

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

Tuesday, February 23, 1954

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

The House resumed, from Monday, February 22, 1954, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Wooff for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. J. W. Horsman (Wilkie): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in this debate, of course I want to do the usual thing. I would like to congratulate those who have spoken before me, who have already taken part in this debate, the mover and the seconder of the Address, the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition, and all the other members as well. I would also like at this time to extend my hearty congratulations to the two new members of the House, and it is a source of pleasure and pride to us that they both happen to sit on our side of the House. I would also like to congratulate these two new members on the speeches they made the other day in this Assembly, and I am sure that the people who elected them, if they had been listening (which no doubt many of them were) would be very proud of the performance which they made here at that time.

Of course we here are on the Opposition. We are not a very big group; we are not asking for sympathy from anyone. We are here to perform a certain function, and I think in the interests of good government you need a strong Opposition. Maybe we should have more members. But the way we are situated here, we will have to get along with what we have and I can assure you, Sir, that we will do the best that we can to perform the function that we are put here to do in the best possible manner.

I just want to say another word about our two new members. They are both young and very capable men and I think they will be a great asset to this Legislature.

I was greatly interested, too, a few days ago, in the remarks of the member for Athabaska (Mr. Ripley) from the far north. He has a great knowledge of that great north country. He has a knowledge that he did not learn from books; not something that someone else has told him. His knowledge was gained in the hard school of practical experience. He has been a good many years in that country, and has been over most of it. I am sure that the people all over the country who heard his remarks would be greatly interested in what he had to say.

I am going to say something also about the member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly). It might not be my province here to say too much, or to pat a Conservative member on the back, but I think you will agree with me when I say that he is a young man of great promise. He is a very powerful speaker, and also he seems to have ideas of his own. I was quite interested in what he said about the establishment of a development fund here from moneys received from oil, minerals and so on and that that money could be placed in a fund similar to the school fund and used sometime when funds or finances might not be as high as they are today. I think it is very well worthy of consideration. I was also glad to note that he

February 23, 1954

supported the system under which landowners who did not have mineral rights should get something out of oil if it is struck on their land. I think that is very important, too.

Many people here do not know very much about my constituency. We are situated on the west side of the province and most of you people do not go, as a rule, very far west of Saskatoon. I am very proud of the people up in that constituency. I am proud of the constituency itself, and very proud that I represent them in this House. And just to show you that people up there are not so dumb after all, I just want to say this. I have a neighbour there, an old friend of mine, who had three boys attending the University of Saskatchewan a few years ago now. Those boys all won scholarships the same year, and I think every one of them won a scholarship every year they attended University, in Agriculture.

Now, just a short time ago another neighbour's boy attending the University at Saskatoon won a \$1500 scholarship in Agriculture. I am very proud of that, and I just want to mention it. I just want people to know that although we live on the west side of the province we have some people up there who, after all, are not so dumb.

In my constituency we have a lot of good farms. We have quite a few good towns. We have a lot of good farmers. We have a lot of very good businessmen, progressive business people and, on the whole, we have as good a constituency as there is in the province. The quality of our soil up there is best indicated by the bountiful crops that we have grown during the last few years, when we had moisture enough to grow a crop on. That has not always been the case up there, as in many other parts of this province. Our farmers also raise a lot of livestock; some of the best livestock in the province comes from that part of the country. Then we have a few developments of our natural resources, which is not common in other constituencies. Unity was the first place that natural gas was struck in commercial quantities in this province. We have the first salt plant that has ever been established in Saskatchewan; that plant is producing 10 to 12 carloads of salt a day. Progress is being made in the production of potash up there, though they had some trouble in getting through the quicksand. They found it necessary to get a freezing plant in and freeze the quicksand before they could proceed; but I understand now that the work is going ahead on schedule.

Another thing we have is a power plant under the supervision of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. It is quite a large power plant; one of the three major plants in this province, powered, as you know, by natural gas. Natural gas, according to many authorities, is one of the cheapest ways there is to develop electricity and we have it right there. I am glad that the Government of the province or the Power Corporation have taken advantage of that and extended that plant. They have now, according to this report here, 9,820 horse power natural gas engines in that plant. Some of you fellows who have never seen a natural gas engine I would like you to see them. The last one that was installed was 3,750 horse power, a mammoth thing; and now I hope the plant will be extended. Power goes out from there to most of the west central part of the province, to North Battleford and south, I believe, to the South Saskatchewan River.

Of course, we have many other ways that we contribute too. We pay as many taxes as anyone else, – gasoline tax, motor licences etc., –

which we expect to do. We are glad that we are in a position to contribute probably a little more than the average to the treasury of this province. We are glad, and we are proud, that we are able to do that; but we think sometimes that we do not always get a square deal. The people believe that up there, and I think many people on the other side of the House believe the same thing. For instance, in the last 10 years we have never had one mile of new highway built in that constituency; not one mile. We have never had old Highway No. 14 rebuilt yet. It has been there since it was completed in 1929, I believe, and outside of certain spots which became impassable, we have never had anything done on that highway except a little bit of gravel put here and there where the gravel was worn off. We believe that we should have a little more consideration along those lines.

We have some farm electrification. A good start has been made in farm electrification there, but much remains to be done. You will understand, of course, that when you are that close to the source of power, it is much easier to establish a farm electrification programme than it is some place where power has to be transmitted for 100 miles or more. We are glad to have as much done in that line as we have had done; but much remains to be done and we hope that in the near future, all the farm area of that country will be covered with farm electrification.

Highway No. 14, as you know, crosses the province. It is one of the main highways in this province, and that highway has been rebuilt from Saskatoon to Biggar. It is blacktopped as far as Perdue, and I believe it is ready for blacktop from there on to Biggar. From there west there has never been anything done to it. I just wonder if the Department intends to go on west and build that highway. I would urge them to do so. I think it is a very important road. I believe that the Government of Alberta are building Highway No. 13 in Alberta down to the Saskatchewan border. They will be working on it in the Spring, and they worked on it last year. Highway No. 13, meets Highway No. 14 in Saskatchewan at the border, and that would be one of the shortest and best routes from central Saskatchewan to most points in central and northern Alberta. I hope the Minister will give this matter some consideration.

We need many other roads besides that, of course. Every constituency does. We do not expect the Department of Highways to build a highway on every road allowance. We know that cannot be done, and we do not expect it. But we do need connecting roads between Highway No. 14 and No. 31 for instance, and Highway No. 14 and No. 40. We need a road down towards Kindersley – something you can get through when it is muddy in the summertime. At present, if you want to go to Kerrobert from Unity and it happens to be a rainy day, you have to drive to Macklin and then go down Highway No. 31 to Kerrobert, a long way out of your way; but a few miles of road built across there would save people hundreds and hundreds of miles of travel.

