership which is in the best interests of society and, therefore, leaves the least opportunity for exploitation of either labour or the consumer. On the other hand, what is monopoly capitalism? Monopoly capitalism is the ownership of the means of production to such an extent that it gives to those owners a power and a responsibility far beyond what any irresponsible individual should have, far beyond any individual who is not responsible to the people should have.

**Mr. A. Lopton (Saltcoats):** — Does that apply to oil?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — My hon. friend says, "Does that apply to oil corporations?" There certainly is monopoly ownership in the oil business to a considerable extent. There is no question about that; but I want to give you a rather classical example of monopoly capitalism. We have all heard about the Duponts. This is taken from the Toronto Star of December 23, 1950:

"Members of this Dupont clan dominate the one billion dollar Dupont company, which makes 1,200 products, including nylons, cellophane, paints, gun powder and atomic bombs. Furthermore, through stockholdings they dominate General Motors Corporation, the world's largest producer of automobiles, and the U.S. Rubber Co., one of the world's largest sources of rubber products, as well as other corporations. The empire dominated by the clan has financial assets of five billion dollars."

That is an example of monopoly capitalism, and what does it do? I just managed to get a little clipping from the Co-operative newspaper about General Motor's Manager, President Charles E. Wilson . . .

**Mr. Dundas (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — From the "Commonwealth"?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — No, this is from the "Consumer". My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley does not believe in the "Co-operative Consumer" nor in co-operation. And this article says Charles E. Wilson, President of General Motors, does not get paid off in peanuts, but if he did the world's largest company would have deposited 5,861 — 5 cent bags on his desk for each and every hour he worked in 1949. 5,861 — 5 cent bags of peanuts every hour if he got paid in peanuts. In other words, it is \$293.05 an hour — and my hon. friends sitting opposite are helping to pay it: \$586,000 for the year.

**Mr. Danielson:** — He has got Cadbury and Shumiatcher beat.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — My hon. friends never talk about that, but they sometimes talk about wages. They talk about labour getting too high wages, and I would like to point out here that under the present system of monopoly capitalism, where this monopoly capitalism actually controls government in many cases, and on the request of those monopoly capitalists, the price controls are thrown away. And so from 1946 to 1950, the price index rose 46.7 points. The cost of living

index went up 39 per cent — over one-third higher in 1950 than in 1946. The Liberal Party has got to accept responsibility for this. They cannot blame anyone also for it at all. They took one dollar out of every four out of the pockets of people who are on fixed incomes when they allowed that price increase. And here is what it did to the working people. All manufacturing industries, the average weekly wages in 1946 were \$30.00 — I will forget about the cents; in 1950 they had increased to \$44, an increase of nearly \$14 per week, an increase of actual dollars of 46 per cent compared with the 39 per cent increase of the cost of living. But when you take that increased cost of living into consideration did the workers in the manufacturing industries get a 46 per cent increase? No, their real increase was 5 per cent, not 46 per cent. Glass products workers — they had an increase of 16 per cent in real wages between 1946 and 1950 because their increase in actual wages was enough to keep ahead of the increasing cost of living. The coal miners had a decrease of \$3.20 in actual purchasing power per week. On steam railways the actual decrease of real wages in purchasing power, between 1946 and 1950, was \$2.44 a week. They did not get an increase at all. And some of my hon. friends like to make capital out of the railway strike. There are a lot more figures that could be quoted.

The farmer did not escape either. In this period from July 1946 to July 1950, the 6-foot combine increased 40 per cent in price. The 4-cylinder tractor, rubber tires, increased 44 per cent. And rural electrification, which my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition is so much exercised about, did not escape either. Electrical fixtures and equipment increased in that period over 56 per cent. That is not doing much to help rural electrification, or any other kind of electrification in this country. According to the Bank of Canada's 'Statistical Summary' for May, 1950, 450 of Canada's largest companies had profits in 1938 of 208 million dollars. By 1950, it had gone up to 473 million dollars. That shows what is taking place when monopoly capitalism runs the government of Canada as they are doing at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, one other thing that struck me as peculiar in this debate was the fact that the Leader of the Opposition seems to think that we should not criticize any of our institutions. This was particularly evident in connection with the Wheat Board; but I would like to remind the Leader of the Opposition and all members opposite that this is a democracy and that democratic institutions thrive on critics; that criticism is a necessary part of democracy. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, that is their only excuse for being over there. They have no hope of ever being over here. And so I do not think that when we criticize the actions of the Wheat Board, that somebody should rise and say "Oh, you mustn't talk about this thing or maybe they will do away with it, and take it away from us altogether", or that the Leader of the Opposition should get up and try to name the Premier of this province as one who was working in such a way that he was going to destroy the Wheat Board. That is resorting to the old tactics of calling names when you cannot meet criticism, and that is not new to the Liberal Party either. Not at all. They have been doing that this session, and I remember a former Minister of Highways who called a couple of C.C.F.'ers in a public meeting, (and these two C.C.F. supporters were veterans of the first World War) — called them Fascists and Nazis, and that Minister of Highways refused to allow those members to get up and answer the charge. That was during the last World War when the Fascists and Nazis were our enemies.

The resort of name calling has always been a resort of the Liberal Party when it runs out of arguments. There was the case of a prominent Liberal up near Hudson Bay, who thought he could get away with calling a school teacher Communist and saying that that person was not fit to have a certificate as a teacher. Thank God we have some British justice here yet, and the result was that the man who called the names was called into Court and had to pay damages for calling those names. And so, when we talk about the Wheat Board, I do not think that people should start calling names. But let us take a look at the record. My hon. friend over here seemed to be very enthusiastic about the Wheat Board. He said if it had not been for the Wheat Board we would be getting nothing for this crop.

**Mr. Danielson:** — No, sir, I did not say that. I said that if it had not been for the Wheat Board we would be getting nothing for our feed wheat.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — All right, Mr. Speaker, if he will sit down and give me chance. He talks rather fast, and I jotted it down as quick as I could, but that is just as good. He said that if it had not been for the Wheat Board operating today, the farmers would have got nothing for their feed wheat, or words to that effect. What I am trying to establish is that the member for Arm River now is apparently quite enthusiastic about the Wheat Board, and I do not think he would deny it. But we will take a little stroll through the records of this House . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — You are welcome to do that, boy.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Here we go back to 1937 or maybe we should say "here we go gathering nuts in May". Back about that time in March, 1937, there was a motion before the House, a great long motion. The Turgeon Commission was sitting at that time and the Liberals were enjoying themselves hiding behind the Turgeon Commission, saying "Oh, now, we must wait to see what they are going to do about it". And our C.C.F.'ers, our 'quintuplets' of which we were so proud, were here in this House at that time, and they moved an amendment to put at the end of this motion a statement to make it clear that we in Saskatchewan wanted the Wheat Board to handle the 1937 grain crop. And this is the amendment, moved by Mr. Williams, seconded by Mr. McAuley, both of whom have now passed on:

"That the amendment be amended by adding the words 'that the 1937 grain crop be marketed through the said Canadian Wheat Board.'

Looking down the list of those who voted against the motion I see here Messieurs Loptson, Danielson, Dundas.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Nothing wrong with that at all.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — My hon. friend wants to look it up.

**Mr. Danielson:** — The wheat was down to 45 cents a bushel then.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Look on page 107 of the Journals of 1937. And then, Mr. Speaker, we will go to 1938 . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Not a thing wrong . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — And in this case . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Grin all you want to. You did not grin yesterday. They won't grin day after tomorrow . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — In this case Mr. Hantelman had moved a motion asking for a National Grain Board and for a minimum fixed price of not less than the cost of production as established by the research bureaux of the Universities. Now, that was not satisfactory to my hon. friend for Arm River, so he moved an amendment, seconded by Mr. Hummel who has long since passed into oblivion in the field of politics, and this amendment again takes refuge in the Turgeon Commission. A year later, they are still hiding behind the Turgeon Commission. They say,

"Pending the completion of the report and its submission to the Government of Canada, by the Hon. Mr. Justice Turgeon as a commissioner appointed by the Government of Canada to enquire into the whole question of the marketing of grain, this Legislature is of the opinion that any specific recommendation regarding any action to be taken by the Parliament of Canada would be premature and inadvisable at the present time."

What a beautiful way of getting out of the tough situation of responsibility.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well that's what they were appointed to find out.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, again one of our quintuplets moved an amendment — Mr. Williams, their leader — and the main part, the spice of this amendment was to add the words:

"And the said Board to accept delivery and market the 1938 crop."

