

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Twelfth Legislature
12th Day

Friday, February 26, 1954

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. Robert Kohaly (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to speak on a question of privilege. It came to my attention, last evening only, that in an article published in a publication called ‘The Commonwealth’ dated the 24th of February, on the fourth page thereof, one Bob Deverall reports on my ‘maiden’ address in this House as follows, in part:

“The least surprising statement of the session so far came from the only Tory member of the House, Robert Kohaly. He was opposed, he said, to Socialism in both theory and practice and will support the Liberals.”

It is the last five words on which I wish to raise the point of privilege.

The only thing that I intend to do is to draw to the hon. members’ attention the official transcript of my maiden address in this House. The last few lines of that address were as follows. I indicated that “I would assist and support the official Opposition in carrying out their duties of providing constructive criticism, and at times suggestions to the Government for them to accept and incorporate if they so see fit,” and that is to be my intention. On the other hand, I also made it clear, Mr. Speaker, at the time I entered the public life, that “whenever the Government announced policies which, in my opinion, were for the benefit of the province of Saskatchewan and for the betterment of the people of Souris-Estevan then I would support them.”

In the interests of fairness, honesty and good journalism I thought that I should be entitled to raise this point of privilege.

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Thursday, February 25, 1954, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Wooff for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Arnold Feusi (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, on rising to continue to debate, I wish, firstly, to compliment you on your high office and the order kept in this House. I know at times it must be an onerous task. I also believe it must be an onerous task for you to have to keep silence when the rest of us continually speak. It seems the practice in this House to throw a certain amount of brick-bats and bouquets at random, Mr. Speaker, and probably I should do likewise.

February 26, 1954

I would first like to compliment my desk-mate on the fine effort he made in this House a few days back. I believe he gave a very fine explanation of Indian Reserves, and I also liked his method of giving his Liberal federal member work to do at Ottawa. It was very well done. I would like to say that as a desk-mate he is very forthright and blunt, and he makes a very interesting companion at times.

I would also like to compliment the junior member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper). She gave a very good account of herself again this year, and I believe the ladies of this province have reason to be proud of her. It was my privilege, last night, to attend a livestock debating panel in the Forum in town, and I noted there that men were in preponderance. There were seven gentlemen on the panel and one lady, but she also gave a good account of herself, Mr. Speaker.

Well, to go across the way, our friend from Rosthern, in his maiden address, did the people on this side of the House a favour, Mr. Speaker, and I think he deserves commendation for his interest in the 'Regina Manifesto'. One little failing, though, Mr. Speaker: I believe that he should read it with a little more feeling. There are some sentiments in those words, and possibly there will come a time when those words will be regarded as a Magna Carta.

I also note, Mr. Speaker, that there are no lawyers in the Liberal benches opposite. Probably that accounts for the wandering in the wilderness that the Liberals are doing this Session. I know they are looking for a new Moses; they failed to find one this winter and they are putting off the time until next year. I note, though, that they have a new member on the other side, the Conservative member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly). I wish he was in his seat at the present time, Mr. Speaker. He is a lawyer and probably will be of considerable service to the Opposition. I hope he charges his Liberal friends liberally for the advice that he will be able to render. I would also like to warn him, as did the member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Wellbelove), about the little gap between the benches. It is not very much of a gap, Mr. Speaker. I believe a few years ago we did have another Tory in this House, and the gap was not wide enough. Some infection, or defection, took place, and we found our Tory member absent and on another bench.

I am delighted to state that last year in this House, I had considerable interest in the expressions given in this House by the present Leader of the Opposition. He is an old friend of mine. He comes from the same part of Saskatchewan, and probably we know each other from a long time back. In fact, Mr. Speaker, when I got my baptismal in the political field, it was probably under his tuition; back in the campaign of 1934, I recall I was his chairman on two occasions. It was probably his good advice that got me over on this side. I would also like to mention the fact that I was the chairman for the first Farmer-Labour candidate in that constituency, and probably the sentiments expressed at that time have put thoughts into the minds of many of our Saskatchewan people that they have followed out through the years, and the result has been the weight on this side of the House.

I remember on the Hustings of the early 'thirties some of the comments made. Some of them were quite strong in those days. I remember the comments made by the Liberals and most of them were directed to the

Tories. The comments most often expressed was ‘the Tories with their high tariffs and trade restrictions were the worst enemy of the west’. We can go on further, ‘the well-being of the west depends on free trade and markets’. That is an issue today, Mr. Speaker. We also remember R. B. Bennett and his attempt to ‘blast’ his way into the world markets. We also remember that his powder was wet. But the recollection I have of my friends across the way and their castigation of the Tories – the fact that they were the worst enemies of the week – makes me wonder. I never felt at that time that I would see the day I would be sitting in this House and, on looking across the way, would see my old friend, the present Leader of the Opposition, who at that time was a great man for free markets, in the same political bed with a Tory. I did not realize I would see that day, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lopton: — A lot better than being in a C.C.F. bed!

Mr. Feusi: — And I cannot help but think that if we did give the member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) a little red bonnet that we would have the personification of Little Red Riding Hood and the big bad wolf.

