

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eleventh Legislature
19th Day

Wednesday, March 5, 1952

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

BUDGET DEBATE

The House resumed from Tuesday, March 4, 1959 the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of the Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair. (The Assembly to go into a Committee of Supply).

Mr. L.E. Blanchard (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, once again, on behalf of the people of the north, and as their elected representative, I wish to make reference to some of their problems. All over the north there is general dissatisfaction with the policies of the C.C.F. Government. In the 1948 election, if there was one seat that the C.C.F. Government should have won, it was Cumberland. In that seat it was a deferred election, and everybody knew that we were to have a C.C.F. Government for the next four or five years. Cumberland was one of the seats that the C.C.F. held before the election of 1948, and there was a tremendous campaign out on in Cumberland when the Government lost the seat by a very substantial majority. They lost because of a general dissatisfaction with the fish, fur and, lumbering policies. They resent a compulsion being used. They knew their prices were less for their fish, fur and lumber than could be obtained in an open market, under free enterprise. The present C.C.F. policies are no better, and there is dissatisfaction on every hand. Before 1948, fishermen in large areas were compelled to market their fish through the old marketing board. There is still a great deal of compulsion.

Under the present policy, before the fishermen in any area are compelled to market their fish through the C.C.F. marketing service, a vote is taken. The taking of that vote, Mr. Speaker, is a farce. Those who have been persuaded to vote for the Government Fish Board are stampeded. Every inducement and assistance is offered to anybody who will vote for the Fish Marketing Board. Once the majority has been obtained, by the questionable methods, then all fishermen in that area are compelled to market through the C.C.F. marketing agency, whether they want to or not. There is much indignation and complaint, Mr. Speaker.

The notorious case of Mr. Ivanchuk is a sample of what this kind of compulsion leads to, Mr. Speaker. He did not want to market his fish through the C.C.F. marketing agency; but a vote had been taken, and he became victim of compulsion. Charges were laid against him that he sold his fish through a private dealer; his case was never brought to court. He was denied the ordinary British right of a trial in a properly constituted court, Mr. Speaker. The officials and the Minister of the C.C.F., Department of Natural Resources made the charge and said he was

March 5, 1952

guilty, and imposed a penalty. Ever since the English . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I do not think I said he was guilty.

Mr. Blanchard: — Ever since the English barons in 1215 forced King John to sign Magna Carta, the British had a right to a trial in a properly constituted court. The C.C.F. denied that right to Mr. Ivanchuk. This case was never brought to trial. The Minister of Natural Resources made a wholesale admission that he and the officials of his department had been wrong. They did this when they restored to Mr. Ivanchuk the fishing equipment they had taken away from him as part of that penalty. Part of the penalty they have never admitted, because this man for several months was deprived of his rights to fish as a mode of making his living. Perhaps the worst thing said about this incident was a statement by the Premier for Canadian radio station. The Premier said he was penalized because he had broken the law. He was fishing without a licence. It would be difficult for any person to make any more vicious statement than that, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Ivanchuk was fishing without a licence. So were virtually all other fishermen on that same lake. They were just doing what they had done every other season. They had started to do their fishing before the Natural Resources officials came around to supply them with a licence. That is a plan which has been followed year by year. If Mr. Ivanchuk was guilty in that connection, then nearly every fisherman on that lake for several years was equally guilty.

It is amazing that the Premier of this Province would ever dare to make a statement of that kind. Mr. Ivanchuk knows more about fishing than all the members of the C.C.F. Government put together. Why does any government have to pursue the kind of a policy that permits or requires officials of the government to push men like Ivanchuk around? All he asked was a right to fish and a right to be left alone. All he asked was simply the right to sell his fish, his own fish where he wants to sell it.

The principles of compulsion are still an essential part of the C.C.F. policy of fish marketing. If the C.C.F. wishes to set up a fish marketing service, why do they not do so, and let every fisherman sell his fish to them or some place else, if he wishes to do so? There is no need for all this pushing of people around.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fur marketing policy of the C.C.F. Government was one of the things which guaranteed their defeat in this northern constituency in 1948. There has been no change in that policy. Here again the principle of compulsion asserts itself. All beaver, and virtually all muskrats, must be marketed through the C.C.F. Fur Marketing Agency. Two years ago, I brought into this House a petition signed by a good number of trappers. We asked to have that compulsion ended. They wanted the freedom to sell their beaver and muskrats where they wished. Apparently no attention has been paid to these petitions. Several petitions and letters of complaint are still reaching me, Mr. Speaker.

The people in the north are just waiting the opportunity to register their protest once again with their votes. The only ones of these

C.C.F. corporations that can show a profit are those which depend upon some form of monopoly or compulsion, Mr. Speaker. Whenever the C.C.F. have gone into business in competition with private enterprise, it has lost money. They have lost so much money on the shoe factory and the tannery that they were thrown out of the window by the C.C.F. Government itself. It is consistently losing money in cases where the government competes with private enterprise. As I have already said, there is considerable compulsion in the Fur Marketing Agency. This so-called service seems afraid to compete with other fur marketing agencies.

The C.C.F. Fur Marketing Service does not buy and sell pelts. It takes none of these risks in that kind of a business. It takes the pelts from the trappers, sells them, deducts several substantial charges from the selling price and sends what is left over to the trappers. A group of high school boys could make a profit that way, particularly when the trappers are compelled to deliver a substantial proportion of their pelts. In 1951, the C.C.F. Fur Marketing Agency claimed a profit of nearly \$34,000. That is simply money taken away from the trappers. In addition to that, the trappers had to pay the operating expenses, another \$72,000 — or well over \$100,000 in these two items. Since the C.C.F. Fur Marketing went into business, they have taken out of the trappers' pockets \$222,000 in profits and \$363,000 in operating expenses, a total of well over one-half million dollars, and this is what they call "service and humanity first."

I have heard members of the C.C.F. Government try to justify this kind of a racket like the Fur Marketing Agency with the Wheat Board. Apparently they know less about the Wheat Board than they do about the marketing of their furs. The Wheat Board makes no profit at all; its operating expenses are kept very low. The Wheat Board takes over the farmer's wheat, sells it in the best markets for the highest price and the farmer gets everything for which the wheat is sold, less a very small administrative cost. For the period of the 1945-49 Pool, the Wheat Board handled wheat valued at over \$2 1/2 billion, with administration and general expenses of just over \$5 million. Now, in 1951, the C.C.F. Fur Marketing Agency sold \$1 1/2 million worth of furs. As profit and operating expenses, they took over 7 per cent of the total selling price of their furs. Now, Mr. Speaker, what did the Wheat Board take in the five years for selling the farmers' wheat? Not 7 per cent, not 1 per cent, but one-fifth of one per cent. Why does this Government insult the trapper by saying that the Fur Marketing Agency is something like the Wheat Board? Recently, in Manitoba, there was a vote among the farmers on the question of marketing coarse grains through the Wheat Board. The farmers of Manitoba approved of that system of marketing by an overwhelming majority. If the C.C.F. Government were to give the trappers a vote, and keep all their civil servants entirely away from the trappers, the trappers would vote against the compulsory marketing of their furs. The trappers resent this compulsion. They also know very well that the prices they are getting are not as good as those obtained by trappers in Manitoba and Alberta. Sometimes, after the list of fees of one kind or another is subtracted from the selling price, the Saskatchewan trapper gets very little.

I was shown recently, a statement by the C.C.F. Fur Marketing Service, which was sent to a trapper with a cheque. The trapper had shipped in two skunk pelts, and these were sold. From the selling price there was deducted a lotting fee, a cleaning fee, a royalty and a commission

March 5, 1952

of the Fur Marketing Agency. That trapper was sent a cheque for one cent. Many a time I have smelled the aroma of a skunk in the damp evening air, but this is the first time in my life, Mr. Speaker, that I have ever known of two skunks with only a single cent. I do not say, Mr. Speaker, that this case is typical, but the list of fees takes too big an amount off the selling price of virtually all the pelts sent in to the C.C.F. Fur Marketing Agency. The trappers of the northern areas are generally poor but hard working men. They should be one of the last classes of people on whom the Government should try to make profits. Why should the trappers of Northern Saskatchewan be compelled to pay for the asinine propaganda put over the radio and paid for by the Fur Marketing Agency? This is part of the operating costs squeezed out of the people that I represent, Mr. Speaker. The Liberal Government will, as soon as possible after the election, end this socialist regimentation and the compulsory features of the C.C.F. marketing laws. The men engaged in fishing, trapping and lumbering will be given the right to market their products just as they wish. If a fur marketing agency or a fish marketing agency is required, the trappers or the fishermen will be free to use them or to leave them alone. Under a Liberal government, these agencies will be there merely to render a service but not to make profits. The people I represent are very much dissatisfied with the highhanded actions of many of the officials of the Department of Natural Resources.

I can perhaps illustrate the kind of thing that goes on by referring to a conference which trappers recently held at Prince Albert. These trappers were very anxious to pass a resolution protesting against the compulsory features of the C.C.F. Fur Marketing Board. They were not allowed to pass this resolution. An official of the Department of Natural Resources made himself chairman of that meeting, Mr. Speaker, and he was the last person in the world who should have been chairman of that meeting. When this resolution was put before the meeting, this official . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, might I offer a correction there? The official of the Department did not make himself chairman of the meeting, he certainly was not there by choice.

Mr. Blanchard: — This official counted the hands and said that the resolution was defeated. One of the trapper delegates stood up and protested vigorously for a full five minutes, demanding that the vote be taken again and a proper count be made. The delegates from no less than fourteen areas, in sending in resolutions, had sent in their resolution asking for the end of this form of compulsion. The officials apparently knew this. They made it appear that the resolution did not pass the convention. This resolution was not brought before the convention until a considerable number of the delegates had left. The trappers do not claim to be as well educated as the official of the Department of Natural Resources; certainly they are not as slick as he. They, however, saw through this; they knew that the official refused a second vote and a proper count because he was afraid the resolution asking for the right to sell furs on the open market would be passed.

The trappers went home dissatisfied and disgusted with the way this meeting was dominated by officials of the C.C.F. Government. The Government talks about rendering service to these people. This convention asked the Government to render them one service and all they have gotten so

far, Mr. Speaker, is the brush-off. They asked the assistance of the Government in building up a pension fund for themselves by making deductions from the selling price of their pelts. They are not asking the Government to pay pensions, but merely to give them assistance in organizing and operating the plan. A representative of the trappers wrote to the Minister of Natural Resources on this question of establishing a pension or welfare fund, and the Minister replied stating that the proposal was too complicated and too difficult and he did not wish to commit himself or even circulate the proposal among the trappers. I want to say that under a Liberal Government any proposal of this kind would receive a most careful and sympathetic consideration, Mr. Speaker.

The Government sometimes tries to justify the large amount of money taken from the trappers by saying this is used for a conservation programme.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. The Hon. member was quoting what was supposed to be my words in regard to a proposed group insurance plan which some of the trappers brought forward — that I turned it down and said the reasons were so and so, and so and so. He is entirely incorrect; that is not what I said about it. I advised them to go ahead, to work on this plan. I said we will get information with regard to this plan. That is what I said, not what the hon. member said I said.

