

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Eleventh Legislature
22nd Day

Friday, March 2, 1951

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

BUDGET DEBATE

The House resumed, from Thursday, March 1, 1951, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Fines: "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair. (The Assembly to go into a Committee of Supply.)"

Mr. Harry Gibbs (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, when we went in a huddle last night, and I finished my short address, we were talking in a very quiet manner, I think, about how the Opposition was complaining about the high cost of the budget. I think I tried to explain to the members, very quietly and very casually, why they objected to the high cost of the budget. However, I noticed that, on the Order Paper, we have a resolution, I believe submitted by the hon. Member from Yorkton (Mr. Swallow) with regard to price control. Being a trade unionist and a member of a Trade Union, I would just like to point out for a few seconds, what organized labour is trying to do in Canada, to try and get price controls re-established by the Federal Government.

I think it is imperative that each and every member of this Assembly, both on the Government and on the Opposition side, should support price controls, because they know and we know that is one reason why our budget, at the present time, is so high. I would just like to read you, Mr. Speaker, with controls on in 1941 to 1946 (that was during the war), from December 1941 to April 1946, the cost of living index went up only 5 points. As a result, your 1939 dollar is now worth only 59 cents; you have lost 41 cents on every dollar you earn. This means you can buy less food, less clothing, less of all necessities for your families.

That proves conclusively just what we have been talking about in this House for the last two weeks about the inflationary period, the high cost of living and so on and so forth. I hope, when that resolution is put before the House, that each and every one . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. The hon. Member is out of order in referring to a resolution that is on the Order Paper.

Mr. Gibbs: — Well then, we will pass on to something else, Mr. Speaker, but I thought it would just be a nice hint, anyway.

I just want to say a few words because I haven't got much time today. I have to make about 25 yards in about 25 minutes for a touchdown. We have to have teamplay and I hope we get it, because if we get that I think, probably, I will get in under the wire.

March 2, 1951

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the constituency I represent, Swift Current, is quite a thriving little city, and I want to give credit to the C.C.F. Government for what they have done in regard to grants and assistance, financially, which they have given in various respect with regard to Swift Current. We have now, in construction, a union hospital, and I want to say, and give my thanks, to this Government for the very generous grant they have given towards that hospital. It is true the Liberal Federal Government is helping also, and I think when that hospital is finished we will have one of the finest hospitals of its size in Western Canada. It will be a credit both to the city of Swift Current and to the province of Saskatchewan.

Also, our schools. I think I told you, last year, that we had one of the finest composite schools in Western Canada, built with the assistance of the Provincial Government, which our Liberal Opposition friends claim don't do anything with regard to helping these matters out. I wish to tell them right here and now that, with the aid of the Provincial Government, we have got one of the finest composite schools in Western Canada in operation today. We have also been aided and helped in furnishing the museum there, which is another asset to any town or city or hamlet in this province: things we must have, things we should have, to further education and everything in that line.

As you know, Swift Current is a railroad terminal. It is the hub of the busy distributing centre. We feed, through our distributing system there, railroads, from quite an area for miles and miles around the city of Swift Current; and as you know, we have quite a few government institutions there — courthouse, lands titles office. We also have a Highway depot, and a good one. They extended the warehouse, last summer. In helping to keep the roads in good shape, keep the snow removal down in the wintertime and so on and so forth, they are doing a real good job and I have to congratulate the Minister of Highways in that regard.

We also have a power station, which has been equipped to feed hundreds of farm units and hamlets and villages surrounding Swift Current. Up to the inauguration of the C.C.F. Government and the progress of electrification, they had no such thing around Swift Current. Today, I am glad to say, that many a village and hamlet that had never seen electric light before, are using that power today which is a sure source and a sure indication of the progress which our Government is giving to the people of Saskatchewan, today.

We also have a good telephone exchange. This last summer, they have rebuilt all the wiring — that is the main wiring and service wiring — and also put in hundreds of new cradle telephones, which is another asset compared to the old wall telephones, and another thing we can say is that, owing to our Government's look to the future, I think it is all for the best, for better convenience and comfort all around. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that in a very short time, Swift Current will be supplied with natural gas, which will be another very great asset. I am hoping to see the time come when Swift Current will be serviced with another source of power in natural gas. And don't forget: that small city of Swift Current, is noted, I think, not only

Dominion-wide, but world wide, for its hospitality and friendliness, for the inauguration of what they call "Frontier Days", and it is something worthwhile. I would invite each and every member of this House, if he has the opportunity around holiday time in the summer, around July, to drop up to Swift Current, take in the shows we can put on, and I am sure you will all have a real good time.

As you know, Swift Current was the pioneer city with regard to the C.C.F. When we talked about state hospitalization and medicine, Swift Current was the pioneer and inaugurated the first Health Region on the North American Continent. I am glad to say that I think we are all proud to see that other regions are following suit and that, possibly before many years have gone by, we shall have a full comprehensive health scheme, under a C.C.F. and progressive government, which we have been wanting all these years, but never got under any previous administration that ever held office in this province.

Our health builds up there are really wonderful — very well staffed; and it is a tribute to the Minister of Public Health. It is real tribute to the Minister and his Department for the good work he is doing in health and along those lines, and all I can say is I wish him Godspeed. I hope that, as the days go on, we shall probably get rid of some of the abuses that have taken place in the hospitalization and so forth in our province, and that the day will come very soon when we can get down to a minimum and possibly reduce the premium that we have to pay today, although it is very small as we all know. I think, possibly, one thing I would just like to mention and that is drugs. The sooner our province can get down to socialized drugs, I think that would be one of the finest things we could do in that regard, in order to bring down and mow down a lot of those abuses that are taking place, today. It is something scandalous, sometimes, what the low-bracket wage earner has to pay for drugs, and I think it is about time a stop was put to it.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, I have got to come on to that well-known topic, which I think my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition knows already, because he has started to smile. He knows I am going to deal a little bit now, with the Saskatchewan Landing Bridge. As you know, this was the bridge that my hon. Friend evidently thought could never be built, now he is going to . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, let us get this straight right at the start and I won't have to interrupt my hon. friend more than once. My attitude was that, when it was built, it should be built on high enough piers that, when the dam was put in at Elbow, it wouldn't be under water.