Now, the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield) in his delivery to this House a few days past, was quite determined and excited over the fact that some of our writers – so-called ‘mystery’ writers – were able to do such a good job contributing to the Saturday paper, the ‘Toronto Star’, and I just wonder if their writers do as well. I know that their mystery writer who had prepared the speech for the Leader of the Opposition, did not even have it delivered in this House – he had it thrown down. And I know that the Tory ‘ghost-writer’ did fairly well – he had his speech delivered in this House. I am sorry that my friend the Conservative member is not in the House at the present time, for the simple reason that his ghost writer and myself are old friends from the 1929-1930 Normal School sitting at Saskatoon. We also had our friend, Mr. Willis from Melfort, a member of the teachers’ college at that time. But, him being an old friend of mine, and the Tory leader of this House, and being twitted in the House quite often, and being very close in attendance on his lone chick, I could not help but think of a little verse that suits the occasion very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to read to this House a little verse that I remember back in the school reader that fits the situation very well. Here it is, Mr. Speaker, and this is a recitation I am giving on behalf of the little man from Estevan:

“I have a little shadow that goes in and out with me,
And what can be the use of him is more than I can see.
He is very, very like me from his heels up to his head,
And I see him go before me when I jump into my bed.”

I had occasion to do a little bit of building during the last year or two. Actually, I was elected on to the road allowance. I know building material and I feel that if the Tory member really wants to show that there is a barricade there between himself, or some difference between himself, and the Liberals that possibly with just a little \$10 investment in two sheets of veneer and a few bits of 2 x 4, he could put a little wall there. I mention veneer because I feel that if you just scratch a little under the skin, or scratch a little through the veneer, you will find that there won’t be too much difference. It is an issue in Saskatchewan,

Mr. Speaker. Why, the very word 'Conservative' means to conserve, and I feel that if the member from Souris-Estevan is going to make an accounting here in this House he will stick to his party's principles and attempt to conserve the dollars.

I remember a Conservative in the House here a few years ago, and he probably came in here under false pretences, because he felt, I think, that the word 'conservative' meant to conserve the Liberal party. I hope it does not happen at all to the new Conservative member.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned earlier that the Leader of the Opposition is an old friend of mine and I must say that on the hustings he is a very astute politician. I had reason to learn much from him and probably some day I shall regale this House with some interesting stories, but the time is not ripe.

I would like to make a comparison between our Premier and the Leaders of the Opposition that we have had through the past number of years. I mentioned that they were looking for a new Moses and have failed to find him. I could not help but notice, Mr. Speaker, that in this House when our Premier spoke when we had a full gallery, and they were very much interested right to the very end; but when the Leader of the Opposition spoke part way through his delivery the audience left. Mr. Speaker, it reminds me of the fact that the Leader of the Opposition has two tasks . . .

Mr. Cameron: — You want to watch it doesn't happen to you.

Mr. Feusi: — . . . one is Leader of the Opposition and the other is chambermaid to the Liberal party — and I say 'chambermaid', Mr. Speaker, because it seems every time he gets up to speak he empties the chamber.

And last, but not least, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that in the hustings of the 'thirties, when the new party amalgamation of labour and the farmer put forth a platform, they were much pooh-poohed and laughed at. I know the people in Opposition stated that you would never see the farmer and the labourer together. Well, today, Mr. Speaker, the representation on this side of the House disproves their contention, and I would like to say that last year in this House and this year, we have the moving of the reply to the Speech from the Throne given by a farmer and a labour representative. Many previous speakers did mention the fine addresses that they gave and they did both their constituencies and this House proud.

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, there is a problem that I am considerably perturbed about and it has to do with some of the freedoms that probably some of our forefathers have given much to give us at this time, and I just want to mention in passing a few items to call to the attention of this House, as others have, some of the dangers that are growing about. I want you to note, and I think this House has mentioned time and time again, some of the irresponsible, loose-lipped sneers that are cast around, and it has not done Saskatchewan any good, Mr. Speaker; nor has it done the party that has given it any good, because their representation has been getting smaller as the years go by.

I have in mind the beginning of it; for instance Rubbra, and oil. I know, Mr. Speaker, that members on the other side of the House have just as much right and did take up oil leases, as our friend Rubbra did. But they failed to go through with them. In fact, they out-Rubbra'd Rubbra! And this winking and sneering of other political parties for the word 'Communism'. Their idea is to keep people from thinking, Mr. Speaker: The working of the Wheel Pool and Communism. Then again we have the McCarthyism in the United States. We know that is being done in the United States, the sneering at not only Socialists, but Liberals as well. Liberals who have been well respected in the United States are under the sneer at the present time. We know the sneer to Mr. Pearson of the Federal House by the McCormicks who are followers of the McCarthyites in the United States. We know of the fact that actually two Progressive-Conservatives college students were jailed in the United States because customs people did not know what the word 'progressive' meant. Yes, and it seems as if there is a trend on this side of the line to probably shie away from that word 'Progressive'. I understand that the Progressive-Conservative party in some parts of this nation and also the Liberal-Progressives are going to drop the word 'progressive'.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — They might as well.

Mr. Feusi: — It is possible that it had no meaning in the first place to them; but if they are going to try and discourage people from thinking as free people, then I say this warning has not been for nought, Mr. Speaker.