Mr. Blanchard: — Well, Mr. Minister you will have to admit that you were not a great deal of assistance to them.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I do not have to admit that at all.

Mr. Blanchard: — The Government sometimes tries to justify the large amounts of money taken out of the trappers by saying this is used for their conservation programme. This programme has been applied largely to muskrats. According to the annual report, it started in the fall of 1946, and it does not seem to be working very successfully. Since 1946, the muskrat catch has gone down rather than up. In the last trapping season before their programme, 417,000 wild muskrat pelts were taken. In the last trapping season, 1950-51, this was down, to 302,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on my desk today I see an article about beaver, a very nice write-up indeed. I notice that they have not mentioned rats at all. In fact, I could have gone back a year or two more and made it look much worse. I said here that since this programme started, that one year they caught 417,000 muskrats, this last year only 302,000. If I had cared to go back another year that could have been built up to something over 700,000 muskrats that were taken and this last year only 302,000. It does not seem to me that the conservation plan is working out just as they figured it would.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I wish to say that there is no class of people anywhere in the Province of Saskatchewan who are more anxiously awaiting a change of government than are the fishermen and the trappers and the lumbermen of the north. They are just waiting the opportunity to give the C.C.F. Government the knock-out blow it so richly deserves. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the Budget.

March 5, 1952

Mr. A.W. Loehr (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate, with the short time at my disposal I shall confine myself to a few subjects. I shall have more to say when the estimates are up for discussion.

I cannot help but say a few words regarding education in the province. Yesterday, we listened to the Minister of Education for approximately 59 minutes trying to justify the retention of the Public Revenue Tax. This, as we know, is a keen disappointment to the municipal officials. As far as the municipal officials are concerned, it is simply a tax that they collect for the Government. It is no concern to them where the Government puts it. In the northern districts, where the lands are fairly highly assessed, it is approximately \$5,000 that they collect for the Government. If the municipalities could collect this for themselves, it would mean that they could build roads.

The Minister of Education and others of the Government point to the votes taken in larger school units, after five years of their existence, as an indication that the larger school units are satisfactory to the people of the province in general. There are reasons for those votes being in favour of the retention of the larger unit, and I think they can be summed up under three headings. One is that, after five years of operating a larger school unit, the financial affairs, insofar as the tax collected between the various parts of larger units are concerned, are so complicated, so involved, that it is an utter impossibility to dissolve the larger school unit and do justice to the ratepayers who have paid taxes during the five-year period that that unit was in operation. Then, there are those, of course, who live in districts where schools have been built, perhaps in urban centres located in the large school unit and also some rural schools, at high cost. Those people are very reluctant to vote to disband that large school unit for the simple reason that they are afraid that, if the large school unit dissolved, the cost of the building of those schools would be thrown back upon the individual districts. If that were done it would just be impossible for those individual districts to ever get out of debt. Then there are individual districts in the rural areas where the school is in such a condition that they have high hopes that within a very short time a new school will be built — and it is for that reason mainly that those people will vote to retain those units.

Now, as far as the Humboldt larger school unit is concerned, for instance, no vote was taken at all. At the time when a petition was being circulated — I understand an attempt was made to circulate a petition — the roads were in such a shape at this time of the spring breakup, that people had practically to walk from one place to another. As a result no petition was presented and no vote was taken. I am quite satisfied personally that, had a vote been taken in that school unit, the retention of larger school unit would have been favoured by that vote.

We continuously hear the Minister of Education and the Members on the Government side of this Chamber talk about the improved educational system of the province of Saskatchewan. When I look on page 78 of the last annual report of the Department of Education and find that 930 rural schools in the province are closed and then look at the reply to a question in this House stating that, as of January 31 this year, 558 study supervisors

were in charge of rural schools, I cannot agree with the Government that there is an improvement. If there is an improvement it certainly must be confined to urban centres rather than rural schools. I am quite certain, Mr. Speaker, that at the next election, the people of the province, at least in the rural areas, will agree in general that there is very little, if any, improvement in the education of this province.

There is a matter that I want to touch upon for a few minutes longer, and that is rural electrification. The Government wants to take a lot of credit for its rural electrification programme, especially, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will quote from an address that I made over CFQC on February 16th last, where I dealt with this subject, I stated:

"Much credit and glory is being claimed by the Saskatchewan Government for its rural electrification programme through the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. On the basis of fact no credit is due the Government in any way, shape or form. The fact of the matter is that compared with Manitoba, for instance, the farmers of Saskatchewan are paying through the noses to be hooked up for power. In Manitoba, the Government brings the power line into the farmer's yard free of charge to the farmer (and by the way, the power consuming rates in Manitoba are lower than they are in Saskatchewan). But here in Saskatchewan it is a different story. For instance, while I have not the exact figures, I have been informed that there are approximately 900 farms connected for power in the Humboldt district. If that is correct then those farmers have paid a total of just under one-half million dollars to the Power Corporation to bring the power in to their yards; and again, if the figure of 900 is correct, then those 900 pay approximately \$6,300 per month or \$75,600 a year for electricity consumed.

"In other words, there is no idea of benevolence on the part of the Government toward those farmers. It is just simply a matter of a high dividend-paying business on the part of the Government, with the farmers on the paying, and the Government on the receiving end."

That, Mr. Speaker, is what I and the people in the Humboldt area, who have been connected on power, think about the electrification in that area and, of course, in other parts of the province. We know why Humboldt was selected under the rural electrification programme. Humboldt is a district where the farms are close together, perhaps as close as any place in the province, and, where a large percentage of farmers are financially able to finance the high cost of electrifying their farms. That was purely the reason why it was selected for that programme. We are, of course, pleased that we have the power. We are all very pleased, but we are also pleased that economic conditions were such that we were able to finance that; and when members of the C.C.F. Government, or followers, want to claim that, and that they are the ones who made it economically possible for the people to install power, then we object, because we know that as far as the C.C.F. of this province are concerned they had no more to do than the man in the moon with the prosperous economic conditions in the last 10 years or so.

March 5, 1952

In the last few months we have heard a lot about the Government having reduced the electricity rates for farmers.

Some Hon. Members (Government): — Hear, hear!

Mr. Loehr: — "Hear, hear," somebody says on the other side. Wait until I am through; you won't say "hear, hear." In official documents, on the floor of the House, on the radio, in the press and from public platforms, this Government talks about reduced rates for farmers for electricity. Well, Mr. Speaker, having regard for the past record of this Government so far as reductions of any kind of rates are concerned, I was just a little bit dubious about this glorious reduction of electricity rates, and I made a little investigation. I find that there is probably no reduction in rates at all in the overall picture, insofar as the average farmer is concerned. By "average farmer" I mean the farmer who needs only a 5 h.p. transformer. There is however, an adjustment of rates; but it is very questionable that it serves any object worthwhile. I had heard, before I left home, that there was a new rate — in fact I heard it over the radio; and I went to the man in my own little town who collects the rates each month, and I asked him whether he knew anything about the new rates for rural electrification. And he told me, "Yes," he said, "I have got a list of the new rates." And he told me that there were new rates for a farm, also where there are houses in the yard, and the current goes through one transformer. He not tell me just exactly how this thing worked out, so, while I was in Regina here, I went over to the Power Head Office and I asked for a rate table. So I have here a schedule setting forth the old rate and the new rate. I find, having made inquiries around home and having made some inquiries at the office here, that there was an average of approximately 20 per cent of farms that never go over the \$5 minimum rate per month; that up until now, approximately 20 per cent of the farms do not ever go over the \$5 minimum rate per month. Under the old rate that gave those farmers 30 kilowatt hours at 8 cents and 10 kilowatt hours at 6 cents and the service charge of \$2, making the minimum of \$5.00. Under the new rate, the first 45 kilowatt hours are at 8 cents and the next 45 kilowatt hours 4 cents and the next 45 kilowatt hours, 3 cents, making a total of 135 kilowatt hours, and then any balance over that at 2 cents. Then there is the third setup — the setup of two houses on one farm. There is an average of approximately 10 per cent of the farms where there are two houses in the yard, either for the purpose of, say, a son living in a separate house on the place, or hired help, or in some cases (like in the case of a neighbour if mine) he erected a house for his parents to live in. Anyhow, in the area surrounding my place there are about 10 per cent of the farms where there are two houses. Under this new rate, where there is a single house on the place, it enables the man, in order to stay under the \$5 rate — by the way, under the new rate the service charge in all cases in the lower bracket is \$1 per month, where previously it was \$2 — there is a reduction there, yes. Now, under the new setup, the new rate scale, a man that previously stayed under the \$5 minimum can again stay under the \$5 minimum and use up 15 more kilowatt hours. In other words, where previously he could use only up to 40 kilowatt hours, he can now use up 55, or 15 kilowatt hours more. But, under the rate set forth for two-house farms, for the first 90 kilowatt hours the charge is 8 cents and for the next 45 kilowatt hours, bringing the total up to 135, it is 4 cents. So that, under the new rate the man that has two houses on the farm and uses up 55 kilowatt hours will have to pay \$5.40 or 40 cents more than the single house farm.

Then I worked out a table on a basis of an average of 100 kilowatt hours consumption per month, and I find that — I don't want to quote too many figures; but I find that, while under the new rate with a single house there is an actual reduction of 40 cents, if there are two houses under that new setup, then the man with the two houses, using the same kilowatt hours of 100, pays \$1.50 more. So, if you average that over the balance between the 20 per cent whose average stays under the minimum of \$5.00 and the 10 per cent who have two houses on their farms, you will find that there is practically no difference at all.

Then, also, I worked it out on the basis of 135 kilowatt hours, and an average of 135 kilowatt hours allows the average farmer to use all the gadgets he wants, including frigidaire, washing machine, small motors around the house and so forth. On that basis again, under the new rate, with a single house there is a saving of 40 cents and with two houses there is an advance of \$1.85. Then I worked out another table on the basis of 180 kilowatt hours, and on that basis you can have all the gadgets you want on the farm, everything that you can possibly want with the exception of an electric stove or a big motor, and on that basis there is a saving in the first instance where there is one house, of 90 cents and again an advance, with two houses, of \$1.85. That is the rate that generally applies on a farm that has no high power consumption.

There is, however, I see, in looking over that table, quite a saving on farms where they use the 10 h.p. transformer, or the 15 h.p. transformer. When it comes, for instance, up to 1,000 kilowatt hours consumed per month, there is a saying of \$6.65, which, of course, on a two-house farm is again somewhat reduced. So there may be a general very slight reduction, but it is not enough, Mr. Speaker, to speak about. It certainly is not enough to make a great howl about; and insofar as the two-house farm is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I hold that that is one of the setups that constitutes the backbone of farming in Saskatchewan. Those two houses on a farm invariably mean that the manpower is concentrated on one point, so that livestock raising can go along with grain farming, and that, we all agree, is the backbone of the country. So far as I am concerned, I do not see anything to boast about any reduction. In fact it seems to me that the Government is acting as an advance agent for manufacturers of stoves and big motors, welders and so forth. So, with these few things touched upon, Mr. Speaker, I will close and I will vote against the budget.