Mr. Gibbs: — Well, we'll take that explanation, Mr. Speaker; but at the same time, he said "It would be under water". Anyway this bridge now is pretty well completed, and I would suggest to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that if he will go to the Department of Highways and Transportation, he will see a cut of the bridge in construction. It is a pretty good picture, too. But now all the six cement arches are completed, the steel spans are all finished; there is only the concrete floor to lay, and that will be laid just as soon

March 2, 1951

as the spring and frost conditions will allow. Then we have the south approach to build and we are ready to go. I can also inform the members and am proud to inform the members that we intend to officially open that bridge on or about the first Wednesday in June, so I hope that you can all be there . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Gibbs: — . . . and I would certainly like to see the Leader of the Opposition there, because then I could definitely prove to him that the bridge was there and that he was on top of it, and if he were still doubtful, well, then, a little gush wouldn't hurt — and I will guarantee he would be 20 or 30 feet below the bridge before he hit the water.

Mr. Tucker: — The dam isn't there yet, though .

Mr. Gibbs: — I would recommend, anyway, that if he did go “over the top” we wouldn't let him drown; I think maybe we would get him out some way. It would just prove to him that that bridge was there. So don't forget folks: if you get a chance to come up there when the big show is on and when that long-talked-of bridge which the people of the southwestern part of this province had been asking the Liberal Government to build for pretty nearly 35 years, at long last it has been built by a progressive government, the C.C.F. Government of this province, and as I told you before, if we have a peoples' government in this province — true, we have money to spend, we'll have to spend money if we want anything, and that bridge cost plenty of money; but it proved to me, conclusively, that we have a Government sitting now in the province of Saskatchewan, that has both the will and the guts to do things.

Mr. Tucker: — Which has it got most of?

Mr. Gibbs: — Well, Mr. Speaker, so much for the bridge. It is there. I know it is there, and I think it is well constructed. I don't think we are going to have any reaction like the Duplessis Bridge down in Quebec.

Now, we have talked quite a lot about natural resources, and there has been some very good information given about natural resources. We are finding oil and minerals. I don't know whether our Liberal friends think that is to our credit or not, or whether they want us to find oil and minerals, because sooner or later that is going to be the pay-off in this province, and they know it, and I hope it will be soon.

We are not only finding oil and mineral ores in this province, we are also finding fossils, Mr. Speaker, and I could name quite a few places where fossils have been found, and probably it is going to be quite an advent to the younger generation of this province, We can take Qu'Appelle and Saltcoats, Rosthern, Arm River — we have found fossils there, Mr. Speaker, and I am not speaking from terms of reference. The fossils we found in those places I have mentioned were dead, but they won't lie down; and we can go one better than that, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Tucker: — You certainly can!

Mr. Gibbs: . . . because I am positive that if Charles Darwin had been alive today he would patted us on the back, you know, we can go a little further north and up in a town called Redberry, I believe we found the missing link, I really do. I believe we found the missing link, and of course, I notice when my hon. friend from Arm River was talking, the other day, he had to mention about me getting back in the boilers. Well, when the Session is over I will have to go back to the boiler shop because that is my work, that is my trade, and that is where I will have to go. But I would like to invite the member from Arm River up to Swift Current and come to the boiler shop, and if it is at all possible I will try and rivet those loose plates he has in the upper story, and if necessary, I'll caulk the seams to keep them watertight. I can't do more than that.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, we have had quite a discussion on the floor of the House, about farms and about the 33-year lease, and all this, that and the other. Well, it might be all right, but I remember a few years ago, and I am not a farmer, but I own a lot anyway — or at least I think I own a lot; but it seems to me that we don't own this land, we only think we own it. They give us a bit of paper and it makes you feel happy, but get behind a couple of years in your taxes and see how long you own it, and you know as well as I do, Mr. Speaker, that back there in the depression days . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Your Government will take it away from you.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Gibbs: — Oh, let him go, it's all right; he doesn't say anything anyway.

We know that, when the depression was on, there were all kinds of farmers who thought they owned their own land who had to walk off it with nothing but a suitcase, and I saw householders the same way, too. Well, who got this land? They were supposed to own it; but the mortgage companies and what have you got it, because when the time comes that you haven't the ability to pay, Mr. Speaker — yes it is nice to think you own something; but just get in arrears for a few years and see how long you own it. So, after all is said and done, I think this 33-year lease plan is a good plan. I really do, because it is protection all around, and you can be just as happy on a 33-year lease — you are there anyway, and it can be carried on — and you can be just as happy as having a bit of paper in a box in the cupboard, and think you own it — because you don't.

That brings me back to the nationalization of the mines in the Old Country, and I mind this when I was a kid. I heard an old Socialist talking on a soap-box, and I was only a bit of a kid at that time. He was talking about mines and lands and one thing and another, and he was talking about the coal pits of the lords and dukes. They all belonged to the pits and the mines up there. All the worker had to do was work his damned guts out and get nothing for it. And it strikes me right to this day, Mr. Speaker, and I think you have heard the same argument, that we have coal pits in the north of England

March 2, 1951

running under the sea for miles, and the workings are three and four miles under the sea. The miners have to go out there to work. Do you mean to tell me that his Lordship or his Dukeship or whatever you like to call them, owns that — under the sea! Why, they no more own that than we can say we own the sky and the air — it is jut the same problem. So it is about time this thing is nationalized, and after all is said and done I think it conclusively makes the point I want to make — that we don't own the land, we only think we own it; we are only lending it, as long as we live. So if we all get a good break while we are here and we can all make a good living, which we all try to do, why can't we be satisfied? But no, the avaricious greed of man makes all the troubles in this world and that is one of them — the greed for land, and, by gosh! they have done it right in this province of Saskatchewan. Some of them are lousy with land. They can't farm it alone; they have to take in labour and exploit farm labour. It is about time there was a stop put to it. I don't care what you think about it; that is my opinion. As I was saying talking about land — a few years ago, in the depression, I was on the city council and we were giving city lots away for the nominal sum of \$1 in order to get people to build on them so that they would become revenue-bearing. Today some of those lots, owing to the inflation and the greediness of the system we live under, are worth about \$1,000 a lot. It is a lot of nonsense, I would say.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, I am a Socialist and I am proud of it, and I think my Opposition friends can't point a finger at me and say any different, because that it is the way I have been brought up — I never knew anything else. I have come through the bitter school of experience, and if I could make this life of ours better and give better conditions to the people, well, that is my aim. I don't care how soon I go out or how long I am in, as long as I can make people happy in the communities of our province and in our Canada as a whole.