Recently we had a Liberal convention in the city of Regina, and there were a few statements made. The President of the Liberal Federation of Saskatchewan, Dr. Partridge, did mention a few items in connection with northern development and certain members in this House have also mentioned the need for northern development. The hon. member for Cumberland, I believe, has made a very strong appeal both in the House and out of the House in a more practical way, I think, than these other members have on the other side of the House. I mentioned, last year, that I had flown to the north in the Spring of 1945 and dropped off at Lac la Ronge with the then Minister of Natural Resources, and I had a chore to do in connection with a field officer. He would not believe that I had the Minister of Natural Resources along at that time. And that is an indication of how much interest was taken by the previous governments before the time of 1944. There had not been too much interest in the north; but, of course, that is no excuse at all for lack of northern development. I want to point out that there has been tremendous northern development. That great highway to Lac la Ronge is a fine thing. I know there is a necessity for further northern development, but we in the South here have a heavy population and there is a shortage of good highways and good roads. Mind you, we have more highways and roads than any other province in Canada; but as long as there is that great need and there is a small population in the north, those of us from the south are going to have to stand by our people. But, if the Federal Government came across with their fair share, we would probably not be averse to more northern development.

I would like to point out in connection with the Flin Flon route that my friend from Nipawin spoke about, if we could get equal help to

what the Manitoba government got (and we should be getting it), we should continue the development of a highway to the north-central part of Saskatchewan. In the same way, Mr. Speaker, I recall on the hustings two years back, one night I went to a show and saw the Minister of Defence of Canada present a gift to Italy – armaments, \$40 million, as a present. We do not know whether it will be the Fascists or the Communists that are going to return those armaments against us, yet the people of Saskatchewan, who have been asking for a dam for many years, are going to have to pay, and pay their share to the very last cent. I think it is high time that the people of Saskatchewan look into these matters and realize what the Liberals really are doing to Saskatchewan.

My friend, the member for Athabasca (Mr. Ripley) did in his address mention that we should be in the railroad business. Mr. Speaker, that is far beyond the budget of this province, and I know that a railroad was promised to the people in the northern part of my constituency 40 years ago. I've got a series of small hamlets there that should have railroad connection. There is a tremendous farm trade which finds its way to the railroad and to the highway just through market roads. I shall speak more about that in a few minutes.

I would like to turn to Pelly constituency and some of the problems I would like to reiterate again those that I have mentioned last year, and probably mention a few new ones, but in so doing I want to connect it with some of the sentiments expressed in this House a few years back. I did peruse some of the Journals and I have a few points here. An amendment moved to the Throne Speech by Mr. Tucker, a few years back, and I want to point out how it affects my constituency. The amendment reads:

“That the Government has failed to establish an adequate programme of rural electrification.”

Mr. Speaker, this year my constituency, if all goes well, will probably have around 300 farm homes electrified, in four blocks. Two years ago, we had two lines extended across the constituency from east to west, or west to east to the Manitoba boundary. This year we are getting farm blocks put in. That is a tremendous advantage and a tremendous step forward. When I look back and recall the hustings and the advice that the Liberals of that day gave to the effect that we would never get power in our part of the province (you'd have to get a Liberal government in and they would get power for nothing), I would like to point out, that of course, they were set back on many occasions. I would like to compliment those supporters of mine who had diligence enough to go out to Liberal meetings and trip them up and make them speak the truth. In fact, they were labelled 'storm troopers' at one time, but they were probably instrumental in electing me and I feel that mentioning in this House the importance of speaking the truth on the hustings is an important part of democracy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned some 300 farm homes. There are difficulties. There are going to be delegations into Regina possibly. The finances are not too available at the present time, and I hope that these blocks do go through. I would like to hear publicly praised not only the members of the Power Commission who have laid out these plans,

but those citizen who are working with them. They are taking a great deal of their time going in and out to the city, altering plans, interviewing people. I know of one occasion where the man did not have the finances to meet the small obligation in order to sign up. His neighbour knew of it, knew that he was feeding a few steers; the neighbour took them off his hands and he has the funds to go ahead.

I would like to make a comparison between the Liberal record and the present record in Saskatchewan on the power line. Up to 1944 the Liberals had been in power, as the member for Nipawin has mentioned, since 1905, with a little gap in between, and, of course, they do not like to be reminded that Manitoba was in just about as long and that they had done quite a worthy job there. In Saskatchewan, they did not, for somehow or other, we had renegade Liberals in here that did not get jobs done. In that period of time, when we took office in 1944 there were some 135 farm homes electrified. That is over a period of about 40 years and it works out roughly to a little under four farm homes a year. Now, in my constituency I am getting 300 farm homes in one year. Even if the Liberals had carried on government and had improved, say they had improved two times or two and one-half times as much as they were in 1944, and if they had electrified 10 farm homes in a year, my people in Pelly constituency would have had to wait 30 years, and with 18,000 farm homes electrified in Saskatchewan, the people of Saskatchewan would have had to wait 1800 years. Mr. Speaker, that is longer than the most ardent Liberal would like to wait, and I am happy to see a lot of them are finding it out and not waiting for free power.

Another item, Mr. Speaker, in the same amendment to the Throne Speech debate proposed by Mr. Tucker:

“That this Government had failed to either fairly distribute expenditures on the highways of the province or obtain value for money expended in highway construction.”