Last year the Minister of Municipal Affairs mentioned a plan which he had in mind for main market roads. I think I had mentioned that plan in this House before that. I believe I went on record as favouring something like that some years ago here, and I am glad that the Minister has taken this thing up: I do not mean he took it up because I mentioned it. I hope that that programme will be gone ahead with. I think that is just about as important a programme as the highway programme, because if we could get some

February 23, 1954

of these main market roads built – for instance a road from Highway No. 14 to No. 31; a road from Highway No. 14 to No. 40 up in the hon. Minister of Agriculture's country, or something like that – I know that the municipalities would be only too glad to co-operate on any plan of that nature. I think that at least a million dollars a year should be appropriated for that purpose, or probably more than that, and I think it would be money very well spent.

How many times have we had this experience. If you want to go some place and you start out on a gravelled highway, you drive a few miles and you have to turn off, and if it is a rainy day you are stuck right there. Now, if we had 10 miles of good road built in each municipality each year – and I am sure that most municipalities would build at least 10 miles of good road each year, if the Government would agree to put gravel on that road. They cannot do it alone. Their taxing powers are limited. All they have got is land taxation and taxes are getting very high now, and they need some assistance in the building of these roads. If we had a system where we got 10 miles of good municipal roads built every year, main market roads, in 10 years you would have 100 miles of good road in each municipality. You would have a system under which you could drive almost anywhere in the province, and I would urge the Minister to go ahead with that plan.

I am going to say a word about the boost in the automobile insurance. It is unfortunate that accidents are so bad and so frequent as they are. It seems to me that something could be done to cut down the accident rate in this province. Last year, I understand that more police were put on to look after our highways, but they cannot watch everyone: that goes without saying; it is impossible. I remember last Fall one day I was driving from home into Manitoba to Brandon and I got out on these highways here where the road is good, and if you go 50 miles an hour cars just pass you like that. And when I got into Manitoba, where their speed limit was 60 miles, if you drove 60 miles an hour you just got the same thing – they passed you like that. So, I do not know what it going to be done about this. It is not altogether speed. Many accidents happen that cannot be avoided, but there are things that contribute to accidents on the highway. As a matter of fact I was out in Vancouver for about six weeks this Fall, and the police there were right out after people who were breaking the highway rules. The speed limit in the City is 30 miles an hour and if anyone was driving 31 miles an hour they just picked him right up and they put road blocks out there every night. If they found people who were driving under the influence of liquor, they were pulled into court the next morning and in a few weeks you would be surprised how much they cut down the accident rate there.

I do not want to get tough with anybody, but there are times when it makes you think. It makes you think many times if you happen to go into the beer parlour in the small town, and you come out of there at 10 o'clock at night and you see men staggering out of that place drunk, and you know they are going to drive a car home. Well, I think something should be done about that.

As far as the automobile insurance is concerned, the \$200 deductible under the policy, instead of \$100, is going to create a situation whereby many people will be absolutely out. They cannot collect a dollar insurance. There are hundreds of cars on the road that are not worth \$200. By the time they buy a licence and pay for their automobile insurance it will

cost almost as much as the car is worth to put the car on the road. I think these things should be considered when a plan like this is made. It is not like insuring a building against fire. You do not have to insure a building, but this is compulsory – you must insure in order to get a licence.

There is another matter I want to bring up, Mr. Speaker, and it is this – I am glad the Minister of Public Health is in the House. About a year ago, the people of Luseland and surrounding area decided that they would make an effort to have a hospital built in Luseland. Part of the area that they proposed to include was already in another hospital area. They wished to withdraw, and I think under the Act they have the right to do so. At least they seemed to think so. With the assistance of certain areas that have never been in a hospital area they wanted to form a hospital union of their own for the purpose of building a hospital at Luseland. This proposed area comprises one whole municipality and part of two others, altogether just about the area of two whole municipalities; that is about 18 townships of farm land. Besides that, there is the town of Luseland and the village of Salvador. They would have an assessment of roughly \$6 million.

A petition was circulated throughout that area, signed by all the burgesses in the area, all the people who had a right to vote on this thing, and the petition proved that 85 per cent at least of the people in that area were in favour of building a hospital in Luseland. The petition was duly presented to the Minister of Public Health, but so far as I know has received little or no consideration so far. There have been several delegations down here to interview the Minister and his officials, delegations that were representative of the people of that area. There was a delegation here last week – a representative from each municipality in the area, a representative of the Board of Trade of the town of Luseland, a representative from the Council of the town of Luseland and a representative from the village of Salvador. They interviewed the Minister. I do not think he altogether turned them down on this request – I don't think he did that; but he did not give them very much hope, and I think little consideration has been expressed for the wishes of the people in that area.

These people are very anxious that this project go ahead. They are willing to do everything in their power to help it. Businessmen in the town there are willing to supply anything in their line such as electrical equipment and building material and so on, at cost, to help the thing along and keep expenses down, if they could get it done. The town of Luseland is a town with a population of, I would say, roughly, 700 people. It is situated almost in the centre of this area, and it is in the centre of one of the best farming areas in that part of the province. I believe that this area is large enough to support a hospital; I believe their assessment is high enough. The people in that area want it; they are willing to pay for it; and they are able to pay for it. They are not asking for anything for nothing. They are not trying, either, to take anything away from anyone else. All they are asking is a chance to do something for themselves. I am sure that debentures that would have to be issued in connection with this plan could be sold without any difficulty at all, right in the town of Luseland and the surrounding area. I am quite sure of that; and I do not believe that it is either fair or just that the express wishes of any group of people from any area should be disregarded. If this area is formed,

February 23, 1954

according to the plan laid down by the Department of Public Health, which is a much larger area, there would be people over 50 miles from a hospital. It is all right to say that 50 miles does not amount to anything nowadays; it is only an hour's drive with a motor car. That is true – if you are on a good road; but we are not in that happy position up there. We have not got many good roads. There are many times when that country is blocked up with snow. Well, you might go on snowshoes or skis or with a good team of horses, but there are no horses left in the country. You might be able to make 20 or 30 miles, but you certainly could not make 50 miles.

This will look to the people up there, if their wishes are disregarded, like a form of dictation, a form of dictatorship that will not be tolerated by the people of this country very much longer. I sincerely hope that the Minister will give this matter careful consideration before he makes a final decision on it.

To return to something else: We have listened to a good deal of the same old story this year that we generally hear expressed by many members from that side of the House, that the Liberals were in power so long and that they never did anything, and that anything that has ever been done of any good in this province has been done since 1944. That story is so old that it is ridiculous; absolutely ridiculous, Mr. Speaker. I am going to say this and you can contradict me if you wish. I can stand contradiction if you wish to do so. But every good thing that we have in Saskatchewan today was started at some time by former governments. Our school system was laid out by a Liberal government; our road system was laid out by former government; our union hospital plan was devised by a former government, by a Liberal government. Certainly they have been extended and improved since 1944. If they were not, what would this government do in the most prosperous years that the province has ever seen? We expect them to improve things; we expect them to do something. But when a man stands up in this House and says that the Liberals or other governments never did anything in this province, it is a most ridiculous statement.

One thing they cannot say – they did not build this building that we are so proud of here.

Government Member: What are they trying to do?