I would just like to touch, for a second or two, on international affairs, and I want to say emphatically to each and every member in this Assembly that I concur with every word that our hon. Premier said with regard to international affairs, when he spoke the other day. I think he paid a tribute, not only to himself, to the people he represents, but to all the people of Saskatchewan and all the people of the Dominion of Canada, and I certainly want to be aligned with the thoughts, the splendid humanitarian thoughts, he gave out that day.

We hear a lot about war, and I know that we had a peace delegation in these corridors, yesterday I know that the hon. member from Saltcoats (Mr. Lopton) made some snide remarks about it. Well, that is all right; that is his privilege. It was my privilege to go out and talk to those people because I believe they are not all Communists. I believe in peace; our Premier told you that he believed in peace, and I don't think any one of you can point a finger, and challenge either the Premier or myself, as being Communists. But I am a peaceful man, Mr. Speaker, and I want to say to His Majesty's Loyal Opposition that I am still a peaceful man and believe in peace, and will do anything I can, while I have got life and blood in me, to keep peace. I don't want war. A lot of these chaps that are talking about war, Mr. Speaker — have they seen it? Do they know anything about

the devastations that war has caused? I know some of my friends in the Opposition have been through it, and I am certain they don't want to see another one . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Gibbs: — . . . but just imagine: the battlefields of Europe are sodden and rotten with human blood yet, to this day, and we are still talking about other wars. I would just like a great number of Canadians to see the Old Country, to see the devastation, to go through Coventry. Coventry was wiped out, Mr. Speaker, as you know, and for years after that city was wiped out, it stank of death. They couldn't bury all the bodies, Mr. Speaker, they couldn't find them all — men, women and children that were diabolically slaughtered; so they threw a cement platform all over the city in order to bury them — to get the stench away from the city; and now the process of reconstructing Coventry is being done. That is not the only place, but several places in the city of London are being treated the same way. We don't want to see that sort of thing again.

Take the poor old British Isles: they no sooner had one war off than they had another one on. The people of that country are sick and tired of bloodshed and slaughter and war. Out here what have we seen? The average Canadian citizen doesn't know what war is. They have never smelled gunfire, they don't know what it is to see devastating bombs dropped and the slaughter of innocent women and children. They don't know what it is to see houses demolished in a few seconds. They don't know what it is to see their water-mains and sewers cut off. No, they don't realize these things; but I do, and it is about time we started to talk about these things. That is one reason, Mr. Speaker, I never want to see war again, and I think, if we can get down to some intelligent thinking, and start to publicly speak about these things we don't want to see any more probably we could get some action; I am not going to belittle any organization that has the fortitude to get out and try to bring to responsible parties peace measures and why we should have peace, because the world is sick and tired of bloodshed and slaughter — and I, for one, Mr. Speaker, don't care who it pleases or offends. I say definitely, I am for peace and I will do all within my power, to bring peace and keep peace in this wonderful Canada of ours.

Now I would just like to quote, because I know that, in many parts of Canada and many parts of this province, the Socialist is being condemned; but I don't think there is any man or woman in this province of ours who has read anything about that “granddaddy” of the old Independent Labour Party, Keri Hardier, who would ever say that that man was anything but good. He has done a lot towards the foundation of Socialism in the British Isles. Keir Hardie, the good old Scotsman he was, rugged-looking gentleman, this is what he said, in defining Socialism:

“What is Socialism? It is the return to that kindly phase of life in which there shall be no selfish lust for gold, with every man trampling down his neighbour in his mad

rush to get more.

“Socialism is the reign of human love in the room of hate. Socialism is not, as so many suppose, a thing recently invented by a few discontented, shiftless fellows. What is now known as Socialism is woven from the same loom as was the vision of Isaiah, and is also, without question, of the same texture as that Kingdom of God which the early Christians believed to be at hand.”

There is wonderful tribute, Mr. Speaker, and there is wonderful grand old man.

I guess I had better soon stop because I told you I had to make a touchdown in 25 minutes.

Well, Mr. Speaker, just in conclusion, I would just like to make an appeal to my friends in the Opposition to stop playing, peek-a-boo and singing that song, “Is you is or is you ain’t”, because if they don’t they are going to be looking through the knothole at father’s wooden leg, and I don’t want them to go home from this Session with faces as long as fiddles and all worn out, because if they will get behind, as the hon. Minister of Natural Resources told them, yesterday, if they will stop fooling around and messing about, and support the budget — because they will have a lot to answer for if they don’t; well, I would say to them to get behind progress, get behind these things that the C.C.F. Government has given to the people of this province. You asked and received an explanation yesterday a very full explanation and I think if you do that you will go home singing, “Sing as you go and let the world go by”, and I think you will be very happy. So I appeal to you most earnestly to think it over, and I think you will all have a better conscience for doing it, if you will vote for this budget, as I certainly shall.

Hon. J. H. Sturdy (Minister of Social Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, by coincidence, the member who has just spoken, my old friend, Harry Gibbs and I were born on the same day, 58 years ago. Harry and I have many qualities in common, some good, some bad — I cannot hope to attain his size and his vigor and his wit, but as the years go by, Harry and I are at least alike in this: we grow more alike in our political thinking, in our loyalty to the C.C.F. movement, and our belief in the principles of ‘humanity first’.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in observing the usual courtesies, I wish to congratulate all the Government members who have spoken thus far in the Session. I wish to congratulate them on their constructive, sound and statesmanlike speeches. I would also like to thank the members for the Opposition for making the contrast in the quality of the speeches in the debate, so evident to the people of all Saskatchewan. Even the remarkable skill of the press reporters hasn’t been equal to the job of dressing up and adorning the speeches

of the members opposite and making them acceptable and digestible to the people of the province. They have learned that you cannot make silk purses out of sow's ears.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I have listened to the speeches of the members opposite during this Session, I have been more than once reminded of that ancient Roman philosopher who, on listening to the vaporizings of the opposition in the Roman Forum, remarked: "E nihilo, nihil fit" — out of nothing, nothing comes. Now, I wouldn't want you to get the impression, Mr. Speaker, that I do not like the gentlemen opposite, because I do. They are friends of mine and some of them I have known for many years. In their youth, many of them gave promise of better things; but it only goes to prove, Mr. Speaker, the deteriorating and stultifying influence of a long association with the Liberal Party.