And all they had to do to find out whether there was fairness in the distribution was to make a comparison. I have the figures here, Mr. Speaker, but I don't intend going into them. We have the figures and we can go from constituency to constituency. I know in my own constituency, we had a fair chain of gravelled highways, come 1944. Mind you, they were old ones; some of them built back as far as 1923 and 1924. Some other constituencies had very little gravel. The neighbouring constituency of Canora did not. I believe they have had considerable help from this Government. They have gone ahead probably in excess of Pelly. But this Government has seen fit to give help to those who did not have the help in the past, and have sort of equalized things. But, Mr. Speaker, those people who were fortunate to have highways built in recent years have good modern highways. Those of us who have highways built in the years gone by, some of them were good in their time, but they are worn out now, and I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Highways that in this House, last year, I mentioned that my chain of highways in Pelly constituency were old highways, that they had given us good service, but that I was afraid, come one year of inclement weather (and we had it last year, Mr. Speaker) we would have problems. We are having problems, and I do hope that I don't have to twist his arm too much to get help for this summer, Mr. Speaker.

Time is going on and I should like to mention a matter here of assistance to the provinces. It is just short figures, Mr. Speaker, and I know we are going to have a resolution presented to this House on this matter. The Opposition like us to do things beyond our financial capacity, and I would like to point out to them again that, if we had fair help, we could be doing a lot more than we are doing at the present time. I would like to compare what Washington is doing for trans-American roads and what Ottawa is doing on trans-Canada roads. Washington, in 1952, gave to the States on trans-American roads a little more than half a million dollars - \$554 million, to be exact. We in Canada that year got \$12.8 million from Federal funds. Now, our population in Canada is one-tenth that of the United States. If Ottawa was as fair to the provinces as Washington is fair to the States, we would have got one-tenth of what the people of the States got from their Federal House. We should have had \$54 million, Mr. Speaker, or \$55.4 million; we only got \$12.8 million. I would like my friends opposite to play that on their horns for the rest of the Session.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as to the immediate needs of the constituency – I mentioned highways; I mentioned power. We are in need of help on market roads. I mentioned it, last year. I am sorry that the programme is not lined up for us as yet. We have to wait until the Commission has a plan and can come through with some directive. I believe they should have, by this coming summer, plans that would affect the entire province. I believe some of us had an opportunity of seeing what is being done across the boundary in the United States. Those plans, Mr. Speaker, are a type of plan that we will have to probably go into here in Saskatchewan. But we have needs in some of our rural constituencies. We know before hand that those roads have the traffic on them, and are beyond the ability of the municipality to cope with themselves. I have had aid from the Government, and I hope that the aid does continue until we have a master plan for the province.

Another problem I have, Mr. Speaker, is the matter of a hospital. We had a hospital vote in the northern part of Pelly constituency that went across into the northern part of Canora constituency. I believe that the vote was tied together with two hospital districts. I know that my hospital district in the northern part of Pelly constituency is much more urgent than the one proposed at Invermay that was tied to the one in Pelly constituency. I would like to see action shortly. I understand the Canora hospital district is proposing another vote this Spring. I hope it goes through. There is a great need for expanded hospital service for the northern part of Pelly constituency. We have an area of two municipalities that stretches from 25 to 30 miles from both the railroad and the highway, and it is very densely settled. I would urge the Minister to take it in his hands to carve out such a district if the vote fails, or there is dissatisfaction, this coming summer. I believe something workable can be made. If not, Mr. Speaker, next year, should I come back to this House, I would like to tell this House some of the experiences of the little country doctor up in that area. I am not an old-timer, but some of you who are old-timers will remember the experiences of the country doctors of the past. We haven't too many of them left. This gentleman is a young man, but he is doing a very able job; I believe he deserves every support and I know the community is behind him.

Mr. Speaker, before leaving the microphone to my neighbour, I would like to leave a thought with this House. Last year I had the privilege of speaking on fertilizer, and also on railroad problems. This year I would like to speak on another item. A few evenings ago we were the paid guests of an organization interested in conservation of water and conservation of our soil resources. I did not get up to speak at that time, but I would like to bring to this House a matter that I am very familiar with. At the present time, I believe, the Fish and Game League is sitting at Moose Jaw. I have been a member of the Fish and Game League for some years and probably some people have an erroneous idea of what the Fish and Game League stands for, and some of the principles and ideas of the members behind it. There are many of us in the Fish and Game League who are conservationists. We believe that Canada is not the complete Canada without her wild life, her nature, natural resources and so forth.

I remember going back on the train from one convention and I sat opposite a delegate who was a farmer, but a very well-read farmer, and he told me at that time that we were going to be into trouble again if the farmers don't learn to lift the wind. And of course that remark went over my head. I did not ask him at all what it meant, but it stuck in my mind and probably a few months later it came home to me what it meant. During a tremendous storm, leaving Kamsack by team one time, I had to let the team find their own way. I had to get back to my post in the Park, and we had some tremendous drifts in the highway, some of them 10 and 12 feet in height, and we couldn't follow the highway. I know the storm smoked over the drifts and we were practically blind, but the horses knew their way home. As soon as I reached the 5-mile distance from town and got into a road allowance that had a small growth of young timber on either side of the road, probably only 20-feet in width and 20-feet in height, driving in there I drove in the calm. The storm was going overhead. The little fringe of trees had lifted the wind.