Looking down the recorded vote, among the "yeas" and the "nays", in the "yeas" we have the five quintuplets and in the "nays" we have Messieurs Loptson, Danielson, Culliton — Dundas apparently wasn't there that day. So again they voted against a clear-cut amendment asking the Federal Government that the 1938 crop be marketed through the Canadian Wheat Board. These hon. gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, are only in favour of the Wheat Board in my opinion for one reason, and that is because they dare not take any other stand today, because it would be political suicide.

Coming on to 1939 — I hope this is not getting monotonous to anybody here — here we have an amendment by Mr. Hantelman to the original motion which in this case was moved by Mr. Danielson, and seconded by Mr. Demers, two of the Liberal members. Among other things the amendment said this:

"The Board to accept delivery of and market the 1939 crop, paying to the growers at the time of delivery a fixed minimum price, said price to be established at not less than the cost of production, plus an adequate standard of living as established by the Universities of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan."

Mr. Speaker, in the "yeas" we have this time 15, and I am proud to say that your name is there. I am proud to say that the member for Kelvington (Mr. P.A. Howe) has his name on that list. Also the member for Last Mountain (Mr. J. Benson), and my name is there also. Among the "nays" we have 26 and there we have Messieurs Dundas and Danielson. Before that time my hon. friend for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) had gone into temporary retirement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you will remember, I think, that was the year when we had what was known as the Bracken Committee, a committee of western agriculture, here in the prairie provinces, the Western Wheat Committee; and that committee made certain recommendations, and so later during the Session of 1939, I remember so well that our Leader at that time, Mr. George H. Williams, spoke to the member for Arm River who had a motion on the Order Paper, pleaded with him to accept the recommendations of the Bracken Committee, put those recommendations in a motion, and it would be unanimously passed by this House. But that was not accepted, so the only recourse that we had was to move in an amendment those recommendations of the Bracken Committee, and among other things they asked for a setting of a guaranteed price of wheat of at least 80 cents for No. 1 Northern, basis Fort William, and the continuation of the Wheat Board for 1939 and 1940. When it came to the recorded vote on that question, we find 13 voting for the motion, and we find 29 voting against the motion, which included Mr. Dundas and Mr. Culliton and Mr. Taggart — Mr. Taggart, who was a member of that Committee and who when he was on the Committee voted for the recommendations, and then he comes into this House he votes against them with Mr. Danielson.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Tell us what the motion was.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I have read the important part of the motion. It was that they were voting against 80 cents a bushel, and they were voting against the principles of the Wheat Board.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Read the motion to the House.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take up the time of the House with reading the motion. Here is an interesting . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Just like the Premier was yesterday . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Here is an interesting sidelight. Back about 1939, what was the minimum price then? Was it 60 cents a bushel or 70 cents a bushel? Was that the time they were talking about reducing it? But anyway, we had a Federal election in March, 1940, as hon. members will remember, and just with the Federal election coming up, we could not get the least bit of opposition out of the members at that

time of the Government. Previously, they would vote against 80 cent wheat; they would vote against the Wheat Board; but everything we proposed in the Session of 1940, just before that Federal election, got unanimous support. You will find that in the Journals of the Legislature for 1950, I think, Mr. Speaker, that pretty well shows who are the people who have been really sincere in fighting for a Wheat Board system of marketing and who are the people who are climbing on the band-wagon because they dare not lag behind.

Listening to and reading the speeches of the hon. members opposite, particularly those of the Leader of the Opposition, during the past year, we have heard a great deal about this question of stagnation in Saskatchewan — nothing happening, or the country's just going behind, and all that sort of thing. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that that is why the hotels are full and houses are hard to get — because in the country, there is not much doing! Undoubtedly there is a great population growth in this province; but if you just look around you just cannot help but see the evidences of Saskatchewan going ahead. It is again a case of my hon. friends living back in the age of the Liberal Government. They got so used to stagnation at that time, they think it is still being carried on. Look here, in the 'Leader-Post'. They could not help but put in a red headline about the new Ford plant coming to Regina. That does not exactly look like stagnation. That looks like new business. And then we go to 'Star-Phoenix'. We go to the 'Star-Phoenix' and this is the 'Star-Phoenix' of December 29, 1950, and the headline right across the top of the paper reads: "Full Speed Ahead Seen As Six Saskatchewan Towns Modernized in 1950". The sub-headline, Mr. Speaker, is: "Nothing like it in the last 35 years". And the Towns mentioned are Nipawin, and, you know, they even mention Rosthern in here, and Meadow Lake and Melville — Melville is mentioned: nothing like it in the last 35 years, the way these towns are going ahead. And then my hon. friends talk about stagnation.

Here is a clipping from the Prince Albert 'Herald' of October 3, 1950: "Saskatchewan Tourist Gain continued in August, New Figures Show". The item reads:

"The Saskatchewan tourist trade continued to spiral upward during the month of August, according to figures just released by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. For the second successive month Saskatchewan Tourist traffic recorded a percentage increase greater than that shown by any other province."

I think I have even another one here, I was looking up — and I want to use this paper a little later; I want to find out who was on the Liberal executive in Melfort Constituency; but it just happens that when I take this paper up, I find headlines here about the progress that is being made at this particular time. Oh, here it is! It is a picture right in the centre: "Kindersley Installs Sewage System". Well, that is going ahead. I do not know what my hon. friends read. I am sure they do not read 'L'il Abner'. If they did, they could talk with more sense. But I do not know how they read to manage to be so ignorant about the progress that is being made in Saskatchewan. As Mortimer says, "It isn't easy". And here we have the 'Star-Phoenix' for February 17: "Twenty-three buildings Added to Sturgis"; and here: "Changing Scene at Wynyard". Listen to this:



"New building at Wynyard has increased the assessment by \$58,000 in the last two years, exclusive of the new composite high school, the Union hospital or the Memorial Arena, which are non-taxable although they were all built within the last two years."

And how about stagnation? I have another extract from the 'Star-Phoenix' here, and this is from the issue of November 9, 1950. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition was at Melfort, at the Melfort Liberal Rally and Convention. Other speakers were: J.G. Egnatoff, M.L.A. for Melfort, and J.I. Hetland, M.P. for Humboldt. The hon. Leader of the Opposition is quoted as saying: "The C.C.F. Government has frightened oil companies away from Saskatchewan to Alberta, Walter Tucker, Saskatchewan Liberal alleged at a banquet here Tuesday evening." I think he had eaten too much, and I will produce some evidence to show that something was wrong. I am sure it was not that the food was bad in Melfort, because they always feed you well there. It must just have been a case of over-eating. The article goes on to say — well, that is about rural electrification and in another part; we will not mix that up with the oil.

Now, let us take a look at this question in regard to oil. Has the C.C.F. frightened oil firms away from Saskatchewan? I wonder how many people opposite actually think that that is the case? You know, before we had a C.C.F. Government in 1944, Mr. Speaker, we had a Liberal Government, and my hon. friends always appear to be praying that people will forget that we ever had a Liberal Government back about that time. And so, let us go back to before the time there was a C.C.F. Government, before the time there was a Leduc or a Redwater oilfield in Alberta, and let us compare the oil exploration in Saskatchewan and Alberta with a Liberal Government here in this province. In 1940, 69 wells in Alberta, 19 in Saskatchewan; in 1941, 86 in Alberta, 12 in Saskatchewan; in 1942, 100 wells in Alberta, 7 in Saskatchewan; in 1943, 119 wells in Alberta, 25 in Saskatchewan. But better still, let us compare them on the basis of footage drilled, and the comparison is actually a great deal worse. In Alberta the average footage drilled in those four years, 1940 to 1943, was over 450,000. The average footage drilled in the province of Saskatchewan in those grand and glorious years when we had a Liberal Government was less than 15,000 feet a year. Seven times as much was drilled in the province of Alberta in the same period.

My hon. friends do not like that comparison, and I admire their good taste. I would not like it if I was in their shoes either. Well, we will take another comparison. We will look at it another way. Maybe it would not be fair to compare them with Alberta; but here is the record practically from the beginning in Saskatchewan, from 1900 until 1943, inclusive. The Liberal Party was in power in this province all of those years except before the province was formed, and for the five years when the Anderson Government was in. And in those years, from 1900 to 1943, there were 192 wells drilled in Saskatchewan, an average of less than 4  $\frac{1}{3}$  wells a year. Now, if you take out the wells that were less than 1,000 feet deep, you just have left 64 wells in 44 years, or 11 wells per year, for the Liberal record. Now, they might say that is not fair. Well, let us take their record from 1940 to 1943, and we find that in these four years there were 63 wells dug — in four years, when there was a Liberal Government — an average of 15  $\frac{3}{4}$  wells per year. But, if you take off the wells that were under 1,000 feet — and there were 49 of them — there were only 14 wells over 1,000 feet deep in those four years, an average of 3  $\frac{1}{2}$  wells per year.