I should like to make one exception and that is the speech of the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Marion), yesterday, in the House. There we had the situation straight from an authority of the north. We in the south have been given to understand that everything the Government did in the north was bad. Now the sum total of the hon. member's speech, yesterday, was this: he liked the things we were doing up there. He said, in effect, "We want the things that you are doing and we want them more abundantly."

I would like to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer for bringing down a budget that is both businesslike and humane. That is a rare combination that you can only get from a Socialist Government, and when we consider that this budget is less than that of the City of Vancouver for next year, it is less than half of the budget of the province of British Columbia, we conclude that it is, indeed, a very modest budget.

Every one knows, in this province, that prior to the advent of the C.C.F. Government, in 1944, Saskatchewan as the "Cinderella province" of Canada, the most backward, the most neglected, the most undeveloped; a province lacking in social or other services. But during the past six years we have forged ahead until today Saskatchewan leads the rest of Canada in many fields; and that we can provide these extensive services that we now provide and for the development and the improvement that we visualize for 1951-52, out of this modest budget, certainly speaks for the efficiency, good government and careful planning of this Government.

I would only wish, Mr. Speaker, that the budget had the purchasing power of the dollar of a few years ago, before the top-heavy, incompetent Liberal Government at Ottawa reduced the purchasing value of the dollar to almost fifty cents. This has been the biggest steal perpetrated on the people of this country in our entire history, and I would warn the Opposition that the people of this province and the Dominion are aroused. If conditions do not improve, you have surely sown the seeds of rebellion in this country. Instead of indulging in carping criticism and abortive speeches, you would be better employed for the remainder of this Session, in writing every day to your colleagues down in Ottawa, with the demand that they re-impose price controls and restore the dollar to decent purchasing value. They can bring about reductions when it is necessary, or when they deem it necessary, and at the expense of the farmers of this country. Five minutes ago it was announced on the radio that the price being paid on the 5-year pool to the farmers of this province is only 8 1/2 cents a bushel, instead of the 25 cents to which they are entitled.

March 2, 1951

Now this damnable situation, Mr. Speaker, of inflated prices, of extremely high prices, bears especially hard on our low-income and moderate-income people, but it especially bears hard on the 5,000 people served by the Department of Social Welfare — the aged, the neglected, the handicapped the social cases, mothers' allowance cases, old-age pensioners and blind pensioners — people, who by reasons of age, accidents, sickness or misfortune or other reasons, are unable to care for themselves. A Christian society demands that this Government help these people, and I was amazed to read in the editorial columns of the "Star-Phoenix" and the "Leader-Post" a request by those papers that the social spending of this Government be reduced. I read almost in the same papers that \$455 million had been paid in national advertising to the daily newspapers of the Dominion of Canada in 1950. It comes with ill grace from the millionaire newspaper-owners this demand to cut down the services to needy people in this province.

In dealing with Old-Age Pensions, Mr. Speaker, may I again bring to the attention of the House the fact that J. S. Woodsworth was responsible for bringing in old-age pensions in 1926. It is true that the pension was appallingly low, but it was a start, and for the next 16 years, from 1926 to 1943 — the last year of the Liberal Government in this province — the pension was only \$18.75 per month. But from 1944 to 1950, the pension more than doubled — it is now \$39.20. In 1943, there were only 16,000 pensioners in this province; now there are 24,000, because we have done everything possible, under the rigid means test imposed by the Ottawa Government, to bring as many people under pension as we possibly can. There were no health services in 1943 — and now we have. In 1944, this Government introduced free hospitalization, health, optical and dental services for our old-age pensioners and their dependants.

This Government has set the example which Ottawa and one or two other governments have followed. This Government and the C.C.F. movement in Canada have carried the torch for better living conditions, more security for our old-age people. And, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that this determined and unrelenting effort of the C.C.F. on behalf of social security was never better demonstrated than it was at Ottawa at the time of the Dominion-Provincial conference in December last. That conference, Mr. Speaker, would have ended without an agreement, or without a definite commitment had it not been for the Premier of this province. I want every old-age pensioner in this province and in the Dominion of Canada to know that and to know the story. The conference dragged on for three days — no agreement had been reached. The treasury benches appeared to be pleased, because I am sure they did not want an agreement — and certain other provinces, or their representatives, appeared to be pleased. The Conference threatened to close without an agreement having been reached, but "Tommy" Douglas (God Bless him!) took up the battle. He displayed all the diplomacy of a Talleyrand, and the tenacity of a bulldog, and he refused to see that conference close without an agreement having been reached. He demanded that each province express its intention, and finally the Prime Minister of Canada consented to find out the opinion of the provinces. The Premier, T. C. Douglas, stated the position of Saskatchewan — that we were, first, in agreement with the granting of the constitutional amendment requested by the Federal Government; secondly, that we were in agreement with a \$40 pension to those over 70, without a means test; and thirdly, that we agreed to the \$40 pension for the age group between 65 and 69, with a means test, the Province to pay 50 per cent.

It was interesting to see the action of the other provinces. After the Premier got up and declared his intention with respect to these three points, he was followed immediately by Newfoundland, then by New Brunswick; after some hesitation, by British Columbia; after a great deal of delay and hesitation, by Ontario, and then with further stalling and evident reluctance one province after the other got up and finally the 10 provinces gave their commitments with respect to these three things. Had that conference broken up without this action being taken, without an agreement having been reached, I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, we would have waited another 20 years before this next step had been taken forward in social security. It is true that, while at this conference, we pressed for a \$50 pension and we also pressed for a pension or social assistance to the physically handicapped people, but that was not to be.