Then I went back to thinking about what had happened out in the Park, through the years. I recall an average fall where the main lake, Madge Lake, was open to the sweep of the wind, probably subject to evaporation or to a loss of moisture of eight inches to a foot, whereas the small lakes that were enclosed by hills or a good growth of timber, where the wind-sweep couldn't get at it, at the most in the heat of the fall they probably lost only about two inches by evaporation. My contention is that the evaporation caused by the windsweep, by the wind getting right down to the soil, must be terrific and there must be more attention given to the breaking of the windsweep. I know that there is going to be more and more thought given to this.

Our power programme is asking the people to get their fence-lines moved in under the power poles so we have a snowfence there, a hedge, probably, to keep the snow and the moisture on the land rather than on the road. We have snow-plough problems in winter. We do not need to have half as much as we do have if there was a little more aggressiveness in the planting of hedges and the moving of the fences from the road allowance so that a natural or wild hedge could grow up back some distance from the road. I know that there is some consideration being given to this by the Department of Agriculture, and also, by the Federal people, because I do know that, in the meeting a few nights ago, the Superintendent

of the Forestry Station did call that to our attention. I should like very much, as a conservationist, to see more of the roadsides of Saskatchewan developed and made scenic, because it will bring value in soil moisture, the retention of our soil and lowering of the costs of road building, snow removal, and what-have-you to this province.

Before sitting down, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point to an article in (I believe it was) yesterday's 'Leader-Post', "Train Lost in Dust in United States", and I shall just read a small part of the article:

"Drought seldom is dramatic. Ordinarily it spreads like a silent cancer, but in southeastern Colorado today it is a tangible, fearsome force. You feel the grit between your teeth, between your fingers, in your eyes, even though it may not be blowing. You begin to itch all over with it as you watch mile after mile of fences buried in blown dust and sand; telegraph poles and farm equipment banked high with the powdery stuff that kills rich farm land. The further south and east you go, the fewer furrows you can discern in what was ploughed wheat land a week ago."

I would like to point out to this House that, in the north, the denuding of our farm for timber and bush is taking place. Our land there is not going to stand what the south has taken. We have a different type of soil, a lighter bush soil. It is not going to take the punishment that we have given the southern soil.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I believe I have overreached my time. I would like to support the Motion.

Mr. H. Begrand (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate on the Speech from the Throne, first I would like to extend my warmest congratulations to the mover of the motion, the hon. member from Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) and the hon. member from Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs), seconder of the motion, for the wonderful job they did.

Also at this time I would like to extend my congratulations to the hon. member from Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) for being chosen by his colleagues and his Party to become the Leader of the Liberal Party in the House and the Leader of the Opposition. It is a position of responsibility and I must say, Mr. Speaker, up to the present time I have been somewhat disappointed at the contribution that the hon. Leader has made to this House. But realizing that he is new in this high position, I am very willing to forgive him at the present time, and I will ask Providence to give him the proper guidance and wisdom that from now on he will use his high position as the Leader of the Opposition to represent the best interests of the people of the province of Saskatchewan and this Legislature.

My congratulations also must go to the two new members in this House, the hon. member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly) and the hon. member from Rosthern (Mr. Carr), for having been successful in their election. I must congratulate the member from Souris-Estevan for the good contribution he made to this House in his speech of a few days ago; he made a good job. Since, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from Souris-Estevan is the first Conservative member elected to this House since 1934, I think he deserves my further congratulation for that. However, maybe I should reflect some on that, because I understand, some years ago, the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) was elected on a Conservative ticket . . .

Some Hon. Member: — You are kind of off dates there.

Mr. Begrand: — It was immediately after his nomination that a high pressure courtship had been going on between the hon. gentleman and the Liberal Party, and shortly after his election the hon. member from Moosomin became the bride of the Liberal Party and it appears to have been a very successful union because they have been sleeping together very happily ever since. I do not wish that misfortune to befall the hon. member for Souris-Estevan.

I am sorry that I am unable to pay the same homage to the hon. member from Rosthern. His contribution in his first speech in this House insofar as constructive criticism is concerned was absolutely void of any foundation whatsoever. I was not surprised, of course, to hear the same old line of his ex-leader, Mr. Tucker, expounded by him in this House — C.C.F., Socialism and Communism; but he said this, Mr. Speaker. He said that the people of his constituency who had been consistent supporters of the Liberal members (which is true), believe in helping themselves; there are too many people asking the Government to help them, he said. I would gather from that statement, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member from Rosthern insinuated that since the people of his constituency, consistently since 1905, supported Liberal members both in the House of Commons and this Legislature, they were in a position that they do not require help from the Provincial Government. I am very sorry to have to tell this House that the hon. member from Rosthern knows better than that. He has been the secretary of a municipality in his constituency for many many years, and the constituency of Rosthern, like many other constituencies, have people who deserve some assistance; and I wish to add, Mr. Speaker, that the municipality of which the hon. member from Rosthern is secretary is receiving from this Government more social assistance than any other municipality in the province of Saskatchewan, and he knows it. I challenge him to deny that statement.

Mr. Carr (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I did not say . . .

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

Mr. Carr: — Yes, Sir. I did not say that the people in Rosthern constituency did not require assistance. I said there were many things that people asked the Government for that the people of Rosthern provided for themselves. I did not say that they did not get any assistance, or ask for assistance.