Mr. W.T. Lofts (Meadow Lake): — In rising, Mr. Speaker, to take a little time on this debate, I would first like to say "hello" to Meadow Lake. This may be the last opportunity I will have the pleasure of placing the needs of the Meadow Lake constituency before the Government, and in the time I have, I would like to place the most important needs.

I was just listening to my hon. friend from Humboldt, regarding power, which I am going to bring up a little later. He said they had to have the C.C.F. if they were going to get power. Well, I am afraid if that is the case up in Meadow Lake, we will never have power.

But anyway, as you all know, the Meadow Lake constituency is made up of most everything — wheat farming, mixed farming, lumbering,

March 5, 1952

fishing, trapping; and we also have in the Meadow Lake constituency a number of calf clubs; fat stock sales which are a credit to any community or to any constituency, and I would like to bring to the attention of this House, Mr. H.B. Clarke, the President of the Palm Calf Club, which had the pleasure of winning the provincial proficiency medal as being president of that club. That is something we are very proud of up there, Mr. Clarke.

We do not work all the time up there. We take in a little sport once in a while; and I would like to bring to your attention that we have won from Meadow Lake the Legion curling play-down between Alberta and Saskatchewan with a rink skipped by "Tubby" Haswell, which we are also proud of. Saskatchewan played-off at Creighton between Alberta and Saskatchewan, I think, a week ago last Sunday.

In order to keep the young people on the farms, and also everybody — even old fellows — there are certain services we need which we are entitled to, such as telephones, power, roads and better schools with good teachers. I think it is very important that we have these services. I will just touch on highways first. As you have heard me in this House, for the four years I have been here, this old thing again — No. 55 highway; No. 4, I am not going to spend much time on it. The Minister of Highways gave his little talk on that the other day, but I noticed one thing he said (if I heard him right). He said No. 55 Highway would have been from Shell Lake west. Well, that has been going on for two or three years, and I sincerely hope now that he is really going to go this time and reach No. 54 to make a good connection for those people up in the north country. Just think of those people who went in there in the hungry '30s and established themselves! Now they should at least, after having been there so long without roads, be entitled to good roads in order to get out.

I was very glad to hear the hon. Minister say in his speech that he was going to gravel No. 4. Well, Mr. Minister of Highways, you have my thanks, and I just hope that you will make that one of your first projects in the spring, in order to give us direct routes from Meadow Lake into Montana, where we can have some benefit of those tourists coming from the States, and coming in to stop at Meadow Lake, at all those nice lakes which we have up around there, and which even the Minister of Natural Resources has seen but has not stopped to get organized yet. We just hope that you will put this on the top of your list, Hon. Minister of Highways. We will surely appreciate this in the north country. We even appreciate the thought that you have taken consideration to us, because that has been one of the worst highways in the province of Saskatchewan.

Also I would like to mention, hon. Minister of Highways, No. 4 up to Meadow Lake North. If you can see your way to consider giving us a little assistance to this highway up north; we all know that, one day, will be the highway to all the uranium fields of all the north country. Those people all through that country for the last few years, Mr. Speaker, have been for weeks not able to get into town; so I just ask, and make a special appeal to the Minister of Highways; if you can see your way clear at all to build up that road and gravel at least as far as Dorintosh, it will be greatly appreciated.

That is enough for highways, and I think I will just turn over to education. First, when I arise in this House to take part in the debate on the budget, I feel like giving credit where credit is due, and criticizing where I think criticism should be made; so I would first like to congratulate the Hon. Minister for getting up yesterday and presenting his speech. Maybe some people do not think it; but the way I look at it I am on the larger school unit; it is no secret; everybody knows about it and we are one of the lower assessed units in the province. You take Meadow Lake and Hudson Bay, they are about on the same level, and we have to compete in hiring teachers, meeting these teachers' salaries, and we also have to compete for janitors, carpenters who build the schools these days, and we, with a lower assessment, like Madison School Unit and also Meadow Lake, have, are up against a handicap. I would surely appreciate the thousand dollars that the Hon. Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) said that we received. It is quite a help to us.

I would also like to make the suggestion in regard to the Larger School Unit Act. Now this Act was passed in 1944-45, I presume. We did not have to organize it or anything else. It was put on for us, that is all, and when it was put on to us, I was asked to run it. I happened to be elected and happened to have been Chairman of that particular unit since; and speaking in all fairness to the Board of Trustees, I think the unit was set up in 1945 and the pay for those trustees in those days was \$6.00 per day. Now, I look at it my way, and I think, and most people in the local districts and most board members of units, do not intend to go into education to make any money. They feel like giving their services free, as I have given mine, and so have most of them. But at that time, \$6.00 was okay; but I think in order to give justice to education, that fee should be raised, and I sincerely hope that the Minister will consider that and, at the next opportunity, that he will take whatever steps he feels he can. I know when I go as a trustee — one has to be away three days from home, and he receives \$6.00 a day. Well, when he is away he has to hire a man in seeding time or summer fallow time, or harvest, and you know the rates today which he has to pay — anywhere from \$8 to \$12 a day. So I think there should be some consideration given there to amend the Larger School Unit Act so that sub-unit trustees should receive a little more money.

Another thing I cannot see — I am not very good at looking up the Act, but when we took over, and lots of others units took over the same thing, there was a number of Victory Bonds which a number of local boards bought in good faith during the war to help the war effort, and naturally, when the unit took over, these bonds were turned over to the unit. But today we cannot take those bonds and offer security at the bank, to borrow money on them in case we need it. We cannot do it, if I interpret the Act correctly. You all know that all of us bought bonds through them, and when you take them to the bank and want to borrow money, you can borrow it for about 3 or 3.1 per cent; where otherwise you have to pay about 6 per cent. So I suggest there should be some amendment made there.

Another thing, (I do not think this takes in the Minister of Education, or the province as a whole) is the matter of the Indian children or Metis, you call them; they are all over the province of Saskatchewan. I mean the non-treaty Indian that roams around, where the father cuts brush, etc. Now, we have had times when the parents of these children have come and

March 5, 1952

asked can they attend the school? Well, as far as myself and some of the board in my sub-unit are concerned, I have never refused them, but it is just like this, Mr. Speaker: these children come from a Roman-Indian family. They will hibernate in the wintertime maybe in one of our particular school districts. They will get started at school, and they attend until spring, then brush cutting comes and away they go. It does not do them any good, and it is a hindrance to the local schools. I think that when these Indians are put on the responsibility of the province, I really think they should have a boarding school built for them, and take them there and give them the fair chance that other children of the province have. I do really think this matter should have some consideration, because I have had lots of experience with this situation. If we do not give them a chance the parents are not stabilized enough to stay in one place, and then they wander, but still I think we owe it to them — whether they are Indians, or whatever else they are — that they should have a school room.

Regarding telephones, you all heard me in this House, since I have been a member, hollering about our poor telephone service between Glaslyn and Meadow Lake, but I would like to take this opportunity right now to congratulate the Hon. Mr. Darling for putting in an extra line for us between Glaslyn and North Battleford. We did appreciate it, and I speak on behalf of the people up there. But I would further like to draw to his attention rural 'phones. We have a lot of inconvenience that way out in the country. You take out west at Meadow Lake — there is Rouleau Park and Blue Bell, and Golden Ridge. I have just received a registered letter regarding phones at Rouleau Park. Well, I would like, Mr. Speaker, just to explain to the House how the area is situated up there, and also Golden Ridge. They are away off on secondary roads, which lead from Meadow Lake into Britfall, and these people at Rouleau Park, Blue Bell and Golden Ridge are forced to travel at least 20 or 30 miles in case of sickness. The road is not gravelled, but the Minister of Highways (Hon. J.T. Douglas) has mentioned that he would do something about that this year; but anyway, in case of sickness these people have absolutely no connection out at all, and I would like to bring to the attention of Hon. Mr. Darling (Minister of Public Works) that it would not be an expensive thing — you already have the telephone out west of Meadow Lake about 30 miles — and if we could just have an extension of that line in order to give these people a little service, it would be appreciated.

Now, I would just like to talk on power and electrification. I am still humming on No. 55 — these towns along there., At Meadow Lake, the power is in; outside of Meadow Lake they are also putting in the rural power; but I still think, Mr. Speaker, that these towns along No. 55 Highway, towns, villages and hamlets, should be considered in the shortest possible time, regarding having the power installed. I am running a power plant at Glaslyn, and so are my friends in Medstead, Leoville, Shell Lake and Canwood. We are just running that now, hoping that the power line will come in. We do not feel like putting out money to replace out equipment and it is getting old and worn. We do not know when the power line will be through, and when it is, we do not know what we will get for our old stuff. So the people in these particular districts are being penalized. Right now, I am running a plant there which I am ashamed of; but still, if the power line comes along what may I do? They will not tell me. They give no promise of

what water I will get, and I understand from Power Commission officials that if water comes in there, they would not have to pay for anything. But that is what is holding it back, and I would suggest this now — I do not suppose it is feasible, no; but if we had the power plant out of that Big River mill, instead of it sitting there about nine months out of each year, set up with two poles along the highway (it does not do any work up there anyway), we would have light in the north. I mean that sincerely. It is only used for two or three months of the year.

Now, I said I would like to give credit where credit is due, and criticize where I personally think it is coming. I want to take this particular time to deal with the Saskatchewan Transportation Company. I would like to congratulate the management, including the drivers, for the service they have rendered us, especially in the north. I would like to sincerely congratulate them on behalf of Bill Lofts, and I think they have done good service. As far as they are concerned, we do not look at the bus depot as something that should make money. We figure it should be a service, and I cannot help but see, when travelling through Saskatchewan, how courteous and kind these bus drivers have been. I give them credit for it.

We talk of the changes that have gone on in the north country. The country is drying up; it is a stock country; the sloughs that used to be are drying up. I remember when I went up there in 1907 there was water everywhere, but now it is diminishing. I think we should have a little further grant and consideration from the Government regarding dug-outs. Also the same thing applies to grazing leases; I think we should get consideration on these grazing leases, and have them reduced to a certain extent.

I will turn now to fur-marketing services. I somehow have the same opinion of the fur-marketing services as my hon. friend from Athabaska (Mr. Marion). I think the Natural Resources should control it, and take care of it. We all like to see the wild animals of our north country taken care of. There is no doubt about it at all; but I think they should collect their royalty and let the trapper sell them where he likes.

I would just like to mention something about the Timber Board. I have no criticism against the hon. Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank). I think he is doing a good job of selling timber, and I still think he should do the same thing — he should govern the way the timber travels. I have been in the bush more than the Minister of Natural Resources, and more than any member of this House, I bet; and I say he should enforce these regulations; but he should tell the lumberjack where he is to operate, and tell him how much he is to pay for it, but not to tell him how much to sell it for. I think he should have the privilege of selling wherever he likes.

I would like to mention a bit on the Big River Mill. I mentioned something a few moments ago, and I say the same as I did, last year. I say take the fur services, the Timber Board and the Big River Mill, open the window and throw them out, and shut the window behind them! Forget about them! Mr. Tucker, I am talking to you now. You will no doubt be

March 5, 1952

the Premier after this next election, and I just want to tell you one thing, and, in case you aren't, I just want to make note to Hon. Premier Douglas; in the next Session we want a Minister in the north in Meadow Lake where everything is developing. We need a Cabinet Minister there. We, in the settled part of Saskatchewan have deserved that, and I think we should have one.