Mr. Horsman: This building was built back in the early days of this province and it will stand here for many years yet as a monument to the vision and the foresight of the men that built it.

Now, this Government tried to take credit of course for the prosperity of Saskatchewan. I give this Government credit for doing many good things; I am not the kind of man, that wouldn't.

Mr. Loptson: Not very many.

Mr. Horsman: But the prosperity of this province does not depend on any government. It depends on the crops that we have. That is what it depends on. It depends on the rainfall we have. Just as I said a moment ago, in the last few years of abundant rainfall, we have grown abundant crops. What government had anything to do with that? And regardless of the prosperity that we have now, if we had about two dry years – that is all we would need, we don't need a depression in Saskatchewan,

we don't need a business recession; but if we get a couple of bad crops this country would be as bad off as it ever was.

Mr. Walker: We would not have a Liberal government.

Mr. Horsman: No government has anything to do with that. I would like to tell my hon. friend across there that when I was a young boy I used to go to Sunday School (you might not believe it) not because I wanted to go so much, but because my parents insisted that I did go. I learned certain things about the Scripture in those days. Some of those passages of Scripture are still in my mind and one is this: "He maketh His sun to shine upon the evil and the good and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." So no government can take credit for the prosperity of this province. It is all under the jurisdiction of a higher power than ours.

Another thing, our trade policy in this country is the only thing that makes a country prosperous. The prosperity of the world depends on world trade; we all know that. And trade and commerce are not under the jurisdiction of a provincial government. They are under the jurisdiction of the federal government at Ottawa. They no doubt make mistakes too; they are only human. But there are many things that we believe they have done that are to the good and to the advantage of our province here. The Wheat Board, for instance, is a government board – not under the government exactly, but it is under a government board, something that we have wanted for years, and a system of marketing that we think is O.K. and we do not want to lose it. It proved its worth in some of the dry years here, or some of the years when we had poor crops, or frozen crops. You remember a few years ago when half of the wheat in Saskatchewan was frozen. What would we have got for that wheat if that had been thrown on the market? Less than nothing. This Fall, when it was pretty dry – I mean the soil was dry; I was looking over the report of the liquor board the other day and I noticed that the government has made almost \$11 million profit on liquor, so that would not indicate that the province is dry in every respect.

We hear a lot about the development that is going on in Saskatchewan. There is some development, and we are very proud of it. I hope that it will continue. I do not wish any bad luck to the province, that is sure. I don't care what government it is under, as long as the development goes on. But I was out in British Columbia this Fall, and I find that on one project alone out there they are spending \$500 million – the Kitimat project – and things are going ahead there much faster than they are in this country. The population is increasing faster. They have a different economy from ours, of course, and all that; but still those things really count.

There is just one thing here I noticed in the newspaper. As a matter of fact, I heard it in the House the other day. The hon. member for Bengough (Mr. Brown) was speaking and he gave the hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly) some very fatherly advice. He said he was going to suggest to Robert Kohaly that he could not wallow around in the mire such as the Liberal party was surrounded with, without getting involved. Well, I do not know, I don't take that statement very kindly, Mr. Speaker. I think that as far as the hon. member for Souris-Estevan is concerned, he is very capable of looking after himself, and if he gets involved in any dirt I do not think it will be from any fault of ours. I think he is

February 23, 1954

very capable of looking after himself, and I thought that that was a rather slurring remark on every member on this side of the House.

I just want to say this in conclusion. I think that the people of Saskatchewan and the people of Canada face the future with confidence in the sure and certain hope that the development that is going on all over Canada will keep our country prosperous for a good many years to come. We hear criticism here too about the federal government at Ottawa; lots of it. I don't blame you for criticizing them; I do it myself quite often. But, after all, the Liberal government have brought Canada up to the third place in the world in world trade. Canada is now the third largest trading nation in the world – a country of only 15 million people. The Federal government have always been able to balance their budget during these years, and they are spending about \$2 billion a year on defence. Now, I think that a government that can do these things and carry on the way they are doing should not get too much criticism. My opinion is that we have the best government in the world right here at Ottawa. That is my opinion. And I think if hon. gentlemen opposite would think the thing over and compare it with governments in other countries, they could not help but form the same conclusion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that is all I have to say today, and I will support the Motion.

Mr. H. C. Dunfield (Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, I do not know just how to adjust my voice – last year I was accused of speaking too quietly, in too low tone of voice, and then it was suggested, from my mild manner, that I was probably going across the floor pretty soon. I sincerely hope that, before this session is over, I will be about as welcome on the Government side as a wildcat.

At the first of the dinners given to the students of the University Parliamentary Forum and to the members of the Legislature and their wives, I listened with great pleasure to the speeches of the students, but I was much more interested in the remarks of the Premier (as I always am) in which he told the students that members of Parliament and of our Legislative Assemblies were often accused of spending too much time in talk, but that talk was the very basis of our democratic system, that it was through talk that legislative problems were whittled down to size and shaped into workable instruments of public procedure.

I think that is a very excellent thought and it has taken a great load off my mind, because last November, during the Throne Speech debate in the House of Commons, there appeared in the Saskatoon 'Star' an editorial expressing the opinion that the business of the country could be speeded up greatly if all the backbenchers on both sides of the House were gagged for the duration of that debate. I can imagine that that would have made a wonderful basis for debate among pure political theorists; but fortunately we seem to have, in all parties in the House of Commons, men and women of good sense who realize that, since the business of the Government of Canada is vast in extent, complex and varied, of necessity they must consider the element of time in their discussions. But in our provincial affairs, though our problems are of equal importance to us, they are infinitely less in number than are those of the senior government and I would say that I think they are of greater interest to the people of Saskatchewan. For that reason I would say that perhaps at

least the first two rows of frontbenchers on both sides of the House should have the privilege of participating in this debate, if they so wish.

In the Speech from the Throne the Government has outlined to us the programme that it prepared for this session of the Legislature, the details of which we shall hear later. Now I think I may safely assume that, in formulating this programme, the Government consulted not only its elected members, but also the rank and file of its Party – I use the word ‘rank’ strictly in its military sense, Mr. Speaker. Essentially then, this programme becomes a formal expression of the opinions, wishes and desires of the C.C.F. party of this province.

Notwithstanding the disparity in representation on opposite sides of this House, there is in this province, today, a large and growing number of people who may agree with much of the routine procedure of this Government, but who disagree very definitely with the fundamental tenets and concepts of this Government as laid down in the creed of its Party; and if there is any doubt that that number is growing, may I give a few figures from the returning officer of this province. In 1944, the Liberal party obtained only 35 per cent of the popular vote of this province; in 1948, it had risen to 38 per cent, and in the last provincial election it was in excess of 40 per cent. For that group of people whom I might call dissenters, I feel it is in this particular Throne Speech debate that they can exercise their inherent right to have some of their opinions and some of their wishes and desires placed before this Government.