Mr. Begrand: — And I will add this, in addition to what I have already said. I would say that the constituency of Rosthern, due to some unfortunate land conditions and so on and so forth, are receiving more social assistance from this Government than any other constituency in the province of Saskatchewan. And I am also going to say to the hon. member that the people who are receiving that aid have been and are still being told that that aid is paid entirely by the Federal Government, which is a completely misleading statement to the people of that constituency. I know what I am talking about. I know that constituency as well as my own, and that is not correct.

Now I do not mind anybody criticizing this Government. We need criticism, honest, constructive criticism; but I do not like any member who goes back to this constituency — and this is not directed to the new member here; it has been going on for a long time in that constituency — and says that all the aid they receive there comes from the Federal Government.

Mr. Loptson: — That's not far wrong.

Mr. Begrand: — I can quote the figures if the gentleman wants to know them, too; because I have them here.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to turn to some problems closer to home and surely the people of the province of Saskatchewan and my constituency of Kinistino, which I have the honour to represent in this Legislature, will be very appreciative of the many items of importance which are contained in the Speech from the Throne. Following the policy of this Government, the Speech from the Throne contains many items of consolidation and gradual expansion as we promised the people of this province, in 1952, that we would do. Our highway programme again this year; an expansion of the highway works programme throughout this province. I can tell the people of my constituency that I hope, this year (we were by-passed, last year), we have our share of that works programme. The Minister will be announcing his programme in the near future, and I hope that in his programme he will have a little place in his heart for the Kinistino constituency.

I am also very glad to note in the Speech from the Throne that the Government is recognizing and has for many years, but it is coming to a more definite conclusion regarding the grave problem of main market roads in the province of Saskatchewan. The engineering staff of the Department of Highways, at the present time, are busy on a very comprehensive main market road grid and the process of formulating it for the province of Saskatchewan, which we hope by the end of this year will be submitted to the municipalities.

I would like to say a word or two, (my time being very limited) on main market roads, Mr. Speaker. The main market road problem in this province is a very big and very urgent one. That condition has been mainly brought about, I would say, during the past 15 years, and during that time some drastic changes have taken place in our farming methods. I would say that, 15 years ago, our method of farming in a large part of this province was mostly horses and labour. Today, we have changed from that method to almost 100 per cent highly mechanized methods of farming. This has brought about a tremendous increase in

motor vehicles of all sorts using the roads. The roads which were built within this period were not built to a standard which can sustain the heavy, increased traffic and increase in heavy loads.

During the past few years many municipalities have adopted a standard of better roads and some gravel, on a very limited scale indeed, for this type of road is very expensive and, due to the great increase in cost of road machinery, labour, repairs and so on, it has become next to impossible for most of the municipalities to cope with the tremendous problem of main market roads. I am also firmly convinced that the rural people of this province are very much justified in their demands for a better setup of roads; after all, so far as the rural people are concerned, that is one of their main services.

Some people may say, "Well, if you want those roads, just raise your taxes." That is a common thing we hear all over this province from certain people who are not too well acquainted with the facts. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a word to say about that. If the municipalities of this province had a field of taxation entirely to themselves, they could provide a first-class secondary highway system throughout this province without help from anybody else; but the field of taxation is shared by other bodies as well. The land taxation field is shared by the schools, is shared by union hospitals, is shared by telephones, and so on to the point where the land tax, today, is somewhere in the neighbourhood of 50 mills, and in many municipalities it is beyond that. My opinion is that land tax in this province has reached its peak in the majority of cases and in some cases is already too high. Due to the blundering policy of the Liberal Federal government over the past years in being a contributing factor in losing all our overseas markets for grain and farm products – again the announcement of the wheat payment, yesterday, of 9½ cents, which is 1½ cents less than 1951; Mr. Howe announced, today that he could not say when the interim payment of 20 cents would be allocated on the 1953 crop – the downward price of our cattle and so on, I hope I am wrong, Mr. Speaker, but I predict that the agricultural economy is still going to deteriorate very much and very fast and, therefore, instead of an increase of taxation on the land of this province, a reduction of taxes is about due.

The municipalities of this province are very appreciative of the fact that this Government has done a lot for them. For instance, in 1944 when this Government took over, the contribution of the former Liberal government was \$367,000 to the municipalities of this province, including bridges. Today, in 1954, that contribution is away up over \$2 million by this Government; but irrespective of all the additional help which has been greatly appreciated by the municipalities, the fact remains that this problem has got so big and so pressing that I am asking the Government to give very serious consideration, as soon as possible to increasing in a very substantial manner the assistance to municipalities for main market roads.

My time is up, or very close to being up. In conclusion I would like to reply to the hon. member for Nipawin (Mr. MacNutt) for the wonderful speech he made yesterday, and also for the wonderful expression of faith he told us his Party contributed to this province from 1905 to 1944. And he told us, yesterday, that when this Government came in that all the services we are enjoying today, except a few which we have extended to,

were handed to us on a silver platter. He put it in a very nice way and it sounded very good; but let us just look at that platter for a moment and see how much there was in it.

As far as I recollect, Mr. Speaker, all the platter contained was a long chain of broken Liberal promises from 1905 to 1944 which had never been accomplished. For instance, we inherited a dilapidated highway system of some 8,000 miles which was practically gone; no good blacktop; a very poor telephone system; 127 farms electrified; education facilities at the lowest level; nothing in the north; no health programme; no free cancer treatment; hardly any care for the aged people; social welfare very poor; hardly any exploration in the north or development in the north; no gas or no oil, in 1944. And yet, today, after 10 years . . .