There is one other thing. The Premier said we may have an election soon, and maybe not; but anyway we will have one next summer, I presume. Now, I sincerely hope that both parties, the C.C.F. and the Liberals, will get out and fight this election like gentlemen, and after elected, regardless of who wins, let us run this Legislature like gentlemen — not like a bunch of kids tongue-lashing back and forth. I do not think the people anywhere in this country elected us for that. I say; let us get down to business, and on the radio time do not just give one little peck all the time — get on with the business.

Now, in closing, first of all I would like to thank the people of the Meadow Lake constituency for the support they gave me in electing me, and the support they gave me after I was elected. I would ask them to do the same thing for the next member who is elected regardless of whether he is a Liberal (which he will be, we think), or a C.C.F. but I hope he has the same support.

Also I would like to thank every member of this House on both sides for the courtesy and kindness they have shown me in being a "green" member. I am still green; I can see that, but I also wish to thank the Ministers. Anytime I had trouble, by phone calls or personal contact, I went to the Ministers on the Government side, and they have done their very best to satisfy my needs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have already said what the Minister of Education is going to give us for the school; but before making a decision as to whether I am going to vote for or against the budget, I am going to have a conference with the Minister of Highways.

Mr. J.G. Banks (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, I also wish to join in congratulating the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) on his Budget Address which was so well delivered. I do not know whether or not we all agree with it, but his technical effect was splendid, and we can only say that we are quite proud of him on this particular occasion.

I want to say a word to my folks at home. This is the first time I have been on the radio, to my knowledge, since I came here, although I have been on many times at the local station at Yorkton. There are a lot of us here, and as Mr. Lincoln said when he was speaking about the flock of pigs, "There were more pigs than there were tits". That is the trouble with us here — we could not all get on; but I guess I will make up for that later on.

Now we have had a flock of Cabinet Ministers this week, and they have been giving us the reports on their departments; and I want to deal, first, with that of the Department of Highways — my time on the air is very short, and I want to deal with that.

I was particularly impressed and amazed at some of the statements the hon. gentleman made in giving his report to this Legislature of the year's work of the Highways Department. There were four things he said; I am going to read them: That all the Government machinery which he took over, in 1944, was obsolete; that all of the highways, at that time, were completely run-down and out of repair; that there was not enough highway in Saskatchewan to drive a car the distance of 25 miles at a speed of 35 miles an hour; and lastly, the important one: that he had never turned down any person who had asked for roads, and he was always willing to go 50-50 on that proposition.

I want to deal with that now. I am going to read you a letter, which is not an ordinary business letter . . .

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — I hate to interrupt the hon. gentleman . . .

Mr. Banks: — I will only be a short time, and I am not going to be interrupted . . .

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — On a point of privilege. I will not be very long. I must take exception to the last statement. He said that I had made the statement that I turned down no one who asked for roads. Well, of course, I made no such statement, because if I did it would not be true.

Mr. Banks: — This is what he wrote, and I believe it went to every constituency in Saskatchewan. These are the words:

"This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 28 with reference to the hill leading from Norquay north.

"As this road is the responsibility of the rural municipality there is nothing much the Department can do in its improvement, except through the regular grant which is made, each year, to the municipalities."

Now, I want to read my reply, which the hon. gentleman no doubt has. I did not get an acknowledgment:

"I have your letter of April 30, and I note your reference to money going to the municipality for this road. While I realize that this is a stock answer given to similar legitimate requests for uses of the public funds, I did not expect to see such hopeless ignorance of this road.

March 5, 1952

"The same was built by provincial funds. When it became passable, and for many years thereafter until 1944, a grant of \$1,000 was given by the Government to supplement the funds of the municipality, for repairs; it being admitted that the cost of upkeep was greater than municipal funds could carry.

"Between the years 1944 and 1948, a large sum of money was spent by the C.C.F. Government on the River Hill, also recognizing that the community was not financially able to carry this. When you hear of these facts, the matter of a small grant of \$3,000 to assist in the six miles this side of the river might look altogether different.

"As the member for this constituency, I am distinctly alarmed at the manner the Department of Highways is putting the money that should be spent here in the Pelly seat into seats that are represented by the C.C.F. Party. I believe such a course is contrary to the oath of office of the Minister, and to sell that thing which we call political honesty for a little temporary political advantage, seems to me to be a short step away from taking something that is not your own. I trust that you will remedy the matter."

Well, the way the matter has been remedied — there is no grant for the Pelly constituency this year. That is the way it has been remedied.

The Minister went up there with a great many pious words, last fall. Oh yes. He had the member from Canora (Mr. Kuziak) with him, and he had quite a lot of people, and he led those people to believe that something would be done. I do not know whether they have written-off the constituency politically, but I will say this much — that I would be happy if the money for highways which every constituency is entitled to, and which should be as equal as possible, would be placed under the management of a Board that had nothing to do with politics. These gentlemen tell us that this matter was all on the Liberal side. I want to tell you that it is worse here, today, than ever in Saskatchewan. Yes, worse than it ever was, in Saskatchewan, under the Liberal regime.

There is a thing here that was said that day about the roads and about the equipment of the Department of Highways. If the hon. gentleman does not know it — there was always a Department of Highways in Saskatchewan; and all these offices that he is flaunting his authority and power over were established under a Liberal Government. I believe that this man was a farmer before he went into this; and I wonder what his qualifications are to decide what is a good road machine and what is a bad one. Has he got them? He'd not have them at that time; but now that he has been sitting as an understudy to those same engineers he may have learned something about it. He has been

an understudy — there is no question about that. And talking about the roads, he was on some good roads, because that jalopy he used to drive, as an organizer of the C.C.F. Party, was down in Kamsack, and I saw it; and there were some good roads there. There were some good roads all the way, on No. 5; and you can drive, not only 35 miles an hour, but you can drive 50 miles an hour for stretches of 40 to 50 miles, and you could, in 1944.

This is the report, Mr. Speaker, — the annual report of that Minister of the Department of Highways; and he makes a joke!

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — It is no joke,

Mr. Banks: — I wonder if it is a joke — has the man got any feelings at all for the 500 families up in the north that stayed five weeks in isolation until gravel could let them out?

Some Hon. Member (Opposition): — He does not care for them at all.

Mr. Banks: — I wonder. These folks that are out on the fringes — and remember, I believe they pay taxes, licence fees, etc. There are 132 cars in that area on that 27 miles of road, 82 trucks, and I believe five or six of those big tractors that work up in the bush, and they had this worked out, and they said that if they were just treated decently and given the taxes that they were paying, in five years they would have their road fixed. They are getting some good houses; they have some splendid farms. That land, Mr. Speaker, was not cleared by a bulldozer; that land was cleared by the hard muscles and work of these men and their families that went in there. And still, do you know what we see here, today, and it is typical of all the C.C.F.'s? — the money that is taken from those people who have broken in that fringe of Saskatchewan, is taken up to invest in power machinery for some of these collective farms. There is six or eight miles there that a drag-line could be used on very well. I believe my hon. friend, the Minister of Agriculture, has several of those drag-lines. I know that there was one that stayed in Hudson Bay for a year and a half and was never hitched up; and it was only when he determined (I found out) that that flat land up around the Carrot River country we have heard so much about, was worthwhile, that these drag-lines were utilized at all. They found out that the water had to be drained off the flat land . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform my hon. friend that we had no drag-line at Hudson Bay.

Mr. Banks: — Well, it was sitting there. I do not know whom it belonged to — some department of the Government. I cannot tell you which. Probably they lost track of it.

It seems to me to be a very cheap bunch of statements for the Minister of Highways, that gentleman who formulates the policies for this province, to get up and say, in this legislature, that the highways were all run-down when he came to power.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Hear! Hear! They certainly were.

March 5, 1952

Mr. Banks: — Now then, we can expect the 'jester' to give us some more of that. I expect we will get lots of it; but I do not mind him, he does not worry me. I am not going to talk about the \$40 he said he got out of my constituency. I didn't think very much of it anyway; I do not believe there is much in it. But you see, here we have, in that Department, coming into this Legislature — and these are the words he used: "That the highways were all obsolete." Well No. 49 that runs through Pelly all the way up to Kelvington . . .

Some Hon. Member: — Still obsolete!

Mr. Banks: — It has been gravelled. No. 5 has not been gravelled, and is still going. Now, I want to tell you one little thing different. We appreciate what the Premier did, and I want to thank him for it — that 5 miles; but we do not appreciate very much what was done last fall because the Minister of Highways started in Canora, putting on, I think, 250 or 300 yards of gravel on No. 5 highway. Well, the fellow doing it was a good boy. He did the best he could; but there were no accidents and that is lucky because this was a good man — I could give you his name. I speak highly of him; and I want to tell you if there is a Liberal Government here, I will recommend to the Minister of Highways that he be continued, because he was able to divert accidents there when they were dumping gravel right in the middle of the road. This fellow worked day and night, partly to keep the road so that somebody would not upset his car. Well that is neither here nor there, and as far as that is concerned we feel that it is not anything but an election bribe — this man is only a little man from Delisle, you know. I do not believe if he was here for 20 years he would ever broaden out big enough to fill the position he is holding here now. He has gone to the extreme; he wants to go down to Ottawa and Montreal — "my highways" — transcontinental highway! I will tell you I would rather see the highway delayed for two or three years and see that every one of these boys and girls that go in for teaching have enough money for salaries. That is what I would think should be done. But to be able to get up and boast about his work, boast about his engineers — I wonder if he trained them; but I believe the university trains them; and that is the standard of engineers that were in there when he came, and if their politics did not suit the C.C.F., of course they had to get out; and away they went immediately to a more lucrative job . . .

Some Hon. Member: — With the Dominion Government.

Mr. Banks: — Well, that seems to me to be the finish. I do not know whether they ever regard their promises. I stated here, a few days ago, that I had promises which were completely disregarded. I believe those people up at Swan Plain — some of the C.C.F.'ers at least; they are pretty faithful to the C.C.F. up there for some reason; I do not know why: I think it is this banding together — Socialism. Perhaps now, when that promise has been disregarded — and you know, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentlemen found it out there; but I was called up there and I told them that we did not have the Treasury benches on this side of the House; that they would have to go to the C.C.F. Government to get what they wanted. I told them that if he puts this road in, they are duty-bound to vote for him. I told them that; and I would say the same thing to them today. Oh, he was immaculately dressed

at this meeting, and he gave a lovely little speech. His language was perfect, and he looked splendid. I went outside, and I happened to make the remark about how good his little speech was. You know what the remark was back? "Why, it was too perfect; he got away up above us — the ordinary man he is working for; the ordinary man who pays the taxes that this man here is entrusted with, and which he holds in trust for the Government."

You see now, in the Department of Highways, and in everything else . . .

Mr. Kuziak: — (Interruption)

Mr. Banks: — There is the jester again. I believe he also was up there. I would like a little order if I could get it; I extended him that order.