Now, in respect to the health of old-age pensioners of this province, that has been taken care of by this Government. It is true their pensions have been raised, but much of the purchasing power of these increased pensions has been taken away by the high cost of living. There are two other matters which concern me — that is adequate housing for our senior citizens and the other is nursing care for old-age pensioners who require it but do not require active medical treatment. It is our policy to assume full responsibility for nursing care for all old-age pensioners in the province. To this end we have converted the Wolseley Home largely into a nursing care institution. Three years ago, the nursing home with a bed capacity of seventy-five, was established in Regina. Tomorrow we are opening a nursing home in Saskatoon with a bed capacity of one hundred and fifty to two hundred. It may be, Mr. Speaker, that the situation in Canada, the drastic shortage of steel that I found out about when I was in Ottawa last Friday and Saturday, may prevent our proceeding, but it will be no fault of this Government if that home is not started this year and completed in 1952.

Now with respect to adequate, decent homes for these senior citizens of ours, the churches have done a good deal in this regard in the past and we consider it is a natural activity for these churches. We are encouraging them to assume this responsibility and will assist them in so doing. A few months ago I officially opened a home for the accommodation of ninety old-age pensioners in Saskatoon. There were delightful small suites for married old-age pensioners and rooms for single persons of both sexes. These old people were extremely happy and we do want them to feel, these people who have done so much in the past in the development of this province, that they are not thrown into corners, that they are wanted and appreciated and are part of society. That is our policy, and so far our association with the churches in this fine humanitarian work promises to be mutually helpful and beneficial.

I would like to speak for a moment on Mothers' Allowances. Comparisons may be odious, Mr. Speaker, but we can most effectively gauge progress by making comparisons. Mothers' Allowance paid in 1943-44 were \$520,000; in 1949-50, \$1,083,000, and this does not include the cost of free hospital and medical care for all mothers and all their dependants. The monthly allowance has been more than doubled under the C.C.F. and the number receiving allowances has been increased by over eleven hundred. This increase has been due to a less rigid means test and the inclusion

March 2, 1951

of such categories as unmarried mothers, divorced mothers, mothers whose husbands are incapacitated and so on. One noticeable thing, Mr. Speaker, has been the drastic drop from 1943 to 1950 in the number of widows receiving mothers' allowance. The drop has been from 1,457 in 1943 to 886 last year. I am told that more and more widows are getting married and this has, no doubt, been due in part to the improved economic and social conditions in this province, and I have no doubt that bachelors are no longer afraid of the economic risk of marriage. Well, I had hoped that one or two members in the House would be influenced by the statement that I have just made. Naturally, we are interested in our Mothers' Allowance Branch, in reducing the number of widows as much as we possibly can.

Under the previous government, Mr. Speaker, allowances were cut off when the child reached age 16. Now they are continued until the child reaches 18, providing the child is in school and making progress that is satisfactory to the principal and to the Department of Social Welfare. The allowance has also been continued to age 21, with respect to children who are incapacitated and unable to work.

Mothers with cash up to \$2,000 and assets up to \$5,000 are now eligible and all caveats have been removed from their property. It is true that a notice is filed in the Land Titles Office against their property, but this is merely as a protection, to prevent the widows from being victimized by high-pressure salesmen, promoters and so on. We have a much more competent and better trained field staff today and these render invaluable service in counselling, advising and assisting mothers in keeping the families together and in helping to make the family independent and self-supporting.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with our veteran land settlement and our veteran policy in this province. Veteran rehabilitation has been the responsibility of my Department since 1945; also in that year, a legislative committee was set up, comprising all the veteran members of the House, as well as the three Armed Services Members of that time. I worked closely with this committee; I worked closely with the Legion, and I am happy to say that my associations with the D.V.A. of this province and the Dominion of Canada have always been most cordial and helpful — if I can keep the politicians out of it.

This Government has done a great deal — maybe not enough; but it has done a great deal on behalf of veterans in this province — more than any provincial government in the Dominion of Canada. As an example, we have settled more veterans on provincial farms than all the rest of the provinces put together; and naturally it irks me when I find three non-veteran members of the Opposition attacking our policy because, I am sure, it has been so successful and so acceptable to the veterans of this province that they endeavour to sabotage what we are doing. We are accustomed to the sabotage tactics of the members opposite. They have tried these tactics with respect to every piece of our most progressive legislation — to larger school units, hospitalization, medical services, and all progressive things that this Government has introduced in this province. Why, they could teach the Communists how to improve their tactics in sabotage. I am quite sure of that. Fortunately, the general public, and particularly veterans, resent this sort of thing and, as far as the Opposition's attack on our veteran land settlement policy is concerned, in the words of William Shakespeare, Mr. Speaker "I shall puncture their bloated bladder of lies upon the poniard of truth".

Mr. Tucker: — Stick your chest out some more.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — What has been the veteran land policy of this Government? Well, first, the allocation of Crown Lands to veterans on the basis of war service, need, marital status and other factors. It has been conscientiously and honestly done in contrast to the allocation of Federal land north of Melfort that went to Liberal political ‘healers’. Many veterans have told me, “Thank God; the C.C.F. Government was in power in this province when these provincial lands were allocated; otherwise they, too, would have gone to the friends of the Liberal Party.”

The 33-year renewable lease, Mr. Speaker, is held in perpetuity by the veteran and his family and his heirs. He has absolute security. No one can take it away from him or deprive him of the right to pass it on to his heirs. There is no agreement that is more binding, more lasting and better than that agreement. The veteran pays one-sixth to one-eighth of the crop share produced, as his rent — and if the average crop falls below six bushels per acre in any one year, he pays no rent. Moreover, he has the right to purchase the land at any time after ten years of occupancy — not at war inflated prices. Look in your newspaper and you will find land advertised for \$75 an acre today. I say not at war-inflated prices will he purchase his land, but on the basis of the long-term productive behaviour of that land. If a price cannot be agreed on, the Saskatchewan Arbitration Act will apply. A Judge of the District Court is chairman of the Administration Board and surely the members opposite have reason to have confidence in the judges of this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what has been the Government’s record of settlement: Over two thousand, as I have said, have been settled. This was our objective in 1945 and this is another C.C.F. promise that has been fulfilled. Now, over a hundred veterans have surrendered their lease agreements for one reason or another — health reasons, martial, inheritance and so on. If the veterans had owned those farms, they would have immediately sold them, naturally at the highest price that they could get for them. The veterans who have left these farms have been replaced by other veterans. If the veteran had owned the farm he would have sold it, naturally to the wealthiest farm in the neighbourhood, one possibly who already owned too much land. These hundred farms would have gone to the owners of some of those 3,000 acres farms, in whom the member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) takes such pride.