Therefore, though the topic that I have taken for today, Mr. Speaker, is not one that I would choose normally for debate, it is one that has been brought to my attention on many occasions – an activity of this Government about which I have been concerned for some time, and that is the question of publicity. I heard the hon. Premier snort the word ‘propaganda’ the other day. Well, there is a difference between publicity and propaganda. Of the legitimate form of government publicity, the Departmental reports, the factual comments and the advertising of the great resources of our country – these are legitimate and I would say there is no limit to what you can do in putting them before the public. They are informative and constructive, and they tend to increase the public consciousness of government. But in addition to that, Mr. Speaker, there comes to us over the air comments by commentators paid by this Government, through magazine articles and through newspapers by writers paid by this Government and in many other ways, a continuous stream of supposed publicity, but to me much of it is so distorted in fact, so exaggerated in claim and so biased in favour of the Government that there can be no other name but propaganda attached to it.

Some Opposition Members: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Dunfield: And I ask myself why? I have lived in this province nearly 40 years and never before this Government came into power did I hear or see such a continuous campaign of vilification against any other Party, and I feel very definitely that there is something behind this. It reminds me of an oil painting – on the one side is a beautiful picture done all in highlights, if that is possible; but when you turn it over you are astounded at the seamy reverse side. This propaganda serves much the same purpose as a picture is used at times. Often we find a picture placed on a wall not because it is the best place to view it, but because it covers

February 23, 1954

a very serious defect in the structure; and that is what I think this propaganda is for.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, – and I feel strongly about this because it is not only a matter of government propaganda; it is something that touches closely some very dear friends of mine, and I could not let these statements go uncontested. I have here a section of the Toronto ‘Star Weekly’ of November 28 of last year, in which there is an article entitled ‘After 40 years of neglect a new life for the Métis’. It refers to the Green Lake Métis settlement and is written by a D. Fraser Symington and a Don Snowden . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: Oh, that’s why the question!

Mr. Dunfield: . . . and I can understand why two collaborated on this for it certainly required the combined capacity of two of the most fervid imaginations available to write such an article as this, and it was paid for by this Government. I asked in the House, the other day, if these men were in the employment of the Government, or if not, if they had been, and in what capacity, and at what remuneration. There was a D. Snowden from April 3, 1950 to 1953, and he was classified as a senior informational writer – I have never heard of such a thing in government until this Government came into power. And Fraser Symington was to assist the senior informational writer, and between the two of them, in the period that they were in the employ of this Government, they received \$13,563 . . .

Mr. Danielson: For writing the article!

Mr. Dunfield: . . . and add to that all the expense of travelling all over this country writing such trash as this! I am not going to read this whole article, but I am going to read from it a few items and give you the facts that can be corroborated in the files of this Government, because I believe the actual files are correct.

They begin by saying that, after 1880, when the buffalo had disappeared from the prairies and the way of livelihood of the natives had gone, these Green Lake Métis – that is also after the great land boom took place – “moved into the deep bush and there they squatted in utter poverty and misery; all were undernourished and most of them were diseased.”

Mr. Speaker, there was a settlement in Green Lake 90 years ago, before there were any farmers on the prairie, and it did not come from the south. It came from the north, because the early immigrants came in by the waterways that extend from Churchill to the McKenzie basin. And when he speaks of them all being undernourished and diseased, it so happens that the first permanent doctor in that country was my brother-in-law and with him I did a great deal of driving and got to know many of these people. Of course there was disease; but from the information that you can obtain in Green Lake today, the incidence of disease is infinitely greater now than it was in those days, because in those days there was no liquor available and today in Green Lake liquor runs like water. I could point out to you half a dozen places in Green Lake in which liquor can be purchased every day in the week and ’most every night. I asked my friends there: “Why don’t you take this matter up with the superintendent of the Department?” They said, “We have, but you know he suffers, at times, from attacks of complete blindness and deafness; he can’t see and he can’t hear anything.”

I asked why they didn't go to the police, and they said, "we have." They said, "We know it is there, we can see it; but if I made any move, in two days I would be moved out of here." Now, isn't that a state of affairs to have in this province! And I can ask any member of this Government to go up there and prove those statements, because they are absolutely true, and those people who seem to be naturally addicted to liquor use the most of their funds in liquor – not in the legitimate stores but with these leeches of bootleggers who rob them blind.

An Hon. Member: No wonder we have such high profits!

Mr. Dunfield: Then this article goes on to say:

"After 40 years of neglect the Government stepped into the picture, in 1940."

That is under the Liberal administration and I am very well acquainted with what took place then. Of course, according to these writers, there was no good done at all under the Liberal administration and they say:

". . . The Government made mistakes, like tossing in tens of thousands of dollars worth of horses, machinery and cattle. This was an expensive overestimate . . ."

I want you to remember the word 'expensive', because later on we have another word 'inexpensive' – I want you to see the difference between their ideas:

"This was an expensive overestimate of the Métis' capacity. They ate the cattle, left the machinery to rust in the still uncleared timberland and remained wards of the government."

In 1928, the hon. Mr. Parker, Deputy Minister J. J. Smith, mounted police and members of the Welfare department – and of course, we did have a Welfare department in Liberal Government, though speakers from this Government say there was never one until this Government came into power; they held a conference in Green Lake, in 1938, to see if they could possibly evolve some plan whereby these people might become re-established. For it was the white men moving north from the prairies in the 'thirties that destroyed their way of life.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: What date was the conference?

Mr. Dunfield: In 1938. These men went in there to try to re-establish these people to create some permanent system of re-establishment. And it was in that year or the year after, that there was laid down the basic plan upon which this Government has built the present institutions there. It was agreed to set aside 40 acres – **to give the people 40 acres** each as a subsistence farm and develop a central farm from which these people would be able to obtain, by working for it, the basic commodities of life. At that time, also, there were sawmills already in Green Lake, or around Green Lake, in which these people were working, and it was determined at that time that this area would be set aside for their use alone, and that this timber would

February 23, 1954

be conserved for them. And as far as those tens of thousands of dollars spent by the Liberal Government are concerned, it amounted to this (and you can look up your records for proof of it): there were some small bits of machinery in the way of plows, disc harrows and drag harrows; the idea was to give these people security of tenure – they gave them the property, remember. This present Government induced them to sell it back and then leased it to them. I know what those people desired – they simply wanted security of tenure and all they needed was a garden patch and a little bit of ground to plow up, so they might have feed for their horses. They were great freighters and traders and they had cattle too, but they needed horses. However, the Liberal experiment, according to this article, was a total loss. But the writer was very magnanimous. He says this:

“This lesson that you cannot make farmers by an Act of Parliament was probably worth what it cost.”

And I can assure you it was, because when you attempt an experiment like this you can only arrive at a permanently satisfactory decision by the cut and try method. I defy anybody in the province of Saskatchewan who is not acquainted with these people, to sit down at his desk and lay out a plan that will be satisfactory to them. You have to know the people and understand them.

These farms have now been changed into 33-year leases whereas before they had them for their own. I remember when Gideon Matte asked me (there were a lot of glaring faults in the plan), “What do you think of our plan?” I cannot say there what I thought, but I said: “You are giving these people nothing. They had this land before you or your father or grandfather were born. All you are doing is confining them to 40 acres.” And they have been confined since. I am going to quote what he says here about one of these 40-acre farms:

“This man used to live in a dirt-floored, sod-roof cabin with bush on three sides and the lake on the other.”