In matters of this kind we progress — the building of roads, of road machinery. This matter of road building is done scientifically. After the war, we got large bull-dozer machines. They came out first as 5-ton machines; then they got them up to 10 ton. We got them so we could move the dirt cheaper. This was the work of these trained men, and the advance in the science of building road equipment. I do not think that anybody on the other side of the House — although the Minister tried to convey that he was responsible for it — can take particular credit for that. It is something progressive, and we are very glad of it, because I understand that you can build roads a lot cheaper — you should be able to build roads an awful lot cheaper; and when I am asked by some person this rather trick question of the C.C.F.: "What are we going to do with those machines if a Liberal Government is elected?" Well, I say, "They are a thing that is used everywhere now," and they say, "Well, but we were afraid that you were going to go back to horses."

Mr. Kuziak: — That is what "Jimmy" Gardiner wants to do.

Mr. Banks: — When you have done 1/99th of what the Jimmy you are speaking about has done for this province, then some person will look at you.

Mr. Kuziak: — That would amount to very little highway!

Mr. Banks: — I have another little matter. We had a piece of road built up in the north; it was in the seat of the Minister of Natural Resources. They had a little tough luck with it. They were working on that very late last fall. There is not much of a story about it except that there were five checkers on the job, and they received pay for straight time, and if they worked they got \$1.00 an hour extra. I have not got to the interesting part of the story; I want you to get it all. Do you know what the interesting part of it was? There were only two trucks working — five checkers and two trucks. That was the interesting part . . .

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Banks: — Do you want their names?

March 5, 1952

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I cannot hear the hon. gentleman very clearly over here, but if he is stating that we had a gravel job under way with two trucks and five checkers, he is telling what is absolutely untrue.

Mr. Banks: — Well, I am going to give you the names. I expected you to say that. Here they are, and I will tell you where they were working.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Yes, I want them.

Mr. Banks: — I have the names right here.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Well, let's have them.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Wait till he stands up and asks.

Mr. Banks: — Apparently, he doesn't want them.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Yes, I do. Let's have them.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. Minister of Highways did request the names.

Mr. Banks: — All right, I want to give them to him. For two weeks there were five checkers. Here are the names: Jack Dawes, Yorkton; Henry Schneider, Yorkton; Floyd Armstrong, Toronto; Bud Gallagher, Toronto, and the last one is G.C. Waite of Yorkton. Now these checkers were paid for ten-hour days, rain or shine; there was a lot of wet weather. And when they worked they were given one hour extra. Now, if that is untrue I hope the Minister will write me a letter and say it is untrue.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask for the date when this work was carried on?

Mr. Banks: — I think it would be very late in October or November.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — And the location?

Mr. Banks: — It was near Endeavour; it may be some miles out of Endeavour.

Now, I want to say a few words here with respect to the address of the Minister of Education. I was somewhat surprised that he intervened in the Budget Debate just at that stage, but that is his affair. And I recall his able defence of money matters of this Government. You see, my mind goes back to the time when the Liberal Government was in there. Yes I remember all about that. And, while I do not want to say this with any disrespect for the school teachers, that was called, by many people, a "school teachers' election." There is no question about that. We have three of them here; they came in from the school room and became Cabinet Ministers — more honour to them, I say that. But there is something that galled me a little bit, and that was that they were willing to sacrifice, by unwarranted criticism, abusive criticism, the very profession that they were making their living at. Now these gentlemen who have got the Cabinet jobs are not the ones who suffered so much from that depressive season, 1937. Regina city schools had not been a bad job at any time, neither had Saskatoon city or

Biggar. I believe there is, or was, one or two "Florence Nightingales" — I'll give you one of them. It was not a case of money with her, it was a case of her not wanting to close the school. The trustees came to the conclusion that they could not pay her, and they said: "We have to let the children go." It happened that there were seven families, fairly well-to-do there, and do you know what she said? "I will keep this school open if each family will pay me five dollars a week, and I will go around to every house and I will board out." That is what I call the Florence Nightingale type. We had that type in those days; I believe we have them today. But I will tell you what you did not have in those days. You did not have this eternal grab, grab, grab, whereby a certain element of the school teachers that have been educated by these very gentlemen —

Premier Douglas: — They are not as bad as some lawyers.

Mr. Banks: — Oh yes! You could not keep away from that. It does not add to your stature a bit; I don't think it does. But that is exactly what happened there.

No, these teachers today — and I want to apologize to the profession because I think the thing has gone, I think the bubble has burst. We only have a few of them running around, and I am going to name some of them. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, we have one in my constituency. Yes, he is a very, very ardent C.C.F.'er. Why, he was chairman of his constituency association — I suppose that is not so much of an honour now as it was four years ago, but he was. He was chairman of the Teachers' Alliance, or whatever you call it now. And you know, to top it off he became returning officer in the election. And do you know what? He went around and did that work and he drew his salary all the time. I did not make anything about that. I believe the poor fellow has a big family and maybe needed it. When I met him around I did not even criticize him, although I do not think that they will likely appoint him next time, because it made the people of that district where he was teaching (he must be a pretty good teacher) say, "We want him full time; we do not want him running around on that kind of business."

We had another teacher up there. My, he was strong four years ago! Not so today. Do you know how strong that gentleman was? He was able, by this Government, to get the Council of the Village of Stenen fired. The Council were tossed out on their noses — until, of course, they could not keep it up indefinitely; then he was appointed overseer. That is the way this was carried on. That's right. You do not need to laugh about it. It is all true. And then when his term was up and the council reappointed, he knew he could not stay on, they gave him a job in the larger school unit as secretary, and he is still there today.

Now I am not through with all those teachers. I guess you had one here too.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — May I ask the hon. member a question? Who appoints the secretary of the larger school units?

Mr. Banks: — It is the Board, don't you know that?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — I know that.

March 5, 1952

Mr. Banks: — You do not need to laugh very much, because you had one up in the Kamsack district who for three years was disqualified, and you did not seem to know about it until, I think, I pointed it out to you, and you had to amend the Act to do it.

Now then, we will get along with these. You see, there was one here some years ago. He was quite a teacher. He was an important teacher. His name was Mr. Watson Thomson. He created quite an impression here with the Radio College. That seems to be the policy of these people who come in here — to use, and climb the ladder through the teaching profession, to enter this Legislature, get into politics and get into the Cabinet. That is the product of employment. You have seen it all the way down the line. Do you know what you see here? You have here employment of the brand new men who are going to revolutionize it. Maybe the Educational Department may be getting him; he is going to revolutionize things. He goes on and his course is a failure — one year, two years, three years. But during that time this propaganda machine has him up before the public as a great man. Then he passes on his way, and I do not think the impression he left was a very great one.

We had quite a little scene in the Crown Corporations, a year or two ago, about some of these things, but I would like to see them leave the school children alone; I would like to see them allow these children to grow up. And I am going to tell my friend the Minister of Education that he will be confronted, as I have been confronted, by young men who went through the schools — and I think you were one of them, you went through this to teach to get probably \$1,500-\$1,700 a year. They quit the thing in disgust. He would not stay any longer. Because why? His chums who went on to the railroad or went into the machine shops or went to wherever it is, were getting just double the salary he was getting. That is what the Minister of Education is going to be confronted with. He is confronted with it today, and he has never made any effort outside of a little political politics, and it seems every action of his is permeated with that.

Well now, that is about all I wish to say on this, but I am going to say here in connection with it, that if there is more money needed for schools I do not care whether they spend all the liquor profits on it. I do not care if they spend every dollar. This is my own opinion — it is a kind of a nebulous thing — but some day, I do not think it is going to be so long, this province, in righteous indignation, is going to abolish this liquor traffic. It may not come today, but some day it is going to come; we are reaching that. And do not depend too much on that nebulous source of revenue. I know what the Liberals have done when it was necessary to do it — they abolished it, there was no question about it. I doubt very much that this Government would voluntarily abolish it, because they are getting too much easy money.

Well now, there is another little thing I am going to say. There is another teacher, and I guess he is a good man, he is quite a prominent man. I want to refer you to the paper, "The Commonwealth" of December 18th. There is an article in that, a Christmas article. This is what it says at the bottom:

"Christmas is traditionally a season for the people to remind us again of peace and good-will. Maybe in the foregoing I have written the Christmas message which the editor has asked me to send to the C.C.F. members and friends."

I did not think that this was just the time for politics. And I notice here that a gentleman, a very clever man, the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines), his Christmas message was:

"Good wishes to all supporters and friends of the C.C.F. on Christmas."

With my knowledge of the C.C.F. members, it made me feel good when I read a lot of them, because all that nonsense was taken out. But here is one, and it starts out:

"You have got to be carefully taught,"

It was written by a school teacher — "You have got to be carefully taught." He said:

"I find an exhilarating thought in this; that it does not just come naturally to hate. Somebody or something has to take a great deal of trouble with us before we reach the approved boiling point. If we leave the children alone or even adults who escape the danger of education, we may find, to our surprise, that they get along satisfactorily in the same province, same country, same world, with Frenchmen, Germans, Ukrainians, Chinese, Indians, Negroes. Before we can get them to quarrel, fight or kill, they have got to be carefully taught.

"Now, of course, there are many people and many agencies that are only too willing to take on the job of teaching them. Every day the daily press, the radio and the moving pictures are busy instructing us carefully whom to hate, and we can hardly attend any public meeting, whether it be a political rally, Wheat Pool committee, trade union congress, board of trade dinner, ladies aid meeting or Sunday school picnic without getting a little more instruction along the same line.

"The surprising thing is not that the careful teaching gets results, but it takes some time to get them."

Some Hon. Member: — Who wrote that?

Mr. Banks: — Well, he happens to be president of the C.C.F. Party, and that is a good-will message at Christmas. I want to congratulate, I want to say this — I am going to be fair; I read the Premier's message and

March 5, 1952

it was very nice; it uplifted you and kept up your Christmas spirit.

Now I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that outside of two or three, there is any person that approves of that on the other side of the House.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. If the hon. member has swept the whole House into that inclusively, I want to say that I do agree with the statement that was made by Dr. Carlyle King, but not the travesty and distortion that has just been made of it in the last few moments.

Mr. Banks: — I said, "Except two or three." I read the words.

Premier Douglas: — No, you did not read it all. Dr. Carlyle King went on to point out in that article . . .

Mr. Banks: — Well, I read the bottom and I'll read the rest of it.

Premier Douglas: — No, but he read a few carefully selected sentences. Dr. King went on to point out that people naturally live together in peace, harmony and good-will, except when propaganda injects hate into people's minds. He was speaking against totalitarian propaganda which teaches people to hate one another, asked that that be removed and that if it were removed, the people would live together in harmony and in peace. I think this type of distortion is something that ought not to be accepted in this House.

Mr. Banks: — I am going to ask that that be withdrawn, because I read the exact words.

Premier Douglas: — But you read parts of it, without reading the whole thing.

Mr. Banks: — All right, we will finish it.

"That suggests a strategy of peace. Let's all be slow learners, dull normals or negligent students. George Bernard Shaw remarked once that he had refused to learn anything at school, because, unconsciously, although wisely, he was saving his brains for something useful in later life.