Now let us come to the C.C.F. period. From 1944 to 1950 inclusive, 7 years, all wells — 488, an average of 70 wells per year, compared with the Liberal average of 15 3/4. My hon. friend is mumbling to himself. Then the wells, in this period from 1944 to 1950, that were over 1,000 feet deep. We find there were 451 of them, an average of 64 wells per year in those seven years. That is to be compared to the Liberal record for the previous four years of 3 1/2 wells per year: 3 1/2 wells per year the Liberal record; 64 wells over a thousand feet the C.C.F. accomplishment. The average footage drilled during the Liberal rule, in the years 1940 to 1943, the average feet of hole drilled per year, 14,728 feet. The average footage drilled since the C.C.F. Government took office, 141,832 feet per year, 10 times as much drilling. And yet our friend says, "C.C.F. frightened oil firms away". Well, Mr. Speaker, if we frightened the oil firms away, what in the world did the Liberals do to them from 1940 to 1943?

Now these are some of the accomplishments of the oil exploration programme in the province of Saskatchewan during the past few years, but there are some more, too. For example:

**Mr. Danielson:** — May I ask the hon. Minister a question?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — No, I will do exactly what my hon. friend did with me. I will deal with that later.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I answered your question.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, that does not give the whole picture, because we have had a great deal of other work besides drilling of wells, not only the gravity meter work but the seismic work that has been done throughout the province. One company in this Province put down 14,000 shot-holes for seismic work, short one — 13,999; and the total footage of those shot-holes was 1,094,000 feet of drilling. Another company put down shot-holes totalling over 600,000 feet of drilling. The total for the whole province in footage of seismic shot-holes drilled would be well over 2,000,000 feet, probably 2 1/2 million feet of actual drilling which has taken place. So, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there should be any further argument on this question as to whether or not the oil companies have been driven out of Saskatchewan. They are here. They are working. They have put millions into it now. They are going to put millions into it in the future. They have full confidence in the Government of Saskatchewan, and that is why they are staying here.

Likewise, in the exploration programme in the Precambrian area, and again, it is in spite of everything that the Liberals could do in trying to frighten capital away by telling horrible stories, that progress is being made. The Hudson's Bay Mining and Smelting Company has built a new plant in the province of Saskatchewan, a \$9-million plant, by which they will recover from the previous waste material considerable quantities of metals. This same company, or rather a subsidiary of this same company, has taken out a mining concession for exploration, 48 square miles, in that area about 75 or 90 miles north-east of Lac la Ronge in what is commonly known as the Waddy Lake Area. This concession is for two years, and they undertake to spend \$60,000 in exploration work on the concession.

The Hudson's Bay Mining and Smelting Company, in the year 1950, did over 10,000 feet of diamond drilling in the province of Saskatchewan, exploring further ore bodies. A good deal of this drilling was done not on their own claims, but on other claims on which they got an option from the claim holder.

There were over a thousand claims staked in the fiscal year, and if we change the concessions into claims, to meet the same acreage, it would take over 9,000 claims to equal the concessions which were taken out during that year.

There are about 40 companies interested in exploration and development work in Northern Saskatchewan. One of the outstanding things was the fact that the International Nickel Company filed through their agents 106 claims, last fall, in an area north of Black Lake and Stony Rapids. There were hundreds of thousands of feet of diamond-drilling done in the exploration in the North during the past year. There are in existence, aside from the development at Flin Flon, thousands of feet of shaft and drift. Three mining companies are presently working underground. Eldorado, the Dominion Crown Corporation, definitely has a mine and we are working with them, and I hope we will successfully work with the Federal Government on the building of a road into that mine, in the same manner as we did to build a road from Stony Rapids to Black Lake, last summer. Nisto and Nicholson mines, one located at Goldfields, the other at Black Lake, are approaching the time when they can make the decision as to whether they have ore of sufficient quantity and of sufficient quality to be a productive mine or not. They are both working underground. Nesbitt-Labine mines, one of the newer ones, will be underground in 1951. The Pitch-Ore Uranium Mines will also be going underground in 1951. Then, coming further south, in the Lac la Ronge area there has been a good deal of activity of surface exploration work, and of diamond drilling as well. There never was in the history of the province of Saskatchewan such an amount of exploration work going on in our mineralized areas, and we can certainly expect to see good results for the province of Saskatchewan.

The motion which is before the House, Mr. Speaker, has been amended, or an amendment has been offered which reads:

"But this Assembly regrets that the policy of Your Honour's advisors in regard to the settlement of vacant Crown Lands suitable for agricultural purposes is that all such land will be allocated on a 33-year lease basis, with no provision for the settler ever having the right to obtain title to any such land settled on by him."

In the first place, the amendment is not strictly correct in that the veterans who settled under the **Veterans' Land Act** do have a clause in their contract allowing them to purchase; but that is a mere detail which would not amount to much insofar as the Liberal Party is concerned. Now, it is quite apparent that some of the people opposite do not like the present land policy in connection with the allocation of Crown Lands. The member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) has stated he does not like it. The member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) does not like it, and he has warned me about the dire consequences in my constituency

on account of this policy. I shall have further to say about that little matter before I sit down today, I hope. The member for Melville (Mr. Deshaye) does not like it, and the member for Last Mountain (Mr. Benson) does not like it either. It is very interesting, just in passing in this House, to refer back to 1934 Journals, and we find that there was a motion moved by Mr. Benson and seconded by Mr. Horner: "That in the opinion of this Assembly a use-lease system of land tenure should be instituted in this province." A debate arising and the question being put, it was negatived on the following division: Yeas — 1, Mr. Benson. And all the rest were against it. I want to pay tribute to the hon. member for Last Mountain for having the courage of his convictions at that time. He is not a man who makes decisions which are hasty, and I am sure before he moved that motion and voted for it he had logically thought out this matter. He had considered the trouble which the farmers were in at that particular time, the insecurity they were suffering and all the rest of it, and he moved that motion because he believed in it. I will have to leave it to somebody else to answer as to why he changed his mind. Incidentally, I was amused at all the applause that the hon. member for Last Mountain got from the Liberal benches, and it seemed that they had completely forgotten about their candidate, Mr. Wilfred Gardiner, in Last Mountain constituency. I think, Mr. Speaker, that when this Redistribution Bill comes in we should try to solve this problem for them and probably make that a two-member seat, so they could have them both.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That is an idea.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I want to read a short passage to the House from the 'Family Herald and Weekly Star' editorial page, November 23, 1950, and I want to make it clear to the House that I do not subscribe to the opinions expressed here. But this is what this newspaper, published in Montreal, said, and it is certainly not a C.C.F. newspaper, I think, as a matter of fact either the Liberals or the Conservatives could claim that they get quite a bit of support from this farm paper. And it says: — it is on land and land utilization and conservation, and it is headed, "Do we really own the land?" It says:

"That fundamental mistake was, of course, the subdivision of the land and the allocation of it to individual farmers without any restriction whatever as to its use."

That is what the 'Family Herald and Weekly Star' said. And again they say:

"As the rain came down (this is writing about the Peace River country) and flowed along the furrows and ditches into the rivers, it was possible to see in the most obvious fashion, the rich, fine soil literally flowing away. In spite of this, farm owners were clearing brush and trees, draining sloughs and lakes and plowing their fields without respect to contours, and there was no authority which had the right to control or direct their activities."

Again I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that I do not concur in the implications of that statement. It points out problems, but it certainly does not indicate any proper solution insofar as I can see. But I did want to read that to the House, to point out to the hon. members opposite that there are a good many people who hold different opinions about the methods of holding land in Canada.

Now that is just one side of the picture. What about the other side — the leaseholder, the occupant of the land? First of all, let us consider what other methods might be used. Well, I think we will have to recognize that the Crown land is a part of the public domain and, of course, as part of the public domain, the Government of the day has a responsibility as to how they are going to handle that part of the public domain and as to what revenue should come out of it. And my hon. friends, when their party has been in power, their party has always been willing to give away large chunks of the public domain if they can get political support for it. Sometimes they gave it to power companies like Beauharnois, but yesterday we touched a new low when the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) took the revenue from this public domain and held it up as a political bribe to every veteran in the province to get them to vote against the C.C.F.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I am proud of it, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Then I want to ask the hon. member — my hon. friend from Arm River should not be so much disturbed about it if he is so proud of it, he should be beaming with contentment instead of that he is looking very much worried. I want the hon. member for Arm River to ponder this question: is he going to also return the rent to every other person in the province who has rented property from the Crown and apply it on a purchase price? And if he has to answer that question to himself in the negative, then I say that he will be admitting to himself that this was nothing else but a way of trying to buy these people to get them to vote for his political party.