We have undertaken a large land clearance and settlement project east of the Carrot River. Over 100 families have already been settled on co-operative and individual farms. This project any government can be proud of. It has been written up in the Montreal Stand, in the ‘Toronto Star’, in ‘MacLean’s Magazine’; you will find it praised in the national papers, but I do not suppose you will ever read anything about this project in the ‘Leader-Post’ or the ‘Star-Phoenix.’

Now, Mr. Speaker, the only people who object to our rentals are those who say that they are too low. Undoubtedly the mortgage companies

March 2, 1951

and absentee landlords complain that these mortgages are too low as it shows them up by comparison. If it is deemed advisable it is conceivable that these rentals to veterans may even be lowered further. If the member from Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) was interested enough in this and wished to be of some guidance to the veterans he might have consulted with the vice-president of the Canadian Legion, who farms at Melfort, and who told me a very short time ago that if he ever had the opportunity of acquiring land under the provincial scheme, he never would have purchased land under any other agreement.

Now, many veterans have told me that they do not intend to purchase their farms when the 10 years of settlement rolls around. If they have saved from \$5,000 to \$10,000, they are going to buy additional land for their growing families. Moreover they feel that they have absolute security in the agreement which they hold. They do not propose to spend several thousand dollars to acquire their land when they can keep it during their life-time and when they can will it to their heirs. Veterans, you know, are evidently much smarter than the members are. The only concern I have heard expressed by veterans is, "What will happen to our agreements if the Liberals ever get back into power!" Well I have assured them there was not a possibility of that happening, but if such a calamity should befall the people of Saskatchewan, the Liberals cannot interfere with those Veterans' Agreements, or tamper with them either. If a veteran wants to purchase his farm, he will do it and it will not be determined by any action of the members opposite.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that besides settling two thousand veterans, we built over seven hundred housing units directly after the war, in communities where the Federal Government would not build homes for veterans. As I look opposite, some of the members should be duly grateful for this: Melville, Estevan, Melfort, Assiniboia, Humboldt. Also, we have put these housing units into cities where the Federal Government could not keep up to the demand for veteran housing. Also, we provided housing and dining-room facilities for over six hundred veteran families or veterans attending University of Saskatoon. The Provincial Government went all out in assisting in the vocational and university education of our veterans in this province. That is not a bad record — is it?

Now, let us contrast it with the Liberal record in this field. All veterans of World War I remember that a Liberal Government in Saskatchewan and Ottawa did absolutely nothing for veterans, except to sell them Crown Lands at exorbitantly high inflated prices. The veteran settlers slaved their guts out under an impossible burden of debt and over 14,000 to the 24,000 veterans settled in Canada left their farms in despair or were forced to give them up. And worse than that, Mr. Speaker. Now, after thirty years, hundreds of these veterans have still not secured the titles to their farms. They hypocrisy of the members opposite and their cheap political bribes! Well, the veteran knows the score and the veteran does not take kindly to the offer of a bribe. Listen to this article — these are the gentlemen opposite whose Government is going to give titles to veterans to their farms if they are elected. Listen to this. It is an article in the 'Leader-Post' of a few days ago — dated February 24th in this year of Grace 1951, and it is entitled "Vets (that is World War I) Land Debts Gradually Written Off":

“A persistent Irish farmer from the prairies, Wednesday, suffered another set-back in his annual battle to persuade the Government to liquidate the indebtedness of veterans who settled on farms after the first World War, and a Government spokesman said that \$1,428,000 still owed by those veterans cannot be written off in one fell swoop. After thirty years, Labour Minister Gregg said the Government has been gradually liquidating the indebtedness of the old soldiers.”

The Liberals are the most “gradual” people in the world, and after thirty years the veterans still owe \$1,428,000 on their farms and they still have not got titles to their farms, and the gentlemen opposite are going to get the veterans in Saskatchewan titles right off the bat if elected. Do you think they believe you on the record of the Liberals at Ottawa? Yes, and on the record of the Liberals in this province do you think they are going to believe you?

Now let us look further. A vote was taken as to whether these veterans should after thirty years be given their titles. Certain Liberals voted for it; all the C.C.F., the Social Credit and the Tories voted for it. Yes, there were a few Liberals; but not a single Liberal member from Saskatchewan, not even Brig. Mr. McCusker voted to give the titles to these old veterans.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the veterans are not impressed by any promises made by the members opposite.

I would like to say a word about the Veterans’ Co-Operative Farms. I am a believer in co-operative farming. Every one of the dozen or so co-operative farms which have been established in this province has been a success. They are economically and socially sound. They prevent the rural drift into towns and cities, a situation deprecated by the members opposite. The cooperative farms provide for diversified farming. I say that the utilization of our large one-economy wheat farms in this province as co-operative farms would settle every land-hungry veteran we have in the province.

Now I was frankly told in Ottawa in December, when I conferred with officials of the Department of Veterans Affairs that “Jim” Gardiner has opposed the arrangement which I thought had been completed for allowing the veteran to use his purchase grant of \$6,000 for the settlement of veterans on these large farms in Saskatchewan on a co-operative basis. Well I can well believe that Jim Gardiner opposed this arrangement. This is understandable, because the people opposite are all opposed to co-operative farming. You and I have heard the Leader of the Opposition in this House, and on the hustings, and in the newspapers, describe co-operative farming as regimentation, communal farming straight from Russia, the brain-child of Joe Stalin! Well, Mr. Speaker, would it surprise you to learn that the Liberals must have given Joe Stalin the idea of co-operative farming when he was approximately seventeen years of age. Listen to this! This is taken from the Statutes of Canada, Queen Victoria, Chapter 31, an Act to amend the Dominion Lands Act, June 13, 1898, when there was a Liberal Government in Ottawa. This is what that legislation states — this is what the

amendment to the Dominion Land Act calls for:

“The Minister may withdraw from general use and from settlement under the ordinary Homestead provisions of this Act any available Dominion Lands for Association of settlers who desire to engage in co-operative farming.”