That is exactly where any of those people would live – by running water, sheltered by the bush where they could get their fuel and have the protection of the bush against the winds and they would have the lake or stream from which they could get their water and get a large part of their food supply.

Going back to that statement of undernourishment. I was in Green Lake in 1917 and camped at the Hudson’s Bay Post for four days while I was being equipped for an extended canoe trip into the north country, and I saw these people for the first time. They appeared to me to be well clothed for that country. They certainly seemed to be strong and robust people, and I can assure you they were the happiest people I had yet met. That country was full of fish, game, fur and wild fowl, with all the building timber they required, firewood, – all the things they needed for their way of life, the way in which they had lived for centuries.

I remember calling on one old gentleman, in 1938. It was during a political campaign. I called on this old gentleman about 10 o’clock in the morning. He was having breakfast and that breakfast (this was in those terrible years, the ’thirties) consisted of a whitefish that would weigh about

3½ lbs and a pot of tea, about a quart of tea. He was very courtly – these old Métis are very courtly people. They learned that from the Hudson’s Bay and the Missions. He very politely asked us to join him in his breakfast, and we just as politely declined and asked him to carry on, which he did; and, Mr. Speaker, when he had finished that breakfast, eaten that whole fish and drunk that whole pot of tea, he sat back and with a smile of complete satisfaction patted his stomach and said, “my that was a good breakfast.”

Mr. Speaker, it was his fish, his tea and his stomach; and who are we to quibble about his sense of taste or sufficiency? Yet, this article says “they were undernourished and all diseased.” Those people could live under conditions in which a white man could never live. When a third of the population of this province, by act of God, had to be sustained through a Liberal government, or the government of that day (any government would have done it), these people were able to carry on. They suffered. Of course they suffered compared to the days in which they had been prosperous; but they were in a better position to carry on than were their white brothers.

Now the story begins to grow, the real fantasy:

“After they had learned this lesson and lost all this money, the Government then (and this is referring to this Government) sent up a quiet soft-spoken young man (I needn’t quote his name, you have it on your records) to find this score and how to improve it . . .”

A quiet young man who had no business training, no administrative training, with a very mediocre education – I have known him since he was ‘that high’; a nice boy and I have nothing against him. He was sent up there to find the score and how to improve it; to solve a problem that has beaten the best brains of the Welfare Department of two governments. Now, listen to what this miracle boy did. It says here:

“. . . An early step was the setting up of a five-room school, run by the Roman Catholic Sisters, and that was the first sign of education in this district . . .”

That was followed by bulldozing a central farm out of the bush – the one that was done in 1938 suddenly faded into the distance, but was re-established under this young man. So it would appear:

“An infirmary was established and rigorous medical inspection followed. Then he organized a small lumbering operation . . .”

My heavens, there was a mill in Green Lake ten years before he ever saw it and from that mill on the banks of the Green River came hundreds if not several millions of feet of lumber and in that mill these people obtained their livelihood; and to the west of Green Lake and the south there were say mills from which came millions of feet of lumber. Lumbering has been the basis of their economy for thirty years – added to social welfare.

Now we are going to come to this 40-acre farm on which we started some time ago. This is good! The man in question moved out of the shack,

remember, at the lovely site by the lake, and they put him away off in the bush here; hewed 40 acres out of the bush and put him in a position so entirely foreign to these people that it nearly drives them mad. They don't stay there long. They are always in town or fishing and hunting, so it doesn't make much difference. However, "now as he steps out of his lean-to" (the kitchen door of his lean-to), "he can look over a 40-acre field of wheat . . ." "in a good year he clears \$200 and pays \$400 on his indebtedness to the Government!"

But that is not all, Mr. Speaker. This is the payoff: Soon it will be paid off and he will be a rich man by his standards." I will give you the story of this man in brief. In 1951, he had his first crop, as many of them did, and it was a beautiful crop. Remember, this is very light, sandy soil and it is only because the water table is very high that they can grow anything; and because they are going to grow a few heavy crops they shall soon take the sustenance out of that soil. However, only grain growing will be done, for, as you will see later, the Government does all of the operations. In 1951, he had a magnificent crop. It was so good that this Government had to send its publicity man – rush him right up to Green Lake with a camera. I expect there were three or four, because the north country is lousy with government officials at all times. And they wrote up a beautiful article on this crop, and they took beautiful pictures of it. In the first year they cut it with a binder; now they use combines. – Oh yes, they use modern machinery on these 20-acre lots! – And they took pictures and they printed this story in the 'Saskatchewan News' – this wonderful farming development in Green Lake. There was a picture of the superintendent with a bundle standing up to his chin.

Mr. Lopston: Those 20-acre plots!

Mr. Dunfield: – But, they didn't tell you, Mr. Speaker, that that crop was completely frozen! A few bundles were hauled in for feed and it was as worthless as grass; the rest lay on the ground.

Now, last year, he had an excellent crop and his net receipts were \$60. The Government does all the work, and that is fine, because he didn't do a thing about it anyway. Why go to all the expense of this great plan then? Why not give him \$60 to begin with? However, that is the method. This year this man has 350 bushels of grain – roughly, it may be five bushels out; but they are all about the same. I am going to read you the balance sheet of one of these farms – they are about the same; but his is the setup under which they are going to become "rich by their standards":

Revenue of 1952 crop	\$333.20
Less operating expenses	109.99
(seed, seeding and harvesting)	

And here I will give the Government great credit – for that is at about the rate of \$5.50 an acre for seed, seeding and threshing and the second year they will have to do cultivation. Five dollars and a half an acre is a gift, because I will say that any practical farmer in this Assembly, looking over these operations – the trails that become impassable when it rains; seeding and harvesting delayed up to three weeks because of the condition of the roads; the pulling of these big machines through the bush and the damage that is done to them and the delays – certainly \$5.50 is very, very low. Any practical farmer in this House today would say that it could not be done for

less than \$15 an acre, and Mr. Speaker, who pays the difference? You and I do; but, Mr. Speaker, you don't get anything out of it. I do – I get wonderful . . . (illegible) . . . support in this Utopia of this Government. Now we will see how it continues – \$333.20 less \$110 roughly, brings it down to \$223. A two-thirds share applied on capital advance of \$148.80 leaves a net balance of \$71.41, less hauling grain to the elevator, 35 miles to Meadow Lake, \$15.68. That brings the balance down to \$58.73 less taxes of \$4.94, leaving him a net balance of \$53.79 for which he received a cheque – and, as I say, it was too much because he did not do anything about it anyway.

There is another grand feature about these farms. This is a grand feature – we are jealous of these people: Taxes, \$4.94, for 40 acres! Mr. Speaker, in Meadow Lake, on our farm lands we pay, in many cases, over \$220 a quarter-section on the better part of our land, on our good rich black soil. Now this was a good year in which he was going to make a profit of \$200, but the year before – the same frozen year in which this other man had his crop frozen – this gentleman got a cheque for 76 cents. I think that will give you an idea of the productivity and the promise of these farms, Mr. Speaker.