**Mr. Danielson:** — A method of doing justice.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Crown Land is a part of the public domain. It is owned by the people of the province. We have not enough Crown Land fit for agriculture to give a half-section or even a quarter-section to all who want and need land. We have not enough to give all veterans Crown Land. Therefore some will get land and some will not. To be fair, whoever gets the benefit of that land must pay something to the public treasury for it. Now, my hon. friend is going to make a special condition which he talked about the other day. They used to have a 'pork barrel' in the Liberal Party, and now they use the public funds instead of the pork barrel. And so, if we were going to sell those lands we would put them up and advertise them for sale, and who would get them? I can tell you who would get them. It would be doctors. It would be business men. It would be farmers who already had a half-section or a whole section or two sections of land.

**Mr. Kuziak (Canora):** — Lawyers.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Yes, there might even be some lawyers venture into the business of farming; they have been known to do so.

**Mr. Dundas:** — Shumiatcher.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Those are the people that would get that land. Maybe that is what my hon. friends want. The hon. member for Melfort is in favour of that kind of a programme. I know that, because it happened right in his constituency, where the Liberal Government were doing the job of allocating of land. That I shall deal with a little later. Therefore, I think, selling the land would not get the land into the hands of the people who are most in need of land on which to build homes. Many of the people who have got this land, who have had this land allocated to them, had some equipment. They are capable. Many of them have not even got money to make a substantial down payment on land, and they are tickled to get this land.

Now, there is lots of land for sale in the province of Saskatchewan; there is lots of land for sale. You see it advertised in all the newspapers. But who is getting the customers? It is the Crown Land on the lease basis. One quarter section in my constituency had 43 applicants for it, and my hon. friend says it is not popular. It is popular. And they recognize in it a security greater than they have ever had before. Suppose you take, for example, the old Federal Government policy that they used with the soldier settlers after the first World War of twenty-four thousand soldier settlers, approximately, in Canada, 14,000 of them lost their farms; there are 3,000 still without titles. These are round figures. About 11,000 got titles, and my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, was on the committee of the House of Commons when the Soldier Settlers' Association appealed to that committee, after over 20 years on the land, to give to the old veteran his title, and they did not do it. They said "No".

**Mr. Tucker:** — The hon. member cannot put words in my mouth. We recommended a system whereby help would be given to these people to get title to their land on an individual basis. That is what we recommended.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I am not surprised that they recommended something that they pretty well knew would not be done.

**Mr. Tucker:** — As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, several thousand have got titles since we recommended that.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Yes, several have got titles since that was recommended. There is no doubt about that; but what they did not recommend was that after 20 years on this land they should get title — and those old soldier settlers went through some pretty tough times, buying cattle at \$100 apiece and then a year and a half later they were not worth more than \$15 apiece; that kind of stuff. And then again the big bump of the '30's. If anybody knows the story of the bumps of land settlement and farming it is the veteran settlers of the first World War. They came through them all. But my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, did not do very much to help them. We have examples. For example, in the selling of school land which has been carried on in the province of Saskatchewan in the past, and the record there is not too happy and has not brought too much security to too many people.

Now, I do not believe that members of this House want to see that Crown Land allocated or sold to people who already have a section of land, or people who have a hardware business or some other business. Or, at least, most of the members of the legislature do not want to see it. But, you know, that did happen. In this case I was talking about, there was a Sessional Paper tabled in the House of Commons — Sessional Paper No. 153 of 1950 — and it is the story about the allocation of land in the James Smith Indian Reserve near Fort a la Corne by the Liberal Government of Canada. James Claggett, a member of the Liberal executive of the constituency of Melfort, in 1936, leased 1,280 acres for grazing at 15 cents an acre. In 1941, he got a new arrangement made whereby he could cultivate some of the land, and on the cultivated land he paid 75 cents an acre. In 1947, on the expiration of this lease, another arrangement was made by which he was to pay a quarter share of the crop, and the lease was transferred to Mr. Claggett's son and son-in-law, that is C.H. Claggett, Clif. Claggett and G.A.D. Will, both of whom my hon. friend from Melfort knows very well. And the acreage was increased to 1,440 acres, and that lease is still in effect until 1953. Under this lease, they paid to the Indian Band, in rental, one quarter share of the crop for two years, 1948 and 1949, \$15,000. They were making a pretty good thing when they were only paying 75 cents an acre for the cultivated land before that time. That would indicate that they were getting \$45,000 in the two years, out of the 1,440 acres. It is not likely that they paid more rent than they were entitled to pay.

In 1950, the Indians decided that they would lease another 6,191 acres for a term of eight years, and so they proceeded to do this job of leasing this land. One of the questions that was asked in the House was: was there any preference given to veterans in this land, and the answer was, "No." Now, the first thing that happened, there were a few big operators who wanted to get this land. One of them applied for 4,000 acres, but it was thought that that would be kind of 'hot stuff', to hand it out in such big pieces as that, so they limited it to units of approximately 320 acres in most cases, and they advertised it for bids, a quarter-share of the crop plus a bonus. Now, the funny thing about it is that, though there were 19 parcels, I believe, 19 units — only four of them offered any cash bonus in their original bid. But apparently somebody (I do not know whether my hon. friend from Melfort knows anything about this or not) — somebody told them that they would have to put in a bonus bid if they expected to have any hope of getting it. And so, they all bid a bonus then of 50 cents or 25 cents or 75 cents per acre. On May 8th, the Indian Affairs Department at Ottawa received telegrams from the remaining names on the list; that is the other names on this list of the successful bidders. They all sent telegrams on the 8th of May offering a uniform bid of 50 cents per acre bonus. Who got the land? W.K. Kirkham of Fort a la Corne got 758 acres; I am not sure whether he is a farmer or not. E. Edworthy of Melfort — 320 acres; incidentally he is a hotelkeeper's son. Next one, G. Edworthy, Melfort, that is George Edworthy of Melfort — 320 acres; he is one of the hotelkeepers in Melfort, and a member of the Melfort Liberal executive. He used to live in Arborfield and I was glad when he moved away to Melfort. That is one fellow that won't be voting against me down there any more. Then we have G. Campbell, of Star City, I do not know him; E. Davidson, of Melfort; R. Townsend, of Tisdale; Bob Townsend of Tisdale, a very nice chap — but he is a Massey-Harris agent and has a whale of a big Massey-Harris business. These are the 'local farmers' that got the land! Chytyk Brothers — I do not

know them; G.W. O'Byrne — my hon. friend could help me out on some of these — I think he is a drover, I am not sure; W.H. Ford of Kinistino is a general merchant and he got 320 acres; G.A.D. Will. Now remember, G.A.D. Will and Clif. Claggett had 1,440 acres already. G.A.D. Will, James Claggett's son-in-law, gets another 240 acres. T.A. Gregg, Massey-Harris dealer in Melfort, gets 240 acres, G.A. Wood, hardware merchant in Melfort, gets 240 acres. J. Davis, Melfort — I do not know him. One of these chaps works in the butcher shop of James Claggett. I do not know which one it is, but he got some, anyway; this might be him, 240 acres. Anton Dorel, 240 acres. And then we come down to James Claggett himself. He is a stock drover and also has a butcher shop, and he got 320 acres. He owns lots of other land around the community, too. C.H. Claggett, who, remember, had a share of 1,440 acres already, gets another 320 acres. Keith Claggett, who, I believe, is the son of Clif. Claggett, C.H. Claggett got 320 acres. And so, when you add up all the Claggetts, the sons and sons-in-law, you find that that family got 2,640 acres. Liberal allocation of Crown lands! Foster Brothers, of Kinistino, each got 320 acres. Now, there you are. No preference for veterans; no regard whatsoever to the need of the applicant for the land, but just handing it out of the pork barrel. That is all it was, pure and simple. The majority of those people who got that land had no more need for additional land to make a living than the man in the moon.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Is there any suggestion there that anyone else bid on the land and should have got it?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Most of these people did not put in a bonus bid for the land. Somebody told them, "If you are going to get this land you will have to put in a bonus bid." And on May 8th, all their bonus bids came in by wire at 50 cents an acre. If there is not something funny about this, I would like to know.

**Mr. Tucker:** — The hon. Minister has not answered my question, Mr. Speaker, is there any suggestion that anyone else bid on this land and should have got it, or was it allotted to those that did bid on it?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, my hon. friend agrees with this allocation of land. I shall tell the people in my constituency that this is the kind of allocation of land that the Liberals believe in.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a suggestion to the hon. member. The hon. member has made a statement that this is an allocation of Crown Land. Now, as I understand this, this is just a lease to these people to clear that land up and bring it under cultivation, and thereafter . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! The hon. member has not the right to make a speech, or give his interpretation of what it is. The hon. Leader of the Opposition knows that he can only rise on a point of privilege or a point of order.