I hope the hon. Leader of the Opposition is listening to this. The amendment further stated:

“Upon receiving from each association an application from ten or more members” (the condition was that ten or more members had to engage in co-operative funding) “stating they had formed an association for the purpose of engaging in co-operative farming”.

I notice in the Hansard of 1898 that this was moved by Mr. Sifton, a good old Liberal, because the Siftons never change their politics; and it was ably supported by Mr. Davin, who was an early Tory of this province. Well, frankly, I do not condemn the Liberals for believing in co-operative farming in 1898, but what I condemn them for is doing nothing about these good ideas which the Liberals had. It would appear that the present-day Liberals have gone to seed — or are infected by intellectual dry rot. In the past they had some good ideas and they had some good intentions, but they never got beyond the intention stage. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, the road to the Liberal hell has always been paved with good intentions and unfulfilled promises. They did nothing about co-operative farming although they passed the legislation over fifty years ago. They did nothing about larger school units although they passed the legislation in 1938. They did nothing in this province about hospitalization and health services or anything else that was progressive and for the benefit of the people of this province.

A change has been made, Mr. Speaker, that this Government employs political patronage. That, coming from the Opposition, is a most amazing statement in view of the fact that their record in this province during their thirty-five years of office in the field of political patronage smelled to high heaven. The people of this province are now proud of the fact that patronage has disappeared and that our Government employees, our civil servants, are now being selected for their qualifications and their ability, and promotions are also being made on that basis. As far as veterans are concerned, Mr. Speaker, there are more than twice the number of veterans employed now in the civil service and Crown corporations than there have ever been in the history of this province. We do not ask the politics of a veteran when he applies. The fact that he has been a veteran and he has the qualifications is good enough for us.

I did not intend to bring this matter up but I have not lived in this province since 1912 and I have not been a veteran without knowing and my friends experiencing some of the Liberal patronage and discrimination that has been going on down through the years in this province. I had not intended bringing this up, but the hon. member for

Melville asked me, the other day, in the Public Accounts Committee, if the manager of our Metis farm at Lebret was still employed by the Provincial Government and I told him yes. That manager had been engaged by this Government on the basis of his experience and ability and as far as I was concerned he has been a good employee. He was a Liberal — that was well known; but that did not make any difference to us. I had several complaints and I ordered an investigation. An investigation was conducted, but on the basis of the report of that investigation, I did not think we were justified in dismissing him and his services were retained. Just a few days — this is what happened in Fort Qu'Appelle, a mile or so distant from Lebret, and I would ask the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley to lend an ear, and also the hon. member from Melville if and when he is in his seat.

There the widow of a veteran who had been the postmaster for many years in Fort Qu'Appelle was fired. She had continued as postmistress at Fort Qu'Appelle after her husband's death. Her husband had been a veteran, and two of his brothers had been veterans in World War I. Undoubtedly as a result of the wounds received by this veteran, he died prematurely, and his widow had taken over the post office. There were five members of her family, five boys. Four of them were in the services in World War II; one of them is still in the services, a high-ranking officer in the Air Force and decorated for gallantry. One of the other boys was killed in ferrying aeroplanes. That was the war record of the family. The youngest son was assisting his mother to carry on the work of the post office. He had been "frozen" to his job by the Federal postal authorities in World War II. He wanted to enlist, but they would not let him. This is a highly respected and much-loved family and this is the record of their services to Canada in two World Wars and to the community. Yet because a Liberal 'big-shot' in Fort Qu'Appelle, the wealthiest man in the valley, wanted that job for his son, this widow was fired from her job.

I know the family well. I had taught four of those boys and I can quite understand and approve the indignation that exists in the Qu'Appelle valley today. Over five hundred residents signed a petition requesting that this lady, the widow of a veteran, be re-instated. The petition was circulated by the ex-reeve of the municipality, a successful but hard-headed Scotch business man. I had never discovered that he was influenced by sentiment or that his emotions were easily aroused and I should know because he was chairman of my School Board for twelve years when I was principal of the school there. He circulated that petition, which went to Ottawa. Nothing was done. The Legion wrote in. Nothing was done! That is the contrast, Mr. Speaker, in the treatment of two employees by the two governments. Small wonder that the people of the valley are not going to rest until this lady is replaced in her job or that the position be turned over to her son who has rendered efficient services and has been a most popular postmaster.

I would like to deal briefly with our Corrections Department, Mr. Speaker, and here again I must indulge in some comparison. Under previous governments the goals of this province were merely custodial institutions where the inmates were kept behind bars. They received no education, no training, no remedial treatment of any kind. Because

March 2, 1951

of no segregation, the young inexperienced offender soon became a hardened criminal. Our gaols in those days were veritable schools for crime; repeaters were high and the incidence of both juvenile and adult delinquency was on the increase, except in periods of war.

Now in 1947, on the recommendation of the Laycock Commission, the Corrections Branch was established under the Department of Social Welfare. Hugh Christie as director with a key staff of trained and skilled men have done a phenomenally good job in less than four years. The director and staff were given a job to do and they are doing it. They immediately changed the treatment of juvenile and adult offenders from punishment to correction and rehabilitation. By scientific means the causes of delinquent behaviour are discovered and treatment prescribed to remove the causes. The prisoners are given trade training and educational instruction. They are actively employed from six o'clock in the morning until ten o'clock at night, during the entire waking hours of their day. A uniform probation and parole system has been established across the province.

I think I can best explain, Mr. Speaker, what has been accomplished by giving you the opinion of one of the United States leading authorities on penal work and a psychologist and author on this subject. I refer to Dr. Bromberg who spent several days in Regina, a couple of weeks ago. I am reading from the 'Leader-Post' of February 24th:

“Warm praise from the province’s correctional system and the manner in which the Saskatchewan Boys’ School and the gaols are being used to re-educate and rehabilitate the offenders was expressed Wednesday by Dr. Bromberg, an eminent American psychologist.”

To use his exact words:

“You have been most successful, more successful than we in the United States, in narrowing the gap between ideas or talks and actual accomplishments in the scientific treatment of offenders”.