Now here is something good – this is worth \$9,000; this is worth all they paid for it . . .

Mr. Lopston: Thirteen thousand dollars!

Mr. Dunfield: Well, for just the one man. Now he says:

“The picture at Green Lake has changed from the apathy and poverty of a decade ago. Now in many respects life there is about as idyllic . . . (isn't that a lovely word? That is the \$9,000 word) . . . as plantation life (now get this) in Carolina must have appeared to a Southern Colonel about a century ago.”

The only correct statement in the whole thing – from the point of view of the Colonel; but he does not tell you how the slaves felt, nor how the Métis at Green Lake feel about it. Isn't that a statement to put in the public press! And this is a good one. These people as I knew them in the early days were good workers. They were great freighters, hunters and fishermen. I had many of them working for me, and they were grand workers; but, today, after the welfare programme of this Government, it is quite a different proposition. They have lost a good deal of that self-reliance; but this is what he says about them, today:

“The Métis are an intensely competitive people. They tear into the job as if they had to saw the whole deck of logs in one day, and they vie with each other, each one trying to play out his partner.”

My, I would like to see them in such action as that! Now let me tell you this. Some years ago the Department of Agriculture sent to Green Lake a young stallion for the farm. The following spring it became sick and as there was, going around that year, a great deal of encephalomyelitis, commonly called sleeping sickness, the veterinary was called from Regina. I

February 23, 1954

shall never forget that beautiful day in May. It was a grand day, warm and sunny, and these people know how to enjoy the simple things of life. There, they have something that we have lost; they know how to enjoy the sun and the breeze and the air. And as the veterinary came into this yard he saw these employees really enjoying the day. Some were sitting with their backs up against the barn, some were lying on the ground smoking and gossiping; they were really enjoying life. He made no comment. He went into the barn and when he came out I asked him "has the colt sleeping sickness?" He said, "Yes." I said, "is he going to get better?" "Yes, but I don't think the men will."

Now I want to get back to this central farm from which all of these people are going to get so many of the good things of life. There was an opportunity in Green Lake to make that farm one of the most valuable assets of that community, for this Government had another good idea, one with which I was highly in accord. They built there a shelter to raise and educate the foundlings of that district, and I am strongly in accord with that because I have followed for years with interests and sympathy the efforts of two governments to assess and evaluate the real human potential of these people. They put up two good buildings, as they should have; I believe governments should always put up good structures. Now there would be, altogether, anywhere up to 35 people in those buildings – 15 children and maybe 18 or 20 of a staff; the staff generally exceeded the number of children. The cost ran up, they told me, to over \$500 a day before it was closed, but there was no need for that. That was an excellent idea but, as they used to say, "the execution was rotten." The cost of the administration of that unit could have been cut tremendously had this farm supplied them with milk, butter and eggs, (they did give them wood), and those basic needs because that would almost have equalled their requirements, with a very few extras. But every pound of that stuff was bought in Meadow Lake – fresh vegetables, bulk milk and canned milk, fresh meat and everything. Their truck was often on the road twice a day supporting that institution. The position of that Children's Shelter, in relation to the farm, was exactly the position of the country boy in school, listening to a lesson on diets in which the teacher was telling of the marvellous nutritive value of milk and advising these children, each one, to drink not less than a quart of milk a day. And then she turned to Willie, the farm boy, and said, "Look at Willie. Look how rosy his cheeks are, how strong and healthy he is; Willie must drink two quarts of milk a day, don't you Willie?" He said, "No, no ma'am; I never get to drink milk. We ain't hardly got enough for the pigs."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that was the position there. The farm could not supply them with milk because they didn't have hardly enough for the pigs – but they didn't have any pigs either! I went up to that farm seven years ago. I had heard that they had some good setting-out plants that my wife wanted, and I went up to buy some. I saw a new foreman as usual – they changed very frequently. If the administrator doesn't like his looks, they get a new foreman. I told him what I wanted, that I had heard he had some excellent plants. He was startled. He said, "I haven't any plants to sell; I haven't any garden." "My gosh" I said "no garden?" He said, "we haven't got time for gardens; we buy all that stuff."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the part to which I take strong exception, both from the standpoint of propaganda and from the standpoint of personal friendship with those people. From this article you would infer that the only

education they had in that country was what began with this Government in 1945. This new school was built four or five or six or seven years ago, I don't know for sure; but let me tell you the story of education in Green Lake. In 1890, Father Teston came to Green Lake – not from the south but from the Missions farther north. It is only seven or eight years ago that they celebrated their hundredth anniversary in Isle a la Cross, of church and school, and Father Teston came to Green Lake in 1890 to make his permanent residence there. He did not pick the best building in Green Lake; he took the only one that was available – a little shack 8 x 10 with the mud falling out of the walls and with a leaky roof, until his parishioners could build him a better building. In a short time they did build him a magnificent building – this one was 15 x 12, same log walls, same sod roof; but this was much better. This one had a basement, a cellar, and the Father lived in that, and stayed there for 30 years. He didn't live in that shack for 30 years, but he served that community for 30 years. Immediately – (just imagine that) in 1890, these people said to Father Teston, “would you start a school for us?” There were about 25 children of school age, the parents of whom had already had some primary education, obtained not in the south, but from the Missions farther north.

So, with a small grant from the Powers-that-were at the time, the Northwest Council, they built a school which Father Teston equipped himself, even to the pencils, out of his own pocket. That was the beginning of their education. He taught for many years there. In 1918 Green Lake was very fortunate in obtaining the services of a young returned man from Winnipeg who had just brought his bride from London straight to Green Lake, and he remained there for six years until he came to Meadow Lake where he has been at the head of our school every since. And I can say that there was never a finer gentleman, nor a better teacher ever graced the profession in this province than that man. Those people still speak of him with deep affection and deep respect. That is the kind of teaching they had for a while there.

But by now they required another school. And a second one was built, with small grants from the Government, and there was a third one built in 1936. Then, in 1938, there were no teachers available because there was only the \$300 grant for salary. I would like to speak some day, Mr. Speaker, on this question of this \$300 grant, or \$200 grant. It has been one of the greatest weapons that this Government has ever used in corrupting the minds of the teaching profession of this province, in inculcating in the minds of those young people that a Liberal government only paid two or three hundred dollars as salary. When the farmers could not pay their taxes nor feed themselves, out of the meagre source of income that the government of that day had, borrowed largely from Ottawa, they managed to scrape up somehow two or three hundred dollars for each of the school districts per year.

There were three schools built by 1938 but they could no longer get any teachers, and the Hon. Mr. Parker, then asked Father Teston if it would not be possible to get some Order of Sisters to teach. The Father said he would try, and it was 18 months before he could find an Order who could spare Sisters to go there. They did go in there, in 1940. They took over those three schools, one of which was nearly 50 years old, and they taught in those schools before the new 5-room one was built in 1947-48. They built a home of their own, and it was in that home in which this infirmary was built – not by this Government, but by the Sisters.