Premier Douglas: — And \$70 million in seed grain debts.

Mr. Bégard: — Oh yes, that was on top of the platter; that's all there was on the platter. Today, we can go back to the people of Saskatchewan, not with a silver platter, Mr. Speaker, but with a gold platter overflowing with all the promises the Government has made fulfilled 100 per cent, and a lot more added to it.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding, it is needless for me to say that I am supporting the motion.

Mr. D. Zipchen (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity at this moment of passing my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, for their excellent presentations.

I also offer my congratulations to the Leader of the Liberal party, who succeeded Mr. Tucker, and that is the hon. member for Saltcoats constituency (Mr. Loptson). I think there is a great deal of personal satisfaction in life to get such a promotion instead of a demotion.

Also I want to convey my congratulations to the two new members on the opposite side – the members for the Rosthern and Souris-Estevan constituencies. I believe that both members will discharge their duties in an honest and sincere way, not only in the House but to the people of their respective constituencies.

I am rather worried in respect to the next provincial election; that is to say, I am afraid that the Liberals may lose out to the Progressive Conservative party. According to the last year's by-election records, the result was dog-eat-dog. These are my predictions. I hope my prophecies will come true; I may not be too much out at that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two about Redberry constituency which I have the honour to represent. My constituency is predominantly an agricultural constituency: good land is used for farming purposes and poor land is used for livestock. There are a number of lakes in Redberry constituency with fish galore, beautiful beaches, such as Meota Beach, Cochin Beach, Redberry Lake Beach, Meeting Lake Beach and Sandy Lake Beach, which is about 25 miles north of Hafford. This lake is surrounded by spruce and jackpine only. I would like to extend an invitation to all tourists to spend their holidays in Redberry constituency, especially good fishermen.

There are also two Indian reserves in Redberry constituency, one on the east side and one on the west side. The natives are hard workers and are contributing much to the development of this country. Some of these boys served in the army; they have shown and proven their loyalty to their country and the Queen.

There are about 10,000 people in Redberry constituency of different racial origin, who are held in high esteem. I have had the opportunity to associate with my people on many occasions, and I sincerely respect their traditional way of life, regardless of their political affiliation or religious denomination.

In the 1952 provincial election we had a 10-point programme; but if I recall correctly, when I made my maiden speech, last year, in this House I presented my programme for Redberry constituency which was more than double – but I had only one project completed last year, and that was the road south of Blaine Lake to the ferry. This road had been gravelled in 1952 and the approaches were built in 1953. Therefore, on behalf of the citizens of Blaine Lake town and district, I want to extend my thanks and sincere appreciation for what has been accomplished in the eastern portion of Redberry constituency.

I also wish to extend my sincere thanks to P.F.R.A. officials here in Regina for the work they have done in Redberry constituency. They have spent a considerable sum of money, building fire-guards on the west side of the Royal community pasture which serves the purpose of a road for travelling on, as well as a fire-guard protection for their property; and at the same time the people of Mildred are able to go straight south to Hafford and thus direct to Saskatoon via the Cee Pee bridge.

We have had a Royal Commission making a study of rural life, and the main reason why people are drifting to towns and cities is just on account of poor roads and, of course, through centralization of schools. We are in the stage of a modern way of life; the horse-and-buggy days are gone forever. During the depression nobody went back to oxen or the walking plow, and nobody will go back to horse farming if we get another depression or recession. I have a copy of the Saskatoon ‘Star-Phoenix’ dated Tuesday, February 24, 1953, and they are in accord with me, and I want to thank them for such a nice write-up. I quote from their editorial:

“For a solid 15 minutes Mr. Zipchen sprouted resolutions, letters, minutes of meetings and other similar items, all of which demanded roads, roads and more roads. When he got through even the C.C.F. were chuckling. The only way in which Highways Minister, Jack Douglas could hope to fill Redberry’s requirements would be to chuck his \$75 million highway programme out the window tomorrow and spend the next five years blacktopping the entire constituency of Redberry from end to end.”

I think it sounds all right. I am quite satisfied and the people of Redberry constituency would be too. In 1953, we got the lion’s share of the \$75 million, and the municipalities benefited in high equalization grant; and I hope that in the 1954 highway programme we get our share in money and roads, because Redberry needs both badly. I have such a large constituency and so few good roads that even our very worthy Premier got lost when he tried to keep an important engagement in one of my communities. I am therefore quite certain that he will

use his influence in the Cabinet to see that Redberry constituency receives a fair share of consideration in the forthcoming road-building programme. After all, we would not want to lose our Premier; we might have a very hard time replacing him – in fact I know we would.