**Mr. Tucker:** — The hon. member has misrepresented our position. Now he has said . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — A point of privilege must be personal.



**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, may I state my question of privilege? The hon. member said that this constitutes Liberal Land settlement policy.

**Mr. Speaker:** — That is not a point of privilege.

**Mr. Tucker:** — It is a misrepresentation of our position.

**Mr. Speaker:** — If you want to rise on a point of privilege and say that the hon. member has made a specific misstatement, personally . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — That is exactly what I am saying, Mr. Speaker. I am saying that the hon. member has said "this represents Liberal land settlement policy", and I say, Mr. Speaker, it represents nothing of the sort. It is just a way of bringing some of this land under cultivation, after which it reverts to the Indians.

**Mr. Speaker:** — That is your point of privilege.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that this Indian land was being leased for eight years — and this is good rich land on the north side of that Melfort area, and that is a little bit more than just bringing it under cultivation — seven years in which to get crops off.

There is a list of 17 people, many of whom are genuine farmers, all the way from Meath Park, Strongpine, and so forth, people who had their money refunded, and who did not get the land. There were lots of bidders for the land, but they did not get any of it at all, and some of them might have been Liberals, but not well enough in on the 'inside track.'

You see, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is in a desperate position on this question, because if he says he is not in favour of that kind of a policy of allocating land, then he is going against his own party; and if he said he is in favour of it, he knows he is wrong and I don't blame him for wanting to keep quiet on the question. But it is a question that the hon. member for Melfort is going to have to answer as to whether or not he is in favour of that kind of thing. That is a question which he will have to answer in that part of the country, and probably the Leader of the Opposition will, too.

I think it was the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), in regard to the settlement, said that one of the things was that the veteran did not know what he would have to pay for this land. You see, they put it in the amendment that they cannot buy it, and yet they go on talking about it, knowing that they can. Well, there are a lot of people that started out to buy land in the province of Saskatchewan that did not know what they were going to pay; but I think that to have that land valued now at the present highly inflated prices; might turn out to be extremely unfair to any veteran who wishes to exercise his right to buy it.

**Mr. Dundas:** — He will take a chance.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Of course, the policy which my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley supports is to sell to the poor

fellow who has to have the land at the highest price he can get, and if he cannot pay it, get it back and sell it again.

The statement was also made by the member for Arm River that the veterans may have to get off at the end of 10 years, if somebody offers more. That statement is just not correct, and I would like to correct the member for Arm River on that.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Is it my permission to correct a statement? What I said was this — what the veteran had today was an agreement that he could exercise an option on that land, at the end of 10 years. He had no guarantee that there would not be someone bidding against him. That is what I said.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I misunderstood him. I understood him to say that we would take this attitude at the end of 10 years, and I am glad he recognizes that we will be here at the end of 10 years.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I didn't recognize that at all. You won't be here at the end of 10 years.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I understood the hon. member to say that, at the end of 10 years, someone else may come along and offer more for the land, and buy it away from under the veteran's very feet. There will be no danger of that happening whatsoever. I am not saying that that is what the hon. member said. I said that is what I understood him to say.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Do the same rules apply in this House, as yesterday?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Exactly the same.

**Mr. Danielson:** — If that is the case I have the right to correct the hon. gentleman that is speaking now. He is again misrepresenting my statement.

**Mr. Speaker:** — You have already corrected him.

**Mr. Danielson:** — He said that I said that at the end of 10 years someone else was going to take over the veteran's land. I said there was nothing in the agreement — and if he has it in the agreement, then let him read it. Then he can prove that I was wrong.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member has had the opportunity to make the statement; he has made the statement. The Minister who is speaking, if he wishes to reply to that statement, that is his privilege.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I might have to rise again to tell what I said, and I shall do so, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — It is this spring weather, I guess, Mr. Speaker, that makes people act like that. But anyway, I want

to tell my hon. friends opposite that the present practice of the leasing and allocating of Crown Land is the most popular plan that has ever been in use in this province. There is no question about that at all. But I can say that the hon. member — he mentioned the votes I was going to lose over this programme; but I would like to say to him that a lot more than the 30-votes' margin that he had is gone over that allocation of land at Fort a la Corne.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I never said anything about the voting.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. Minister was not talking about you. Order! Will the hon. member keep his seat when he is not referred to.

**Mr. Danielson:** — It is pretty hard to tell what you fellows are talking about.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — As I stated before, one quarter-section had 43 applicants for it. Many have had 10 or 12 or more. The people who get this land are people who will enjoy it . . .

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — The C.C.F.'ers!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I want to tell the hon. Leader of the Opposition that the remark he just made from his seat is absolutely false, and he knows it. There is no political discrimination in this whatsoever.

**Mr. Tucker:** — The hon. member must be imagining things. I never said a word. He is having hallucinations or something. I guess it is the spring, Mr. Speaker, I never said a thing.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I humbly apologize to the Leader of the Opposition. I did not know it was the member from Melfort that made that remark; but my reply applies to the member from Melfort . . .

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — You won't even win by 30 votes.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . If you will just take it as read, that will be all right.

This system does give greater security than any other system that has been used. There is no question about that. The lease-holder can sell or assign his rights, and I want to say this. If we had 3 times as much Crown Land as we have, we would still have lots of customers for it on these terms. And if we put it up for sale at what would be the going market value, it would be a different kind of people altogether that would get it — the Claggetts and the Edworthys — the people who don't need it. They are the people that would be buying that land.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Maybe the Liberals would get their share and that would be terrible!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — It would be terrible. My hon. friend from Melfort mentioned the large territorial Crown Land that should

be opened up in the Carrot River triangle. I don't think he knows very much about it. I don't think he knows that the late and unlamented Liberal Government of the province of Saskatchewan leased a large tract of that land for a long term in 1942, to the Federal Government. He probably just did not know that.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — I know that.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — That is one of the things, and it has been, in the meantime, under our conservation programme, developed to a great extent in muskrat marshes. But there is not nearly the amount — let no one get any funny ideas like that; there is not nearly the amount of Crown Land that will be available on which there can be settlement, in the near future, that some people talk about.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with some of the other things in my own Department. I have already mentioned the mineral resources at work in both oil and the Pre-Cambrian, but some other things, too. At this point I would like to take time off to say that the Department of Natural Resources is a very large and varied department. It carries on a great many activities. In most of the provinces of Canada, they have mines separated from the rest of the resources, or they have other divisions. Saskatchewan is one of the provinces where it is all together, and I feel that it would be absolutely impossible to carry on the administration of this, in one department, except for the fact that I have a very excellent staff. I want to pay tribute to my Deputy and Assistant Deputy Ministers, my Branch heads, and right down through the staff, because it is their ability and industry and integrity — that is the only thing that makes it possible for me to carry on.

To come now to our Forestry Branch. The inventory work is being pushed forward. In a couple of years, I think we will be pretty close to having a complete inventory of our forests, and in some ways the inventory is turning out to be pleasantly surprising. Undoubtedly, we have greater reserves of pulpwood and potential pulpwood than we knew before. Forest management work is going ahead — management of the forests — so that there will be a continual forest industry, and one of the big questions is utilization of forest products. In the years gone by it was a case of just skimming off the cream, chiefly the white spruce saw timber. Now we are getting some variation into the picture, and using some of the other products.

The Box Factory at Prince Albert is one of the things that makes possible the using of a good many other products. The plywood plant, at Hudson Bay does help, also, in utilization, but the establishment of a pulp mill would be of greatest assistance in getting better utilization of forest products. We have had a number of people interested in our pulp resources, and I feel I am not exaggerating when I say that it is quite probable that, within a few years, we will have a pulp mill of some type established in this province. I would point out that before we took office, under Liberal Government chiefly, 90 per cent of our merchantable white spruce was gone — of our original merchantable white spruce. We were left with a comparatively little bit of merchantable timber at this time.

Most important of all, is fire prevention and suppression. Our programme of building more observation towers has been carried forward during the year. The air patrol, carried out by our planes, the work of smoke-jumpers, the work of our stand-by crews and equipment for exterminating fires immediately they are discovered — all of these things have been carried on, and they are having a good effect. The great majority of our fires are put out while they are small, before they do much damage. Occasionally one gets away and does do very serious damage. I want, also, to say a word of appreciation to the settlers in the forest areas for the additional care they are taking in regard to fires.

The Saskatchewan Timber Board has carried on with its work during the year, and has fitted in well with the policies of the department of Forest Management in getting the best utilization.