"Maybe Shaw's principle has even more application to adult education which we get in the paper, over the air and on the screen. Let's refuse to learn our lessons. Let's put up a resistance."

Well, there is not very much about peace in that, and I say, it is a very bad example. I do not believe that the people at the Sunday school picnics or the Wheat Pool or the ladies' aid — I do not believe that they are learning to hate. Ladies' aid meeting, Sunday school picnics, Wheat Pool committee — I do not think there is any hatred taught there. But I will say that this illustrates just exactly the thinking of the

C.C.F. Party, because that paper, which is put around on every deck here, has had more to do with attempting to cause hate here in Saskatchewan than any other paper that is published in the same province.

I think that the biggest thing the teaching profession have got to face today are those schools where they have seven or eight or ten children. You have to get a teacher for that and you have to do the best you can under the circumstances. I certainly sympathize with the Minister in dealing with it. The problem in the northern part of the province is not so bad; there are very few schools there; I know of one where there are 11. Most of these schools are pretty well filled up, and I do not know what the solution is going to be. I believe he is trying to deal with it as fairly and as carefully as he can.

I only have one or two things to say yet, and this is a matter that I have to bring up here. I am going to say I got this letter since I came here, and it is from a non-political organization:

"J.G. Banks. Dear Sir, I am sending you a copy of a letter I sent to the Hon. W.S. Lloyd in connection with a larger school unit vote held here, and we expect you and your Liberal friends to make it interesting enough to make them give us a vote. Please try hard as the people are very angry around here."

This is one of those unfortunate things . . .

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member give the name of the writer of the letter? Or table it?

Mr. Banks: — J.G. Bennett, he is secretary of that community, you have it.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Is the member willing to table the letter, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: — Are you willing to table the letter?

Mr. Banks: — No, I do not think so. I have just simply been asked to bring this up. And he encloses a list here of voters. The difficulty is, I think, in the vote held there last fall, there are thirteen parts of municipalities, and the people who were working on this got the petitions, but they could not just ascertain exactly what the population was. Well, they worked away and did the best they could and here I have this list which shows 925 names. It gives the schools: for instance, here is Veregin, 36; Poplar Point, 37; and I do not want to go over them all — Maybridge, 27. Now, they thought that they had a couple of hundred extra. They required 910 names, but what happened? It seems very unfortunate, but they left this pretty late; it was only a week or so before the time was up, before this petition was sent in, and they did not hear anything for five or six weeks as to whether they were entitled to a vote or not. That was the difficulty — they did not hear anything for five or six weeks, so they thought they were all right. Then they got a letter — well, I do not know whether they got a letter, but they find out that it is short. I want to point out that when a man is running for office, under our system — municipal or town — when the vote is counted he is entitled to be represented, but not under the larger school unit. When these names were counted, I believe the only people who were there were the inspector,

March 5, 1952

some departmental official, and the chairman of the unit board. The other people were not notified. They did not know what the count was until they were told.

Now there is one reason — I am not making any charges about it — and the one reason should guide this Department in the future. I would say that when they were that close, if there were a few votes over or short, give them a vote; they have substantially complied with the Act. I do not think it should be the technical application of the law in this case, because I am going to say (and I do not accuse the Minister of it) that many people were told that they had a vote as a matter of right five years ago when this came in. They said, "Try it for five years." Now that poor, "God-forsaken town" of Canora would not trust them, five years ago. They would not trust the Government five years ago, and they petitioned and they got enough that they could not proclaim the district; but they waited for five years to get the vote. They were a little wiser than our people. But in any event, I say that that thing was so very, very close it was unfair to take that right away from these people.

Now, I do not want to enlarge on the question. I know that the Liberal Party, in a matter of that kind, would stretch every point to see that it went through, if that happened here. The Minister went through every one of those districts to find out if these people were on the last assessment roll — or his office did — searched every assessment roll. And here were cases where the man had died and his son was carrying on, or his wife, and his name was still on there, and they got enough — which they say was enough — to disqualify them. It seems to me that this Government does not trust public opinion.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. The population lists to which the hon. member refers were not taken as the result of any count by officials of the Department of Education. The lists were taken by the secretaries of the municipalities concerned, submitted to us and certified by them as being the correct list of the number of resident ratepayers in those areas.

Mr. Banks: — Well that was after the count was made, and all those names were taken off the list. I agree.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. No names were taken off.

Mr. Banks: — Well, these petitions were regarded as short where the secretary did not find the name of the signer. And, of course, the Minister very carefully advised these people — "Go to the secretaries and see." Well, they were pretty well booted out of there. He said, "We are not getting paid for this job. We gave it once and we are not going to bother with you any more."

Now, I was asked to present this; I do not know what is ahead. I know that the people up there feel that something was put over them, that they have not had fair treatment. And, for that reason, they are not going to rest under this thing, and I think it is going to mean, for sure, a solid Liberal vote in all those districts.

There is just one other thing I want to take up and that has to deal, I think, more or less, with the Premier. I was not at the C.C.F. Convention but he was there. And you see they got into a discussion up there about these wild animals. I think this is refreshing, this little thing up here. And the paper reported it later, and this is the report made by the paper. I am going to read it:

"A skunk is a small animal whose home is in wooded country. It increases rapidly and will not interfere with other animals unless attacked. Its protection from bigger animals is a scent gun, which, in times of danger, it uses rapidly and accurately. No other animals will attack the skunk, not even a muskrat, owing to the deadly fumes it throws out.

"It gives one a lonesome feeling to drive out to Madge Lake and back and never see a muskrat. The C.C.F. candidate and his friends have been in the skin game for some years and profits are big in this very lucrative trade of dealing in skins — if you are on the right side of the fence, of course" (he adds). "The lust for gold, the Fur Co-operative, the C.C.F. Government and these lovely little animals, the muskrats, have had to scoot for safer distance and provinces, and they did not possess the deadly fumes which the C.C.F. candidate fears so greatly, which the ordinary man would call truth."

That is all. Now, we lost all the muskrats up there. And do you know what happened, right away? The gophers got out. They tell me down in that area north of Winnipeg the gophers are there. They had to go to save themselves. But this skunk is still lurking under every tree, waiting for the C.C.F. Now do you know . . .

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — May I ask the hon. member a question please?

Mr. Banks: — Not just now. Now I think you can see, from what I have said, that I am not going to support the Motion.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I did not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman until he was finished; but he made a charge here, a moment ago on which I would like to give him the correct information. He stated that on a job at Endeavour there were five checkers and only two trucks. Well, there were five men engaged on that job — not as checkers alone. There were some checkers, but also in that five were men who carried on gravel investigational work, did the chaining of the job at No. 9 and also at No. 5, so that there were five people engaged in that type of work. At one time I find one of the contractors — there were two contracts under way; one of the contractors was down to five trucks, but that was just for a short while, while there were some breakages and some stoppage. But to say there were five checkers on that job is absolutely incorrect. There were five men employed, looking after two jobs, which included checking, cleaning and gravel investigational work.

March 5, 1952

Mr. Banks: — Are the names that I gave you correct?

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I couldn't tell you. I did not have time to check the names.

Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I hope that in the time left for my speech in the Budget debate, I will be able to cover my Department fairly adequately. I was hopeful that I would have a little more time, but with the four marathoners who preceded me my time is cut considerably. I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that I can keep the debate up to the same high level that I have just listened to. I have never heard a more sorry attempt on the part of anyone from the legal profession to give a talk on general uplift.

I notice that the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Lofts) is not in his seat. He mentioned that he hoped grazing lease fees would be brought down. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we did reduce fees this year and, as hon. members know, the grazing rentals are related to the average price of cattle on the Winnipeg market for the last six months in the preceding year. Everyone knows, too, that cattle prices were exceedingly high in the past years and were up until the foot-and-mouth outbreak. The average price on the Winnipeg market ranged something like \$28 a hundredweight, and deducting from that the highest freight rate from the highest freight rate point in the province, we realized that the rentals would be high, particularly on the three categories of lower carrying capacity grazing land. We therefore reduced the grazing rentals in those particular categories from what would have been 10 1/2 cents an acre to 4.8 cents an acre for class one; and class two, from what would have been 11 1/2 cents an acre to 7.7 cents an acre, and then, in the case of class 3, from what would have been 13 1/2 cents an acre to 11.6 cents an acre. The rest of the rental formula remained the same.

I would like to draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that the difference in grazing rentals between Saskatchewan and Alberta is considerable. The rental per acre for class one land is 15 1/4 cents an acre in Alberta and 4 1/2 cents an acre in Saskatchewan: 18.50 cents an acre for Alberta and 4.60 cents for Saskatchewan. Now, I might mention that the grazing rental in Alberta does include the tax, but, deducting the tax, the difference would still be, in the case of class one land, 7 1/2 cents an acre in Alberta, 4.60 cents in Saskatchewan; for class 2, 9 1/4 cents in Alberta, 4.60 cents here, and 11 1/2 cents Alberta, 7.40 here; and 14.37 cents an acre in Alberta and 7.40 here for the next class of land. And for class 6, just over 19 cents an acre in Alberta and 11.20 cents in Saskatchewan. So our grazing rentals are very modest compared with the grazing rentals in Alberta.

As I mentioned, we did reduce the rental of some grazing land because there was some disparity there on the poorer grazing land.

I notice from the hon. members that preceded me that they have a very great aversion to profits. They keep referring to profits that certain of the Crown Companies might be making or some of the surpluses they

might be making. They are very much alarmed at the surplus that the Fur Marketing Service has. I wish that they would express as great concern for the profits that private enterprise makes. Mr. Speaker, it is peculiar that they are so worried about these things. I assume that they would abolish the Fur Marketing Service, then the Hudson's Bay and all the other free traders, the white traders and what have you could step in again and fleece the natives like they did before. That is exactly what would happen. There is no one in the Northland, or any place else in Saskatchewan, who does not realize this administration has done more to prevent exploitation of the natives and to place the economy of the Northland on a sound basis than this administration.

The hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Loehr) trots out the same old comparison to Manitoba and mentions farms can be electrified cheaper in Manitoba. Everybody knows that, Mr. Speaker; even a school child knows this. And a school child knows, and you too across the floor ought to know, there is a problem involved when you try to electrify a sparsely populated area like Saskatchewan as compared to Manitoba. You people know better than that; but you repeat the same thing over and over just as though you could do better. You could not begin to do nearly as much. Your past record of performance proves that. We never had any rural electrification in this province of ours previous to 1944. No matter what this administration does, they are up with their little niggling criticisms, hopeful they can get away with it on the hustings in some out-of-the-way places; but they cannot get away with it in this House and they cannot get away with it amongst people who are informed of the facts. All one needs to do, Mr. Speaker, is to take a map and look at the power grid of this province, and look at the relative density of population here and in Manitoba, and you can see the problem involved. We have the same problem with highways and any other communications as we have with rural electrification; and to hear the hon. member from Humboldt talk it seems to leave the impression that it ought to all be free too. We have always said that services cost money, and if any of these corporations have surpluses they belong to the people of the province, which is not true of private enterprise. You never hear them talk about Alberta, and make any comparisons, where private enterprise holds sway and where the profits go into the coffers of private enterprise and are not passed back into additional expansion of service or into other public uses.