Mr. Danielson: They had better get another information writer!

Mr. Dunfield: I know what great services this infirmary rendered. I did quite a lot of contract work there – not for this Government, but for the Church; and I had occasion to use the services of that infirmary myself. I want to give you just one little instance of what that infirmary meant to those people. There was, in Green Lake at that time, a hardboiled little Irishman from the north of Ireland (from whence my own people came long ago); a dyed-in-the-wool little Orangeman who didn't fit in there very well, you know; but nobody else was concerned about it except himself. However, he kept the pot boiling; but he did send his children to school under protest even though the Sisters were teaching the curriculum as laid down by the Department of Education. But when his baby became sick the Sisters immediately took over. You know, Mr. Speaker, a child is a very important personage to the Sisters, and they were very concerned about this baby and they took it into that infirmary where they saw immediately that it was critically ill. They had quite a time convincing that father. However, they flew that child to Prince Albert where it received proper medical care, underwent a most critical brain operation and was returned safe and sound to its father in Green Lake. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that that is one little Irishman whose hard Orange shell broke forever, never to be re-formed.

In all probability, Mr. Speaker, I would not have discussed this question of propaganda at all except that I had read this article; but since it concerns many of my own friends and is so lacking in knowledge, so distorted in fact and so biased in favour of this Government, I could not let it go unchallenged. I happen to have three sisters of my own who, with their husbands, have served upwards of thirty years in the foreign mission fields of the United Church of Canada, so that I am not wholly unaware of the self-denials and personal sacrifices that missionaries of all churches make in carrying on their good work. To those of us who have lived in the north country for a long time, who know and appreciate the great services rendered by the missionaries in that country, we consider this article a calculated slight on those services, and we resent it very much, for I have known these missionaries who have served the natives so long and so courageously in the often bleak and barren regions of our north country, and I felt that something should be said about it.

I know it is customary, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion, and I do so. I do so from the bottom of my heart, because I feel that the mover and seconder of this motion are the only two men on that side of the House who really will back up their convictions and who believe in the concept and creed of their Party. But I do not pay the same compliment to the hon. member from Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Wellbelove) when he made slighting, belittling remarks about the former Leader of the Opposition in this House – a man whose shoes he could never fill. I resent very much the equally mean remarks and the gratuitous advice he offered to the new member from Estevan (Mr. Kohaly) that he should not become enmeshed or enmired in the Liberal dirt. It was hardly worthy of a man of his standing, and when the hon. member for Bengough (Mr. A. L. S. Brown) got up and repeated the same words almost exactly, then it became quite apparent that this slogan, “Do not become enmeshed or enmired in the Liberal dirt and mud-slinging” is the theme song for this session and the new member offers a very convenient target at which they can throw these verbal mudballs that they may go out over the air.

I would say to the hon. member for Estevan that though he sits in isolation, we have come to appreciate his qualities, and I am quite sure that,

in the immediate years ahead of us, the hon. member is going to display such qualities that there will be other young men and women following him into this House who will rapidly displace the seats of the members on the other side. Whether he agrees with us or not makes little difference to us. We are proud of him and we are glad to associate with him, and shall do everything we can to see that he will retain his own identity and his own integrity. We need no advice from the hon. member from Bengough as to his personal or public conduct.

I cannot support the motion.

Mr. W. S. Thair (Lumsden): I should like to associate myself with the former speakers in congratulating the hon. member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) and the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs) who so ably moved and seconded the Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I wish also to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Loftson) on his elevation to the leadership of the Liberal group in this House. In all kindness I might say that I presume the next logical move would be up to the Senate and my congratulations would be to him there. And my congratulations also, Mr. Speaker, to the two new members who have given such a good account of themselves – the members from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly) and Rosthern (Mr. Carr) respectively.

The Speech from the Throne made reference to the bountiful harvest of this past year in Saskatchewan. It stated that during the past few years Saskatchewan had some two billion bushels of wheat. Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, is a banner province of the Dominion in wheat production. The total production of wheat in Saskatchewan in 1953 was, I believe, 375 millions of bushels; the province of Alberta, 160 million; Manitoba, some 46 million. Thus the province of Saskatchewan has produced almost twice as much wheat as the combined total of Alberta and Manitoba.

According to the Statistics Branch of the Department of Agriculture, the total gross agricultural production in Saskatchewan in the past year of 1953 was about \$900 million; in 1952, the total gross agricultural production was, I believe, about \$1 billion. In spite of the record-breaking crops, however, Saskatchewan farmers in most cases at the present time are actually short of purchasing power. The fact is they have been unable to deliver more than about 5 bushels per acre (even less in many areas) of wheat, and they are not likely to market more because of the very large crops in other countries and loss of markets. They are not likely to market anymore than 8 bushels at the most before the end of the crop year.

The uncertainty of markets for wheat in particular in the future, places the farmer in a very precarious position in spite of seeming prosperity throughout the country. The recent statistics on the export of Canadian wheat overseas is very alarming indeed. The figures here show that the sales by the Wheat Board were down 62 per cent in December, 1953, as compared with the same month in 1952. In the past year the Canada overseas export sales of wheat have fallen by over 40 million bushels, or a total drop of 30 per cent, while the American Tariff regulations have reduced their purchases of wheat from Canada to a mere trickle: a drop of 12½ million to 2½ million, or a decrease of some 10 million bushels.

February 23, 1954

Wheat prices have dropped considerably so far in the present crop year, and the outlook for the future is not at all promising. With huge stocks of wheat on hand, the overseas market dwindling rapidly, it seems that most urgent steps should be taken by the Federal Government to relieve a serious situation. Various methods of promoting the sales of wheat might be considered, one of which was suggested by the C.C.F. convention in November 1953. It urged that outright gifts of grain be made available to the underprivileged nations of the world and such gifts be financed through the national treasury of Canada.

I might say further with regard to wheat prices, only recently the wheat price has been cut at Fort William at the Lakehead to \$1.79. This represents a drop in selling price of some 24 cents a bushel since August 1953. Saskatchewan farmers are now selling their wheat more cheaply than they did under the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement of 1946 to 1950. In terms of purchasing power the farmer, today, is only getting about \$1.39 per bushel for wheat No. 1 Northern at the Lakehead, compared with some \$2.00 in 1948.

It has also been urged – and I speak of a resolution moved by the C.C.F. members at Ottawa urging that some 25 per cent of the money now being voted for defence purposes be spent for food for starving peoples of the world, and various other types of assistance and equipment. I also believe that the Dominion of Canada should co-operate with other nations to a greater extent than at present in assisting in this great humanitarian duty and task of supplying food to the hungry people of Asia and elsewhere.