In about two years time, The Pas Lumber Company will have finished its cut in the province of Saskatchewan. The Pas Lumber Company has been one of the best companies, I think, that has ever operated in the province. The working conditions of their men, the wages they pay to their men, have been leading in that field. Their work in the forest has been very good, and they have been most co-operative in doing anything they can to get better production and better utilization. The total value of our forest production, during the past year, was very close to \$5,000,000.

Our Game Branch, Mr. Speaker, is doing a good job. The work of the Game Branch has resulted in guaranteeing the future security of game animals and birds in this province. In fact, the job in a few phases was done 'too well', and we did have some elk trouble, and I notice one of the hon. members asked a question about the elk season. That, I think, is pretty well taken care of. There was an open season last fall, for elk, and according to the reports turned in — I haven't got the definite figures yet — well over 200 elk were taken, probably nearer 300 if all returns were in. The trouble is that this crop is out. Had the crop been harvested no trouble would have been experienced whatsoever; but permits are being issued to the farmers who have crop out close to the areas where the elk are bothering them, and they are permitted to shoot elk, to keep the first carcass for themselves, and that, in itself, is quite a compensation. A good elk carcass is worth \$200 of anybody's money at somewhat less than the butcher's prices.

The Coyote control programme is going ahead and is meeting with success throughout the province, and the programme is being extended to the north.

One of the problems which the Game Branch has to deal with is the question of caribou hunting — sport hunting of caribou. As you know, the caribou, in the far north are of great economic importance to the native people. In the Northwest Territories the Federal Government allows the hunting of caribou for sale, by hunters and trappers in that area. That means that caribou are shot and killed and the carcasses stockpiled and they are sold to campers or to mining companies, or anything like that. We have been urging the Federal Government to change their laws, to prevent that kind of use of the caribou, to let these companies take in meat from the outside. We are of the opinion that we may probably have to stop sport-hunting of caribou, even though the numbers killed by the hunters are not

very great on account of the psychological effect on the natives whom we are asking to be careful with the caribou.

In our northland, some of the principal things that affect our northland is the Fur Conservation Programme, and the progress there is good. The fur catch was down somewhat from a year ago, but the prices were good and the returns may be as good or better than the year before. We had another convention of trappers at Prince Albert, in January — it was attended by white people, by Metis people, by Cree Indians, by Chipewyan Indians; as a matter of fact we had two interpreters, one for the Cree and one for the Chipewyans. It is inspiring to see those people at their convention discussing their problems without regard to colour, creed or race. It is a real little United Nations — and the United Nations might be able to learn something right there at the trappers' convention about how to get along — some of the members of the United Nations, anyway. The fur has continued to be marketed as before, and the popularity of the Fur Marketing Service is growing. It is bringing greater returns to the trapper — not only to the one who ships direct to us, but to those who sell to the dealer also. When we have our December sale, for example, immediately after the sale the prices of the furs is broadcast two or three times over radio CKBI at Prince Albert, and I think they go over Saskatoon as well, so that the trappers in the province, right in the midst of the trapping season in December, know the value of fur, and if a dealer comes to buy them they have a pretty good idea as to whether they are getting value or not. The value of fur production in the province, last year, was \$2 1/2 million — \$400,000 of that fur was ranch fur; and the balance, wild fur.

In Fisheries, we had another very successful year, and the marketing was carried on in the usual way and with very good success. Biological studies have been carried on in Lac la Ronge, Last Mountain Lake and in the small reservoirs throughout the province, with a view to increasing the angling resources of the province. Some re-stocking of trout and pickerel has been done. The value of production at railhead was \$1 1/4 million.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is becoming a famous place for angling. Last summer, we had two American sportswriters take a trip into our northland and go fishing, and one of them was Bill Wolfe who wrote this article in "Sports Afield". He said in this article:

"Craik and Brockelbank, (that is Mr. Craik of the Bureau of Publications and myself) had asked, back in Regina, for honest opinions about their Saskatchewan fishing. Here they are:

"If there is any better fishing for the species available anywhere on the continent, I have not yet found it".

Then he goes on into greater detail. That is one of the reasons we are getting more tourists: we do have fishing resources here which are beyond compare.

In our northland, our Radio Service is being more and more appreciated and is growing. Sets are being rented to mining companies. We supply a pretty well complete system of communication over the north. Our Prince Albert station handled, last year, an average of over 120 messages per

day for 365 days in the year. That is a lot of messages, if you figure them out.

The educational programme in the north is going ahead. The schools, operated by the Minister of Education, are of great value. I want to remind the House that, this year, at Creighton, near Flin Flon, by agreement, the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Co. built a brand new modern four-room school. You see, the mining property is not subject to local taxation. It can be taxed, but there is a provision in the Act that it need not be taxed if they supply the necessary facilities, and we made an agreement by which they would supply these facilities and make a contribution towards the cost of operating the school, and the cost of other local services, not exceeding \$120 per year per employee. I understand that the member for Cumberland (Mr. Blanchard) is not very well satisfied with that. He says that the Government did not do anything about it. Well, we do pay the regular grants and we made the agreement with the Company, and the result is Creighton, his own home town, has a very excellent, fully modern four-room school. I hope the Minister of Education will have a look at that school the first time he is in Flin Flon. Health services in the north are very much appreciated and are giving great service to the people. There is the hospital at Isle a la Crosse operated by a Catholic order of Sisters; a Government hospital at Buffalo Narrows; a small hospital at La Loche operated by Sisters. They have good hospitals at Stony Rapids, Sandy Beach near Island Falls, and one at Cumberland House, and it is a wonderful thing to see the services that are provided to the people of the north through the medium of these hospitals and the nurses that are in charge.

The Air Ambulance goes all over the north to pick up patients, which are emergent cases, and get them into hospital or in to Prince Albert, when necessary.

Co-operation is going ahead in the northern part of the province. The fishermen, the trappers, the guides and so forth in the north, are taking an interest in co-operation. There is one Guides' Co-operative at La Ronge; there is a Forest Products Co-operative at Cumberland House — that co-operative has a contract from the Saskatchewan Timber Board to produce timber, And there is a great deal of informal co-operation; that is, without formal organization, but just by appointment of a committee and people working together, and that is all to the good.

The Saskatchewan Government Airways is the counterpart in transportation that the radio is in communication, in the north of the province, and pilots and planes are welcomed wherever they go.

Our Resources' Utilization Branch of the Department carried on its work with clays, including experimental and test work in regard to bentonite for drilling mud. We have, in Saskatchewan, a very large well-drilling programme as my hon. friends know, and they will need a lot of mud. There are a lot of kinds of mud that are not suitable for that use, but you have to have it made from the right kind of bentonite. The Utilization Branch, formerly known as the Industrial Development Branch, did work, also, in sodium sulphate derivatives, in utilization of forest products, and a survey of industrial opportunities, in co-operation with the Industrial Development Branch.

The Surveys Branch of the Department made a number of new surveys of lots in different parts of the province. Due to the rapid growth and expansion that has taken place in the province of Saskatchewan, new lots were needed, and there was some farm land which was surveyed. Engineering surveys were carried on of certain landing fields and roads, and some aerial photography of roads; and revision of Saskatchewan maps, with 350 new names adopted for use on our Saskatchewan maps — most of them servicemen's names.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit down I want to say one word. We have, in our country, a lot of great and valuable democratic institutions. One of the greatest institutions which we have, and one which has a great responsibility, is the press. In the province of Saskatchewan practically all of our press follow the Liberal editorial policy, and with that I have no quarrel whatsoever. Of course, I would like to see two or three good publications in the province of Saskatchewan following an editorial policy which was C.C.F. I do not mind how biased they may be in their editorial policy, but it makes it a little difficult for progressive ideas to get across when the reactionaries control all of the press, as they do, in their editorial columns. There is one paper, however, which carries that bias far beyond its editorial columns, and that is the Regina 'Leader-Post', and I cannot help, much as I do not like doing this, bringing these examples to the House.

Take, for example, in the news items. This was a news item issued in regard to Saskatchewan Box Factory, Prince Albert. In the Prince Albert 'Herald', of course, it did the best; it got 19 column inches in the Prince Albert 'Herald'. In the 'Star-Phoenix' it did very well — got 10 inches; but in the 'Leader-Post' it got 3 inches of a news item, and half of that was grumbling because there was no profit and loss figures with it. Now, maybe that is what the editor of the 'Leader-Post' thinks is a fair news policy.

That is not the only example I have — I have one or two more. Here, for example, is the story of the first potash lease to be issued, and that should have been interesting to the paper of the capital. But here we have the 'Star-Phoenix' publishing it at the top of the third page, with a headline right across the page, and a total of 27 inches, including the headlines — 27 column inches. The 'Leader-Post' put it away back on a back page — I am not sure just what page it is from; it might have been on the third page, down low — and it is eight inches, as compared to 27 inches in the 'Star-Phoenix'.