He declared he was greatly impressed with the philosophy, the programs, in the gaol system and was particularly enthusiastic about the school for delinquent boys. He referred not only to this, but Dr. Bromberg was struck by the relative youth and the obvious ability of the staff in the correctional programs. It reminded him of the business executive who attributed his success to choosing young men carefully and then giving them authority to carry on. The institution and policies being carried out were clearly superior, Dr. Bromberg said. “You appear a progressive and progressing community.”

Now, what are some of the results of our correction programme which has been operating for three short years? First, juvenile and adult delinquency in Saskatchewan is decreasing, while elsewhere it

is on the increase. We have closed one gaol. In other provinces, new gaols are being built. We are currently spending less in 1950 in the Corrections Branch in this Government than we did four years ago. The number of repeaters in our gaol is decreasing and, above all, the scientific, humane and common-sense approach to the problem of delinquency is saving many young lives, making them useful to society instead of a detriment and a menace to society.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal briefly with our Child Welfare Branch which has to do with the care of neglected children. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, when I became Minister of Social Welfare in 1948, I knew more about child welfare and child care than I shall ever know again. You see, I had been a teacher for many years and, besides, I was a father, and of course fathers know everything about children and especially if they are grandfathers. Now this Branch deals with neglected children, and if the neglect is continued or corrective measures are not taken, the child frequently becomes a program child and faces failure in life, a detriment to society instead of an asset, a potential menace with the penal institution more than likely its eventual goal. The problem is a sizeable one, when we consider that last year the Child Welfare Branch had 2970 children in care. Down through the years these children have come to us from broken homes; some of them are orphans, children of unmarried mothers and totally irresponsible parents who fail to look after their children. They have all been neglected or they are potentially neglected children. Many of them come to us with deep-seated emotional upsets and complexes which take a considerable time to correct.

To my mind, Mr. Speaker, the work of this Branch is most important; the most exacting and difficult of any in the Department. Miss Parr, the director, and her associates are doing an outstanding job. They have taken as their philosophy "a home is necessary to a child", and it is on this sound basic philosophy that the Branch has been organized. First, there is the Family Division, and it attempts to keep the family together. Family difficulties are many, especially in this neurotic era which we are under. Lack of decent housing and insecurity, low standard of living, immorality and a host of other causes lead to broken homes, separation, desertion, divorce and, Mr. Speaker, wherever there is a broken home or a maladjusted home, there is a potentially neglected child. The work of this Division is most important because it is in the preventive field. Sixteen Hundred and eighty-four family cases were dealt with in 1949-50. The second division is the Unmarried Mother's Division. Mr. Speaker, every possible assistance is rendered to the unmarried mother both before and after the birth of the child. Assistance is given in her rehabilitation, because she has gone through a harrowing experience. Employment is found for her and plans are made for her child's future. Mother's allowance is granted if she keeps the child. The putative father is contacted and made to realize his responsibility, financial and otherwise. I am pleased to inform the House there has been a decline in new cases from 912 in 1949 to 804 in 1949-50, a reduction of a little over a hundred. This is an important division, Mr. Speaker. These unfortunate girls were hitherto felt outcasts of society. They received very little assistance indeed; but now they are taken care of to such an extent that we have been accused of contributing to this defect; but such is not the case evidently, because there has been a reduction as there will be a further reduction in this if our educational programme is carried on.

March 2, 1951

The third is the Child Care Division. Now we have over 2000 children in care at one time and emphasis is placed on finding good foster homes for government wards. No institution, Mr. Speaker, not even the best in the province, can ever replace the training, development, security and love which a child finds in a good home, and I want to express on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan the deep gratitude to the foster parents of Saskatchewan. I have visited many of these homes and there I find these children are living happily, well adjusted, receiving loving care, developing normally; and so I think society owes a debt of gratitude to the foster-parents of this province. We have four child-caring institutions for the reception of children pending their placement in foster homes, and they provide also for the continued care of difficult cases, occasioned by illness, serious neglect, deformities or other causes.

The fourth division in the Child Welfare Branch is the Adoption Division, which places children for adoption and carries the process through until legal adoption has been finalized. Unscientific and haphazard adoption procedures in the past, Mr. Speaker, have led to many unfortunate adoptions with serious consequences to the children. In 1949, 320 adoptions were finalized, 200 placed in adoption homes on probation; nine out of ten of those were eventually adopted. One hundred and sixty-two were supervised by the Branch in the private placement of children; a total of 692 children in that year; children who have become permanent members of good christian homes — and again I wish to point out the importance of this branch and commend the staff for the excellence of the work which they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with the other branches and divisions of my Department. The Social Assistance, with the work of the Rehabilitation Division, for the rehabilitation of handicapped persons — that is the only provincial government division of its kind in the Dominion of Canada. I would like to deal with what has been done and what we propose doing for the Metis population in this province. I should also like to deal with housing, but I will deal with that on the occasion when the private resolution on Housing is under debate in the House. I had intended dealing with it today, but I have not received from Ottawa a letter promised by the Hon. Robert Winters, who is responsible for the housing. That letter, I understand, will arrive in a day or two, but it was promised to me at the beginning of the week. It will outline the situation with respect to the supply of building material, particularly steel, and two and a half ton of steel goes into the building of every normal-sized home. The scarcity of these materials may interfere with the housing programme which we had so confidently hoped we would be able to go ahead with, this year. I have already received applications for approximately 2000 houses to be constructed in the various municipalities in this province, and it will be a great disappointment indeed if we cannot proceed with this housing programme due to the scarcity of materials.

I shall deal with Civil Defence when it is discussed in committee and on the second reading of the Civil Defence Bill.

Before sitting down, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to D.M. Hamblin; one of the finest civil servants of my department and of

this Government. He was one of our most conscientious, best liked, hard-working, efficient civil servants. Hours of work meant nothing to him. He had housing and Old Folk's Homes under his jurisdiction, and he had taken advantage of the week-end, last weekend, to go to Saskatoon to put the finishing touches on the Nursing Home there which is being officially opened tomorrow. On returning to Regina, he and his wife were killed in a head-on collision between here and Saskatoon. I do wish on behalf of the Legislature to express our sympathy to the five sons who have been orphaned by this tragic accident, and again I wish to pay tribute to a very fine civil servant who died in performing his duty.

Mr. A. H. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

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