Sometime ago, when the Hon. J. G. Gardiner addressed the Food and Agricultural Organization in Rome, he spoke most glowingly of Canada's tremendous wheat surplus. It is hoped in western Canada that Mr. Gardiner would devise and suggest some plan whereby the Federal Government at Ottawa would take some action and accept some responsibility for greatly increased aid to the underfed peoples of Asia. It would also help to get rid of some of this surplus wheat. Actually the contribution that was made by the Dominion of Canada to F.A.O. the past year was only \$1 for every \$100 the Government of Canada spent on armaments and defence purposes.

While wheat prices have shown a considerable decline, cattle prices have taken a disastrous drop. According to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, the price in Winnipeg of cattle, the average of all grades, has dropped from \$27.40 per cwt in 1951 to \$14.40 in 1953, or a drop of some 46 per cent, or 13 cents a pound of the average of all the cattle that was sold, according to D.B.S. The volume of cattle offered for sale in 1954 is likely to increase. Even with increased domestic consumption, the surplus of cattle is likely to be much higher even in 1955, with the likelihood of a further disastrous drop in prices. The only possible solution lies in the hands, I believe, of the Government of Canada. The C.C.F. believes that a price support program should be developed to meet this emergency situation in Canada. The level of floor prices should be a flexible one, and should be worked out on the basis of parity-price formula.

I would just like to say a word about the Conservation and Development Branch of the Saskatchewan Government. I know something of its work in the southern part of the province. One of the more or less spectacular accomplishments is the Mortlach project where, out of an area of 9,200 acres, 6,290 have been successfully sown to forage, 5,000 acres of which was seeded to grass – alfalfa mixture, and yielded in the past year 6,250 tons of high

quality hay. I would like to draw to the attention of the House that this area was once all settled by farmers, but was entirely abandoned in the 'thirties. The reclamation work was begun in 1949. There are other projects, such as at Spangler, south of Govenlock, where 1,000 acres of poor, useless pasture has been irrigated and in 1953 had produced over 1,000 tons of hay. Under the Earned Assistance Plan of the Department of Agriculture, the farmers have assisted in the building of community pastures. Some 336,000 acres of grazing land is now operated and managed under the assistance of some 46 co-operative and municipalities. Considerable progress has been made by the Conservation and Development Branch in drainage in north-eastern Saskatchewan. While there may be some who might not agree, who know this country better than I do, or have seen some portions of it, the great problem up there is drainage which lies mostly in that area. In 1949 this Branch of the Department of Agriculture gave engineering services in building 100 miles of drainage ditches. I am sure that does not go far in that great area, but it is a good start. It also actually built nearly 100 miles of drainage and assisted in the building of roads and bridges.

In the field of irrigation the Saskatchewan Government, under the P.F.R.A., undertakes the building of small dams and reservoirs. Since 1949 it has built 245 miles of distribution ditches and 1,120 controlled structures. In these new areas being opened for settlement this drainage affects some 142,000 acres. There are more feed reserves in Saskatchewan at the present time than any time in the history of the province.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

HIGHWAY SAFETY

On the motion of the Hon. Mr. Fines, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Lloyd:

“Ordered, That a Select Special Committee be appointed to continue the inquiry, begun last Session, into the general problem of Highway Safety with a view to ascertaining what further steps may be taken to reduce the number of accidents on highways and roads of the province;

“the said Committee to report to the Assembly from time to time the results of its deliberations with such recommendations as it may deem advisable; to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses under oath; and to have referred to it all submissions, evidence, exhibits, records and reports received or made by the Select Special Committee of 1953;

“the said Committee to consist of the following Members, five of whom shall form a quorum:

“Messrs. Walker (Hanley), Begrand, Brown (Melville), Brown (Last Mountain), Douglas (Rosetown), Fines, Gibson, Kohaly, McCarthy, McDonald and Wahl.”

February 23, 1954

Hon. C. M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): At the Session last year, the Special Committee asked that the work be continued and the Highway Traffic Board during the year was given the assignment of making some study of this problem. We now have received from the Highway Traffic Board a number of proposals, some of which are being implemented in connection with the amendment which I have introduced to The Vehicles Act. Others again will be referred to the proposed Committee, and we do want the members of the Committee to feel perfectly free to bring forward any other suggestions. As to whether or not they should call for public or other organizations to bring in new evidence, that is a matter the Committee themselves will decide. I am sure that with the information which we have been able to collect this year, there will be a good starting point.

Now, I would urge that this Committee meet at the earliest possible moment, as the amendments to The Vehicles Act have now been sent to the printers, and I expect that they should be back within a day or two. As soon as they are returned from the printers, we will bring them forward to the House. The idea then would be to leave The Vehicles Act standing in order that the Committee will have a chance to see if there are any further amendments which they would like to introduce at this Session. But I would urge that the Committee meet with all possible speed.

TIME STUDY

On motion of Mr. Buchanan, seconded by Mr. Walker (Hanley):

“Ordered, That A Select Special Committee be appointed to continue the Time Study, begun last Session; the said Committee to report from time to time the results of its deliberations to the Assembly, with such recommendations as it may deem advisable; to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses under oath; and to have referred to it all submissions, evidence, exhibits, records and reports received or made by the Select Special Committee of 1953, and such further material and reports as have been received for made by the Inter-Sessional Committee appointed pursuant to recommendation concurred in by the Assembly on April 14, 1953;

“the said Select Special Committee to consist of the following Members, five of whom shall form a quorum:

“Messrs. Buchanan, Dunfield, Feusi, McCarthy, MacNutt, McIntosh, Stone, Swallow, Walker (Hanley), Willis (Elrose) and Mrs. Cooper.”

Mr. Niles L. Buchanan (Notukeu-Willowbunch): I want to make a brief statement in connection with that motion and I crave the . . .

Mr. Speaker: It is six o'clock.

Mr. Buchanan:

I know that, but I want to make this statement anyway. I expect you, Mr. Speaker, to treat this motion in the same manner you treated the Provincial Treasurer's and give me an opportunity to speak before you put the question.

However, I would like to say that the Select Special Committee which commenced the Time Study last Session, recommended to the Assembly that a Committee be appointed by the Government to continue the study after prorogation and report to the Assembly within the first 10 sitting days of the present Session. Pursuant to that recommendation, which was adopted by the House, on April 14, 1953, the Government appointed the members who had comprised the Select Special Committee to carry on the work during the inter-sessional period. All submissions and opinions received by the 1953 Committee were referred to this inter-sessional Committee, together with statistical analyses which had been made of the preferences indicated by some 177 representative groups and organizations.

Owing to difficulties of obtaining a quorum during the fall months and to the fact that new material received did not change the picture in any way, it was found expedient to defer calling the inter-sessional Committee together until immediately prior to the present Session. At that meeting the Committee reviewed the report of April 14, 1953, together with the new material received and decided that the evidence available was not sufficiently conclusive to justify any change from the position taken by the Select Special Committee of last Session.

Nevertheless, the Committee felt that progress had been made and was unanimously of the opinion that the study should be continued during the present Session in the hope that members might be able to devote more time to it than was possible in the press of business last year. The Committee also in its discussions explored a new approach to the problem from which it is hoped a pattern of preferences may emerge which might lead to some firm proposals for the Assembly to consider.

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