Now, the other one is "keep the boys on the farm." They are very much worried about keeping the boys on the farm, but they do not seem to know what to do about it. They come up with proposals, Mr. Speaker, that would have the effect of driving the boys off the farm. They have been criticizing the land policy of this Government; but I would like to tell hon. members — and you don't need to flip your desks yet until I am through; I would like to tell hon. members opposite that even in the time of the old Liberal administration when the hungry 'thirties taught a lesson, when the drought and the depression of those years taught them that it would be best to utilize our remaining Crown land resources to stabilize our agriculture industry. Much has been done and is being done today.

Some Hon. Member (Opposition): — All of it — is that all?

March 5, 1952

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I will give you plenty before I am through. If you gentlemen have any ability to reason, if you have any ability to objectively analyze a problem and come up with a constructive solution, you should not be so anxious to bring in all of this biased political criticism. They are hopeful that they will gain a few votes by holding out to a farmer that he might get a parcel of land, or holding out to some prospective person that he would possibly get some royalty as a result of oil drilling. It is getting to be kind of a roulette proposition: spin the old wheel, vote Liberal, and you might be the lucky boy when they strike oil and you might get quite a bit of royalty. Or advising farmers "when we get into power, we will see to it that you get land cheap." Did you ever hear any more cheap politics than that? I have never heard the like of it in all my experience in public life nor in this House; but it is something one can expect from a desperate opposition. And, believe me, Mr. Speaker, they are desperate, grasping at every bit of driftwood to try and prevent their political submergence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like now for the benefit of hon. members, particularly hon. members opposite, to give some figures. I gave these figures before when I gave an outline of the policies of the Department as they relate to Crown land administration, but they do not seem to remember. Maybe there is not sufficient political significance in the Department of Agriculture. But again I want to inform them that the Lands Branch has under its administration about 9,700,000 acres of land, that is all of the Crown land . . .

Mr. Dundas: — Too much.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The hon. member says "too much." I think he would probably give it all away if they get in. He would take the land out of the community pastures, I suppose, and sell it, or out of the P.F.R.A. pastures and sell it, and at the same time talk about stabilizing the agricultural economy of this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, more than two million acres are of little use for agricultural purposes at all. That leaves us with approximately 7 million acres of land that are disposed of as follows: homestead settlement entries (there are a few left), 7,200 acres; under sale contract, 217,000 acres; leases and permits for cultivation, 702,000 acres of land. I hope hon. members will keep in mind — 702,000 under cultivation. What I want to emphasize is the comparatively small amount of land suitable for cultivation as against the great amount of land suitable only for grazing purposes. Leases and permits for grazing and hay, 5,149,000. Most of our remaining farm lands are not suited for cultivation purposes, and I want to say here and now we have reached the limit of our good agricultural land resources in Saskatchewan and I will refer more extensively to this Mr. Speaker, a little further along. There are presently included in the P.F.R.A. community pasture lands that are still administered by the Lands Branch since they have not been transferred to P.F.R.A., 382,000 acres. Included in pastures, 190,000 acres. Reserved for consideration and development projects, 127,000 acres. Included in proposed pastures not yet under construction, 164,000 acres. And reserved for municipalities to sublet, mostly L.U.B. land 34,000 acres.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out, too, that in addition to this, there are presently 1,468,000 acres of what were formerly Crown lands or L.U.B, lands in P.F.R.A. community pastures. There are some 53 P.F.R.A. community pastures in the province, and I want to state one thing that is not given very much prominence; that is the part played by the Provincial Government in the development of P.F.R.A. pastures. It is the Lands Branch administration that obtains land control and gets sufficient land in an area or block to permit P.F.R.A. to fence the area and add further improvements. We have transferred title on 14 million acres of land to the Dominion Government within P.F.R.A. pastures for the purpose of stabilizing our agricultural economy, by enabling farmers who have undersized units to have grazing facilities.

Hon. members opposite think, I suppose, that we have practically unlimited good land resources left. If that were the case I would agree that we could go back to the old system of homestead entries on a larger scale, on an economic unit scale to be sure; but as I have stated, the land remaining in control of the Department is principally grazing land. And then with reference to cultivation leases, the 702,000 acres that I mentioned, this land is leased as follows: There are 2,106 partial cultivation units — 2,106 farmers that we are helping to establish more soundly, that is, by adding Crown land to uneconomic units, thus giving them greater security by virtue of a more sound economic farm unit. In addition to that, we have 7,212 grazing leases of less than a section. Again, this land is leased on the basis of need and the people who have the greatest need obtain this type of grazing land to round out a sound economic farm unit. All the way through, the same pattern is followed, Mr. Speaker, the purpose being greater stability in rural areas that hon. members opposite seem to be so much worried about. We have been doing something about it. We have followed and continued the programmes that were inaugurated through P.F.R.A. We have expanded on those programmes, and we are certain that by following present policies we can at least get a degree of agricultural stability utilizing these some 9 million acres of Crown lands for that purpose.

Now, I will turn very quickly, Mr. Speaker, to the prospective good agricultural lands remaining. The only area that we have left that has possibilities for cultivation purposes is in the northeast part of the province. Not very long ago we had a meeting in Winnipeg between officials of the P.F.R.A., officials of our own Lands Branch here and the officials of the Lands Branch of Manitoba Government. Now, just to give hon. members an idea of what is involved in northeastern Saskatchewan in the matter of expenditure in reclaiming that area for agriculture, I will read the following, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Fiesen, one of the Manitoba officials present at this conference stated:

"Very good information was obtained on water levels during the 1951 flood . . ." (he is speaking about land just over the Saskatchewan boundary on the Manitoba side) ". . . and with the studies being carried out sufficient information will be available for agricultural development of the area. It was recommended that a study of the Pasqua drainage basin of Saskatchewan should be considered and this question then taken under advisement. It was generally agreed that the Pasqua drainage basin of

March 5, 1952

Saskatchewan, adjoining Manitoba, does not offer good agricultural possibilities. The meeting was also told that partial development of the Pasqua project, which would protect 27,500 acres of the better land, was made in an office study, this winter. The estimated cost of the development of this 27,500 acres is \$1 million against \$1,350,000 for the complete development of the project."

If hon. members will just take their pencils out and calculate the cost per acre for that reclamation work, it is tantamount and comparative to irrigation development. Now, when we intend to spend public moneys for purposes of reclamation or for irrigation, it is advisable to maintain some control over the tenure of land. We are told . . .

Mr. Tucker: — What is the hon. member reading from; is that available to members?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It is a departmental report that I have of the meeting held in Winnipeg, and if hon. members wish a copy we can have more of them made and passed around. We would be very glad to make them available because the material, while it is not of great informational value as far as statistics are concerned, it is the record of a meeting and there is considerable information in it.

Mr. Tucker: — If the Minister will let us have a copy, I won't ask that it be tabled then.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — All right.

Premier Douglas: — We had the distribution tabled a little while ago.

Mr. Tucker: — But this is a public document read by a Minister of the Crown.

Premier Douglas: — No, it is not a public document. It is a private report to the Minister.

Mr. Tucker: — If a Minister reads from a document, Mr. Speaker, it is well understood that he must be prepared to table it. On the contrary, a member can read from a letter and if he takes responsibility for it, he does not have to table it. The Premier knows that just as well as any of the rest of us. He was good enough to say that he will let us have a copy of it. I don't know why the Premier is trying to raise a rumpus now about it.

Premier Douglas: — I was merely trying to point out that there are different ways to interpret rules of this House.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, this may be of interest to hon. members opposite who have been talking so much about out lease policy. Half of the acreage contained in the Pasqua project were on the following basis: 96 crop share leases, 36 general permits, and 4 grazing leases, I understand. Apparently they have adopted pretty much the same lease policy in Manitoba, realizing the nature of the problem.

We are constantly being told and being urged on the one hand that, where irrigation development takes place, the important thing is land control. The Royal Commission investigating the South Saskatchewan are very much concerned and want clear-cut information as to what the Government's policy is going to be on land control. It is, therefore, very important. I have a resolution here from the South Saskatchewan River Development Association urging the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Government purchase all land before irrigation is developed and then resell it at reasonable price after irrigation is developed so as to speed up the production and development of our resources."

We have organizations telling us to buy more land, and now the Liberals are going to go out and say they are going to sell it all. Well, Mr. Speaker all that will happen if they do that is . . .

Mr. Tucker: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Kuziak: — Sit down.

Mr. Tucker: — Is the member for Canora taking over your position now, Mr, Speaker?

Premier Douglas: — Trying to relieve you of the responsibility that you have been discharging for the last three or four days.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I suggest that you ask the Premier to withdraw that suggestion. He is suggesting that I am running the House. I don't aspire to your position, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest that it is a reflection on you from the Premier who is angry about something. He is trying to laugh about it, but he is actually quite put out.

Now, if I might make a correction. As I understand, the S.R.D.A. wanted the land taken over so there could not be speculation, not with any idea that it should not be resold.

Premier Douglas: — Who is making this speech. He is now the interpreting the S.D.R.A.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Yes, but I want to say this to the hon. member. If you sell land again the inevitable result is that you lose control of it completely if it is resold. I will give the hon. members an illustration if they want one. I have a letter here that I received very recently — as a matter of fact, I received an inquiry from a returned man that wanted some Crown land in the Cabri district, and so I checked into the possibility of making this land available to this veteran. I discovered that it was land that was under contract for sale, and this is the history of it. According to the records, all of Section 29 was sold to two people (I will not mention names) in Cabri, hotel owners in 1918. These two gentlemen, shortly after the purchase, turned the land over to the present lessee, present holder of the contract to break and farm on a crop share. They bought the land under a agreement for sale, Mr. Speaker, and then they lease

March 5, 1952

it to another person. That is the kind of a lease business that apparently the hon. members opposite believe in. They believe in private leases. They believe in absentee landlords owning land with a very undesirable type of lease agreement; and I can say to them that we have got a lease agreement with the lessees of Crown lands that will serve as a good pattern for any landlord, and they will still get a good percentage on their investment. Now, to go on, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Egnatoff: — I wonder if the Minister would . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — No, I just have a few minutes left, and I am trying to cut corners too. This is the second year, Mr. Speaker, that I have made an attempt to give a full report on my Department and this time I can truthfully say it is not my fault that I am unable to do so in the short time remaining.

Shortly after the purchase, the section was turned over to the renter to break and farm on a crop share basis, and the renter was to obtain title to the east half under agreement of sale. The understanding was that as the renter made the crop payments to the other two gentlemen, the hotel owners, they, in turn, would make the annual payments to the Department. The renter claims that under his arrangement he paid over \$11,000, but as this money was not turned over to the Department, the contract was eventually cancelled, and, therefore, this gentleman was left with the financial burden on his hands.

Mr. Tucker: — Will the Minister tell us what he is referring to? I have no idea.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I am referring to a parcel of Crown land for which I received an inquiry for lease.

Mr. Tucker: — Where?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — In the Cabri district.