Now, that is all right, and actually it is their paper — I do not own it. Mr. Sifton, or somebody else, owns it and I guess he can do what he likes with it. But I do think the ownership of a newspaper does carry some responsibility, according to what they tell us, for giving a fair report of the news. Now, it is quite a different thing when the 'Leader-Post' got hold of some confidential documents. When the draft of the new petroleum regulations was sent out to the Oil Companies, and was sent out confidentially, the 'Leader-Post' got hold of a copy and how much space did they give it? -36 inches. It seems to me that the 'Leader-Post' would do well to check over its ethics.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to be here today and to be speaking in this Throne Speech debate. I have not been here as long as my hon. friend from Arm River or one or two others, but I have been here quite a few years,



and since I have been in this House, I have never been prouder of the province of Saskatchewan than I am today, have never been prouder of the progress that is being made in this province.

I shall vote against the amendment, and I shall support the motion.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I did not want to interrupt the hon. member when he was on the air because — but I do want to point out to him now. He said that the Liberals had done nothing in regard to student aid. I, perhaps, should have interrupted him when he was on the air to read this statement of the facts, but I do want to draw it to his attention now. I have here the Public Accounts of 1944, and under 'Student Aid', even in a year like that in the middle of a war, when we were not spending money and training normal students as a matter of public policy because they were in the army, air force and navy — so many of them; we have here the expenditure on University Student Scholarships and loans, normal school student loans, a total of \$41,000 some hundred. There was \$41,000 for university student scholarships and loans, and \$10,000 for normal school student loans.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The Federal Government had part of that.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, the Federal Government has part of what is being done today, and the hon. member said that the Liberal Party had done nothing, and he put that over the air to all Saskatchewan. Now I protest against Ministers of the Crown getting up and making statements like that as absolute statements of fact.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I will amend my words and say they did very little.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, it is too late now.

**Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, I did not expect to participate in the Throne Speech debate at all. As a matter of fact, I fully intended to deal with the whole matter of rehabilitation, conservation and re-settlement during the course of the Budget Debate. I still intend to do that, Mr. Speaker, but I thought it might be just as well to say a few words in this debate, since the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) has seen fit to issue his challenge, and at the same time I can assure the hon. member he should have seen to it that he was well provided with armour before issuing a challenge.

The amendments, Mr. Speaker, to the Throne Speech, were, in my own opinion, very weak. The first one was so weak that they had to bring in another amendment; and in my opinion, the second amendment was far weaker than the first. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, from listening to the debate in this House, particularly from hon. members opposite, their speeches and the amendments are calculated to entice popularity. I believe though, Mr. Speaker, that the popularity of the amendment proffered by the hon. member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) will not have the popular appeal which was anticipated.

The matter has been pretty well dealt with by the hon. Minister of Natural Resources, and I do not intend to go into any detail, only to point

out that the hon. member for Redberry, who introduced this amendment, spent the greater part of an hour and a half to two hours on a dissertation on international affairs that took us to the four corners of the earth, and then an analysis of human history peculiar to his own particular type of mind; but he made no mention at all of the need of the type of amendment which he introduced. There was no concrete evidence to substantiate the introduction of such an amendment, and then, of course, the seconder, the hon. member for Melfort, similarly brought out no substantial reason why the 33-year leasehold policies should be discontinued, other than that it was not popular. I am inclined to believe that the hon. member for Melfort has a flair for popularity, particularly political popularity. In the course of trying to substantiate his arguments, he began to dramatize a land policy that was never the policy of the C.C.F., and, Mr. Speaker, I have never heard a motion in this House that needed dramatization as badly as the amendment; but dramatization, Mr. Speaker, without substantial factual support, is not going to get the popular appeal, nor is it going to get the support of the intelligent people of Saskatchewan, I am convinced of that.

**Mr. Danielson:** — It seems to worry you a lot.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — The hon. member for Arm River says that it seems to worry me a lot. He seems to be the most worried member in this Legislature. Mr. Speaker, and I would suggest to the hon. member for Arm River . . .

**Mr. Korchinski:** — I rise on a point of privilege. The hon. Minister now speaking said that I had introduced an amendment and that I did not advance any reasons for introducing that amendment. May I be permitted to read the points that I advanced . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — That is not a point of privilege.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — I would like to read the excerpt . . .

**Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, I have the floor and there is no hon. member going to get up while I am on my feet, unless they raise their point of privilege, and the hon. member has not a point of privilege. And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member did not advance any substantial argument in support of the amendment.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — State your point of privilege.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — I want to show that I did advance arguments for the amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** — That is no point of privilege whatever.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — What is it then?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to offer some good advice to the hon. member for Arm River. If he spent less time accumulating newspaper clippings that he cannot find when he gets them all on his desk, when he begins three-hour orations in this House; and if he read some good books on conservation and the actual problems of Saskatchewan agriculture, he could probably give a more intelligent contribution to the affairs of this Legislature.

I want to inform the hon. member for Arm River, since he has made some reference to the Land Utilization Board, that they are the ones who are desperately afraid that they may never get, back on this side of the House again. In their desperation, Mr. Speaker, they cling to any bit of driftwood that will prevent their political submersion; but I can assure them that since they do not come forward with any constrictive solution to the problems of the people of this province, there is very little likelihood of them getting the support that they anticipate.

Now the hon. member for Arm River made some references to the land utilization system. He mentioned that the veterans would be unable to obtain their opportunity on their purchase option after 10 years. I want to mention to the hon. member for Arm River that the V.L.A. has a similar qualification, V.L.A. will not give a grant until 10 years, even though the veteran has paid his contract out in full in two or three years. They do that for a very necessary reason, and I am in agreement with it — otherwise the intended purpose of the lease would be lost. . .

**Mr. McDonald (Moosomin):** — May I ask a question?

**Mr. Speaker:** — You must get on your feet to ask a question. But evidently the hon. Minister does not wish to answer questions.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — If I remain on my feet for the benefit of the hon. members they can take their seats, just like the Premier took his seat yesterday, when he stood up and the hon. member for Arm River would not recognize him.

**Mr. Danielson:** — He was on his feet half the time. Here's a returned man wishing to ask a question . . .  
I

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I want to say further to the hon. member for Arm River that you can have another marathon. Sir, on the budget debate, if you wish, but I am just going to deal with you people now in a few well-chosen words. I think you have heard enough about land this afternoon, but I could tell you a whole lot more about land if you so desire, but the time will not permit. I have some nice stories on land administration under the former Liberal Government, and I will present them to you in due course, along with well-substantiated facts, Mr. Speaker.

I want to say to the hon. member for Arm River . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — I am not going to leave the House just for the pleasure I am getting out of this.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I want to say to the hon. member for Arm River, too, that he should be aware of the fact that P.F.R.A. has certain reservations, too, in connection with land tenure. On irrigation projects they withhold the last dollar — the owner, or supposed to be owner, of that land never gets title to that land, and again for a very substantial reason: in order to prevent speculation in lands as a result of the expenditure of public money in irrigation development. But, the Liberals, in my opinion, are not exactly honest. They want to be complete free-enterprisers; they

want to make the farmer believe that he has got a title to their land. After he pays for it they withhold one dollar — he never gets the title. It is far better to be honest about things and give a person a 33-year lease that is a complete guarantee of security, that does not involve any initial capital outlay for land, and I am going to go into that whole question in very much detail, Mr. Speaker, on the budget debate. But those are recognized principles . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. Minister wouldn't want to mislead the House, or the country in regard . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Are you rising to a point of privilege?

**Mr. Tucker:** — Yes, a misstatement made by the hon. Minister. His statement was that under the V.L.A. the veterans could not get title for 10 years. Now that is a complete misstatement. If a veteran wants to pay the full purchase price he can get title at once; but if he wants to get the benefit of the V.L.A. grant, then he cannot get title at once . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — That's exactly what he said.

**Mr. Tucker:** — No, it is not what he said at all.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, with . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, with reference to the statement made by the hon. member for Arm River on the Land Utilization Board. Well, he knows that that Board was set up precisely for the purpose of defining the utilization of land in Saskatchewan. There are innumerable parcels of L.U.B. land spread throughout this province, that have not, as yet, been incorporated into any particular project, and those lands are being used right along, in exchange for land in the projects, in order that we can get the necessary land control. However, there is much of that land that will never find its way into a project, and it remains undeveloped, unreclaimed. All the Land Utilization Board was saying when they issued this statement to the municipalities, and as I said, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Arm River, like a political drowning man, grasped this and tried to make some capital out of it — he tried to infer that the Land Utilization Board, this colossal octopus, was going to take control of all this land.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That's what it's doing.