Mr. Tucker: — Is it your policy you are talking about?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — No, I am just using this to illustrate what happens when Crown land is sold. The only thing that would happen, Mr. Speaker, is that a few wealthy business men, or wealthy farmers would get control of it in a very short while, and thereby defeat the whole purpose of trying to stabilize rural farming conditions in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to a few more things said about this leasehold policy. On one hand, we have hon. members saying, "Well, we should own the land," and the exponents of the Liberalism in the northeast part of the province, among whom I note a certain Mr. Don Hood. There is what is known up there as the Hood Land Company which controls about 1,600 acres of land in that particular area; and in addition to that, if you go to Hudson Bay Junction, you not only find a Hood Land Company in operation, but you find the Hood Hardware Store, the Hood Drug Store, the Hood Feed establishment, and the Hood Theatre.

Mr. Tucker: — Tut! Tut!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — He has another store too, dry goods and notions. Well, in addition, the gentleman in question has a lot of other silly notions which he also expresses through a private paper that he owns. Is it any wonder that this man would like to have us throw Crown land open for sale to people like that? Apparently up in the Kamsack area some people like to grab. Well, they are not going to get their mitts on any more Crown land as far as I am concerned. The people who are going to have it are going to be the farmers, and they will farm it, and no one else.

Mr. Tucker: — How many acres of land have you got?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I can inform the hon. member of that, as far as I am concerned, I have never made any income whatever outside of agriculture, and they know it. They know too that the farmers of this province understand me and understand that I come from their ranks and I am going to stay in their ranks. They know, too, Mr. Speaker, that when I talk about a lease policy I have their interest at heart.

Now, it is peculiar that you find members opposite talking against a lease policy. I have had brought to my attention a Hansard from Ottawa. It is Hansard, April 26, 1951 — Page 2393. A question was asked by Mr. Thatcher: "(1) During the past two years, have Mr. Peter Wilke or Mr. Richard K. Lehman acquired land in the Duck Lake Indian Reserve? (2) If so, has either gentleman a joint lease with any other person? (3) If so, what is the name of the other person?"

Here are the answers: "(1) Yes. These two gentlemen have leases; (2) Yes; (3) On January 6, 1950, a crop-share on the usual term was issued in favour of Mr. Lehman and W.A. Tucker, covering 320 acres of land in the Indian Reserve."

Mr. Tucker: — Isn't that terrible if I'm interested in the farming industry?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — No, it isn't terrible, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Tucker: — The C.C.F. Party is so hard-pressed that they have to bring that up. No money borrowed from the Government to run a theatre, or a farm either. I'm just interested in farming!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — He should not be making "heap big smoke" on an Indian reserve when all his co-workers are talking against the lease policy. He wants it for five years — maybe he figures he won't stand it for 33.

Well, I could refer to other records. I have records here from the Lands Branch indicating that when the Liberal Government was in power, under their land policy one man got control of 23 quarters of the best land in Saskatchewan, right in the hon. member for Melfort's district. I hope that will not happen again, and now it cannot happen again under present policy.

March 5, 1952

Mr. Tucker: — Your Honour, on a question or privilege . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! The Leader of the Opposition may speak if he wishes on a point of privilege.

Mr. Tucker: — Your Honour permitted the other side to make corrections, and I claim the same rights. Now, the hon. Minister has said this lease was for five years. As a matter of it was a lease for seven years, under which we had to clear that land, break it up, and give a part of the crop and pay the taxes, and before we got this lease it was advertised. We were the only people who applied for it; and if there is anything wrong with that, well then, let the Minister make the most of it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — No, there is nothing wrong with it. In fact we would have given him far better terms if he was a bona-fide farmer and needed it.

It occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Dominion Government could clear and break this land pretty easily. They could give the benefit of net proceeds to the Indians.

Mr. Tucker: — They're getting it done cheaper this way — for nothing.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I know pretty much about the terms of those . . .

Mr. Tucker: — The Indians agreed to it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Tucker: — We get it done for nothing.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn very quickly to some of the other branches of this Department . . .

Mr. Tucker: — What department? Are you not going to deal with the theatre?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We have expanded the Agricultural Representative Service in order to meet the requirements of the agricultural industry in this province. I wish I had time, Mr. Speaker, to outline and give a general picture of the agricultural situation here.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear, hear! If you had not taken so much time on me you could have said something,

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We have approximately 60 million acres in the surveyed area of the province — 36 million acres of which is under cultivation, Mr. Speaker, and I need not refer to the fact that we live in a very hazardous natural environment in this province. For that reason, the whole matter of adopting good land-use practices is more urgent in this province than anywhere else, and the matter of trying to stabilize our agriculture by giving people a sound farm unit, and again I mention that means a unit that will be sufficient in size to enable farmers to operate accord with the dictates of nature. It is only on that basis, that we can get a stable agriculture in Saskatchewan. To that end we have built

up an Agricultural Representative Service that covers the entire province.

I know my hon. friend from Humboldt does not like that, and he questions the value of the Agricultural Representative Service — the most surprising statement that I have ever heard come from a man who pretends to be an agriculturist. There are 36 agricultural districts, and in each district there are approximately 3,500 farms, for one Ag Rep. I do not think that we have too many Ag Reps. As a consequence they are working in close association with local municipal committees which are doing a very useful job at the local level, particularly with reference to land-use surveys that will enable them to better understand the agricultural situation in their particular locality. As a result many of the earned assistance projects, and other projects come in on the initiative of these local agricultural committees, and I do not think that farmers anywhere are more strong-minded at the present than our farmers in this province. We have done all in our power through all agencies of extension and publicity, to emphasize the great need for farming in accord with the dictates of nature, and to try and endeavour to overcome our many natural hazards here.

Some of the hon. members ridicule some of these publications which have been put out, but, in my own humble opinion, anyone who wants to do that for political purposes ought to be ashamed of themselves, Mr. Speaker, and I will let it go at that. I had some more about which I wanted to say, but suffice it at that.

Mr. Tucker: — You should really be ashamed, shouldn't you?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I should be ashamed! Anyone that will start quotations from books that are considered written by good authority, and we do not agree, and I have said so — I have never seen a book yet that I agreed with completely; but certainly we are not going to deny the valuable information contained therein to the people of this Province. I can say that we can leave it to the good judgment of the people of Saskatchewan to decide what is good and what is bad. It is typical of reactionary minds to withhold any kind of information: let only that material pass that they think they are in agreement with. I do not agree with that philosophy at all, and I am going to tell hon. members that if they want to use that to defame anybody's character, they are liable to have trouble on their hands. It is an old level in politics, and we will have a good many allies on our side.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that I cannot go into details on the Agricultural Representative Service, and I will have to go immediately to the Conservation and Development Branch. This is the new branch that was added. It is this branch that has the biggest appropriation voted to it; the other departments have been extended, it is true. We have added staff. Now if hon. members opposite think we are to let any of the dairy inspectors go, any of the agricultural representatives go, let them get out and tell the farming community in this province that. In the Conservation and Development Branch, Mr. Speaker, I just want to give a quick resume of the activities carried on by that branch over the past few years.

Take drainage — we have presently sixteen drainage projects with an estimated drainage area of 22,140 acres. In regard to the movement

March 5, 1952

of earth, we have moved 411,000 cubic yards of earth, and constructed over 36 miles of ditches, and maintained over 16,000 feet of ditches, and structures built to the number of 20. There are 30 irrigation projects presently under development by this Branch, some of which are almost complete, involving an estimated 36,000 acres of land, with over 23,000 acres of that land already under the ditch. Topographical surveys have been carried out on over 70,000 acres and earth moved is over half a million cubic yards: ditches constructed, 44 miles; structures built for irrigation purposes, 541.

In addition to that, this Branch has 35 forage crop projects, involving 64,000 acres, and the area sowed to forage crop at the present time is over 16,000 acres, of which 4,700 acres is under irrigation; 41 pasture projects — either provincial pasture or earned assistance projects that came in as a result of the work done by local committees and agricultural representatives, involving an acreage of 376 acres, and the area sowed to forage crop, under earned assistance, is over 3,900 acres of land. All of this indicates that in these constructive policies that we have in regard to utilization of Crown lands, we are trying to reclaim, we are trying to bring irrigation to other areas, and we are developing dry land and fodder projects on an immense and growing scale.

Then there is a 32-reclamation project involving over 13,000 acres of land, of which over 9,000 acres are already sowed to forage crops. I might mention also the miscellaneous projects — tree planting projects along roadways, etc. Over 300,000 trees planted, Mr. Speaker. Then there are various other projects in connection with some of the problems solved — one is the three projects at Trossachs, where we are giving assistance to the farmers due to burned out soil and are asking them to follow certain prescribed practices, and by following these practices we are certain that we can make a lot of this burned-out soil productive, now that we have mechanized equipment to do so.

That is all I have time for the Conservation and Development Branch, only to say that the emphasis on activities, this year, will be in the north-east part of the province in connection with drainage. We have a full complement of engineers; we have enough equipment to put 35 engineering parties in the field. Some of those engineering parties have been in the field all winter in connection with drainage surveys in the north east.

I will just take one more branch — the Animal Industries Branch. I particularly want to make a few brief references to dairy production as a result of herd improvement, and these inspectors that the hon. members have been asking questions about. In 1935, Mr. Speaker, the average milk production per cow in Saskatchewan was 3,100 pounds. In 1950, this figure now stands at 4,518 pounds, an increase of about one third, as a result of herd improvement work. Now, I hope they will not go out and suggest that they are going to throw all that service out the window. I would not think so. The average production of milk cows in Saskatchewan Herd Improvement Association in 1935, was 7,718 pounds of milk per year; in 1950, the Herd Improvement Association cows averaged very close to 9,400 pounds of milk per year. All of which, I think, tells the story.

We turn to Veterinary Services. In 1944, we had no Veterinary Service Districts whatever; now we have 22 Veterinary Service Districts, and have employed veterinarians. All of this service is going to go a long way in preventing the spread of contagious diseases, and in the control of such things as T.B. and Bang's Disease. The activities of our veterinarians are extensively for the purpose of giving general service, and to do Bang's control work.

In connection with Bang's control work, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to report that, this year, we have tested over 74,000 cows for Bang's disease against absolutely none in 1944; and we have vaccinated 29,000 calves this year, and the figure was about the same last year.

In addition to the 22 organized Veterinary Service Districts supplied with veterinary practitioners, we have another 28 organized and awaiting veterinarians. We were going to send our Provincial Veterinarians to the College at Guelph to get some of the young graduates to come out again, but we were afraid to let them go because of the foot-and-mouth outbreaks here, and we think we should keep them at home. But we have gone a long way along the road towards giving adequate veterinary service to the farmers of Saskatchewan. As you no doubt know, the Provincial Government contributes to each Veterinary Service District.

Mr. Speaker: — Would the hon. member wish to adjourn the debate?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — No, Mr. Speaker I regret very much that I do not want to adjourn the debate. I understand the members of the Opposition wanting to adjourn, and take the air time tomorrow. Again I was probably foolish to try to attempt to give a resume of my Department in the time at my disposal. I had a good deal more that I thought would be of some informational value to the hon. members opposite, and I would be very pleased if the House would let me go into my Department a little more extensively when my estimates are up. No doubt you get the general impression, Mr. Speaker, that I will support the Motion.

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

(Debate adjourned)

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