**Mr. Nollet:** — As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, this land is, and always has been, under the control of the Land Utilization Board. Now, the sole purpose of making this particular statement of policy was to inform rural municipal councils that the Department of Agriculture would assume responsibility for the reclamation of that vacant Crown land until it has been disposed of for the purpose intended — either to round out an existing farm unit, or to create now sizeable farm units, or to place that land in a community pasture or other development project.

The hon. member from Arm River should be the last one to talk about the administrative work of the Land Utilization Board. All he needs to do is

to go to the R.M.s of 252, 253 or 282 to discover the excellent co-operation that has taken place between the Land Utilization Board and the municipal councils and local agriculture committees. If there ever was a constituency in this province that needs conservation, and that needs the administration of the Land Utilization Board, it is Arm River constituency, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Danielson:** — They have been doing pretty well — the municipalities.

**Mr. Nollet:** — Now the hon. member — and this is one of the reasons why I told him he would be well-advised to read some good agricultural books rather than collecting a whole lot of clippings from newspapers -suggests that a whole lot of this land could be turned back to cultivation again. I am sure that agriculturists in this country would be alarmed at that statement . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Another misstatement of facts. I never said that at any time. I said some of that early land had been going back to cultivation, and it should never have been taken out of cultivation. Now he says that I suggested it should be going back. What is the argument about?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — If the same rules apply in this House today, as yesterday then I have a right to correct him, correct a misstatement.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member for Arm River has a perfect right, if he thinks he is being misquoted, to correct the statement.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — We will let the records speak, Mr. Speaker, but I distinctly heard the hon. member say that, with better farm machinery, a whole lot of that land could be brought under cultivation again, because . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — No, no! I said that with better farm machinery some of this land has been brought under cultivation again. That is what I said.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, he is a terribly hard man to debate with — he never stays sitting, he always wants to be on his feet . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — All right, I'll debate with you any time you like.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't think I misinterpreted the hon. gentleman at all. That is exactly as I heard him make the statement, and I believe it to be correct. I want to say to the hon. member . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, he is insisting that I made a statement that I did not make, and according to the rules of this House, as they were interpreted yesterday, he should withdraw that statement.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. Minister must accept the member's statement, until he has some concrete evidence to the contrary.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, I still don't understand what he was supposed to have said that I misunderstood, that I am misinterpreting

at the present time. If he is under the impression that I did misinterpret him, I will have to take back anything that I have said that might have been in error. And as I have stated, Mr. Speaker, . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Let me explain what he says now . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! The hon. member said that if he has misquoted the hon. member from Arm River, he retracts. He takes it back.

**Mr. Danielson:** — But now he is making the statement that he didn't make the statement. He says he doesn't know what I am talking about.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — I had to retract my statement three times, yesterday . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The hon. member for Arm River will realize that I am running this Chamber, not him. And when I rule that a member has properly withdrawn, it is withdrawn, and that is not going to make a case for a speech.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I say, then that the rules should apply the same everyday.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Another thing, I am getting tired of having innuendos made by members of the Opposition that I am not conducting the business of this Chamber in a fair manner. If you don't think I am conducting the business properly, just move a substantive motion. The hon. member has withdrawn.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, just in . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — I wonder what you mean by a substantive motion? You have made the threat before, and I just wonder what you mean, Are you suggesting, Mr. Speaker, and I am asking you a question, that you feel that you have the backing of a sufficient majority that you have nothing to fear? Is that what you are holding out on the Opposition?

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, and you are taking an unfair advantage in this Assembly. What you have implied several times — you, the Leader of the Opposition, have implied that I have shown preference to the Government side of the House. You have said that.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I have to say what I feel, and I remember the hon. member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) muttered something to himself, and I said to Your Honour, and I brought it to your attention, and I asked Your Honour to let me say what I wished to say on this matter. You sometimes interrupt, but I asked you to recall, Mr. Speaker, that I said, "have the hon. member withdraw". I couldn't hear that he did, and you said, "I heard and that is all that is necessary". Now I point out to Your Honour that that isn't all that is necessary. This is a deliberative Assembly and if somebody says something aloud, and then says something so low that the Assembly can't hear it, that's not all that is necessary, Mr. Speaker, and when I pointed out to you, yesterday, when you insisted that my hon. friend here withdraw a thing three times, that all we wanted was fair play,

that was nothing out of order, Mr. Speaker. Again, when you come around to us, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. You have repeatedly refused to accept the ruling of the House, you have remained on your feet, and then said that you weren't getting a square deal, that you wanted the same treatment as the Government side were getting. If that isn't an implication that you are not getting it, I don't understand English, and if we are going to have any discipline in this House, if you are going to have any semblance of order in the House, the Speaker must be allowed to say whether he accepts the statement of a member or not. When I said I had heard the member make the retraction — if I can hear it, and I have fairly poor hearing, very poor hearing, as a matter of fact; but if I hear the member make the retraction, and I acknowledge that he has made the retraction, then it has got to be sufficient for this House. It is not going to be made the purpose for a speech. The hon. member will continue.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I, probably, Mr. Speaker, could be more of a shining example for the hon. member for Arm River.

**Mr. Danielson:** — If he tells the truth it is all right with me.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I know he doesn't like to withdraw any statement that he has made, so if I have made any statement that is contradictory to what he said, in his mind, I gladly withdraw.

**Mr. Danielson:** — If you had said that in the first place it would have been all over.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Well, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I made the withdrawal in the first place, but the hon. member from Arm River seems to be so obstinate in his own wind that he can't hear another person making a withdrawal. He just judges everyone else by his own inane stubbornness.

Mr. Speaker, after just a few more words, I intend to take my seat, much to the relief, perhaps, of the hon. members opposite; but I can assure you that when the budget debate comes, you will hear more from me. I intend to deal with this whole matter of land in an objective manner, Mr. Speaker, not because of any philosophies or any beliefs that I hold, that the group on this side of the House hold, but to deal with a situation that we have in the province of Saskatchewan, and a similar situation prevails in other similar areas of the North American continent.

I was looking, Mr. Speaker, over the record of land tenure the other day, and I discovered this: that, over the years, less and less farmers, in this province, are owning their own land. And I want to say further, Mr. Speaker, that it is because the problems developed under what is known as 'private ownership' — the problem of large farms, the problem of farm tenancy; for that reason and because of the immediate need for the re-establishment of people who have been liquidated off the farms, and others who live on subsistence farms, it is vital and necessary that we deal with the problem realistically, and the most satisfactory way you can deal with it in on a 33-year lease basis, under which there is no capital outlay involved, under which scheme the Provincial Government breaks up 50

acres of land for each settler. I think it is all to the good. Just take a look at the trend towards farm tenancy in Saskatchewan. In 1911, there were some 86,000 owner-operated farms in this province, and that represented 90.6 per cent of the whole. In 1946, only 56.6 per cent of the farmers wholly owned their own land, and proportionately, the percentage of farm tenants went up.

Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for me to say any more in that regards and I want to demonstrate to the hon. members opposite, in the course of my budget address, that the whole problem has arisen, in recent years, not because of the fault of any particular person, not because of any particular philosophy. It developed as a result of mechanization of agriculture. The tendency towards larger farm units has also been pronounced, as you look over the figures. For instance, in 1911, the average acreage per farm was 295, in 1946 it was 473, and those are the problems that we are facing, Mr. Speaker. Everyone is interested in what is termed the 'family-sized' farm, and everyone is interested in keeping the boys down on the farms particularly the hon. members opposite — many of whom have expressed keen regard for the movement from the farms to urban centres. I do notice, though, Mr. Speaker, that very few of the hon. members opposite are farmers and usually the people who are most solicitous about keeping the boys on the farms are people that don't live on the farm themselves. They are usually people that have all the advantages of modern amenities in urban centres, and at the same time, they are greatly disturbed and concerned about the movement to urban centres. And similarly, Mr. Speaker, those are the peoples generally, that are so concerned about this 33-year lease. They are not the farmers themselves at all — our records indicate that completely; but the ones that are chiefly concerned are the ones, again, that are not engaged in agriculture at all. I am inclined to think, Mr. Speakers that their concern, after all, isn't so much for the farmer as it is for the well-being of their own particular business. It could be a loaning business. Perhaps they would like to have farmers in a position where they could loan money to them — yes, and sometimes at very exorbitant interest rates, and on very poor terms too, Mr. Speaker, at times. Those factors and this advice we have been getting from business organizations are the very things that have contributed so greatly to the present serious situation in regard to farm tenure in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with just those few observations at this time, I want to say to you, very firmly, that I shall decidedly vote against the amendments and for the motion.

The question being put on the amendment was negatived by 27 votes to 19.

The question being put on the main motion it was agreed to by 27 votes to 19.

The Assembly adjourned at 5.45 o'clock p.m.