The council of R.M. of Redberry No. 435 took the initiative in arranging for a municipal conference to be held in the town hall at Hafford on Saturday, August 15, 1953, at 1.00 p.m. The purpose of this conference was to solve mutual problems. Such problems as the building, gravelling and maintaining of main grid roads, co-operative purchase of large road machinery, the employment of veterinarians, the establishment of parks and other things were discussed. The following municipalities were represented: Nos. 405, 434, 435, 464, 467 and 495. All present were: Hon. L. F. McIntosh, the Minister of Municipal Affairs; Mr. W. M. Stewart, Deputy Minister of Highways; Dean F. C. Cronkite; Mr. D. Rose, Department of Highways; Mr. Fisher of the Municipal Advisory Commission; Mr. Blakeley, Municipal Inspector; Mr. W. B. Baker of the Royal Commission on Rural Life; Mr. Lang of the P.F.R.A.; Mr. Noble of S.A.R.M.; Mr. Kramer, Mr. Larsen, M.L.A.'s, and myself. Mr. D. J. Semko acted as chairman and Mr. W. J. Burak acted as secretary. Dean Cronkite, in his general remarks, pointed out that there are many problems facing municipal men and he would listen with keen interest to any suggestions for their solution which may be made at this meeting. Mr. Baker conducted a questionnaire on rural life. The Hon. L. F. McIntosh spoke at some length and explained that the municipal boundaries had been established during the horse-and-buggy days at which time a rural municipality was considered to be a very large one. Four-horse outfits were considered to be very large municipal road-building equipment. To meet today's problem under present conditions requires considerable adjustment. There are commissions studying the many problems and they will recommend possible solutions. At this meeting the following resolutions were passed:

“That we compliment the Department of Highways on the policy of making the engineers available to the municipalities and that we urge the development of that policy;

“That we set up a committee to deal with common municipal problems;

“That the committee consist of one representative from each of the municipalities represented at this meeting.”

Again, on November 10, a similar meeting was held at Hafford, with nine Reeves and councillors present. Also there were: Mr. R. H. Stephens, from the Department of Municipal Affairs and Mr. D. Rose, from the Department of Highways. The meeting resolved that a representative municipal group would be entrusted with the expenditure of government grants and public funds for the construction and maintenance of main market grid roads, and were also qualified to recommend on matters pertaining to market grid roads. It was unanimously agreed that all grid roads could not be built in one year. It was also unanimously adopted that this committee recommend to the Commission, to the Department of Municipal Affairs and to the Department of Highways that all government grants for 1954 for the municipalities in question be expended on the construction of the selected grid roads.

It was also unanimously agreed that each of the municipalities spend their whole 1954 government grant on the construction of the selected grid roads running through their municipalities. The following are the two grid

roads decided upon as the most necessary by all present: the road from Leoville south to Spiritwood (but it is hoped that the Department of Highways will include this in the big highway system), then south to Mayfair, to Alticane and down to Highway No 40, then to Hafford, then to the Cee Pee bridge. The second grid road recommended was the construction of the road beginning two miles south of the junction of Highways No. 4 and No. 26 on the blacktop north of North Battleford, proceeding east along the range line to Whitkow, then north one mile, east two miles and north eight miles and east one mile, then north six miles then east to join with the Spiritwood-Mayfair road, as an important grid for the 1954 programme. It appears that all parties concerned with market roads in this section have now reached agreement and have resolved their differences on the proper location of the roads. This should provide a mandate for the Department concerned to proceed.

I would like to mention at this time that I think the Department of Highways is to be complimented on the new formula they have devised for the equalization grant, thus enabling the poorer municipalities to go ahead with a road construction programme.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a few moments to mention private enterprise in this province, especially the farm implement businesses. I have been closely associated with this type of business in the past, having been an implement dealer, and I fully realize why the local dealer has gone broke and is going broke and will continue to go broke. I am glad I got out of it in time. To me it was just a racket. I was sure that if I stayed in the implement business I would be broke, too. There are too many people with their hands outstretched between the local dealer and the manufacturer of the farm implements – the labourer in the factory is not reaping the profits either. So who is getting it? If neither one of these are, there must be somebody in between.

I would like to quote a few statistics showing where the profits on farm machinery are going. Figures do not lie, they say, and this should prove who is exploiting the farmer. I have before me four big implement companies, and I will start first with John Deere Plow Company. For four years, from 1950-53, net profit, \$138,277,934, federal tax, \$150,750,000, or a total of \$289,027,934; J. I. Case Company, net profit for three years, \$31,971,400, federal tax, \$34,425,000, or a total of \$66,396,400; International Harvester, for a period of four years from 1950-53, \$237,401,354, federal tax \$253,169,711, or a total of \$490,571,065. Massey Harris, for three years from 1950-52, net profit, \$38,988,124, federal tax, \$46,102,000, or a total of \$85,090,124.

Mr. Speaker, I have an excerpt from Saskatoon 'Star-Phoenix' of October 6, 1953:

“At a meeting of the Saskatchewan Implement Dealers Association at Saskatoon it was felt that some restriction entering into the retail farm implement business is necessary if the farmer is to get the service he is entitled to. They expressed alarm over the number of persons in the retail farm machinery business; the rate of turnover of agencies, the ones in private business and the high rate of trade-ins.

“Association delegates said the average implement dealer in the province does about \$47,000 business yearly and an association brief said there are more than 1,800 dealers in the

province, serving 112,000 farmers. The Association contended they did not want government interference where it wasn't necessary, but it felt that limiting the number of licences and setting a minimum standard of service would be to their benefit."

Mr. Speaker, my contention is that with the average dealer doing business with a turnover of \$46,000 yearly he should have a comfortable living even if he just gets 10 per cent of the profits, which would give him \$4,600. However, I know for a fact that the percentage is more than double 10 per cent, but the local dealer is not getting it. He is not in business for himself. He is in business for the company. Any deals he makes on trade-ins have been proven to be unsatisfactory for the dealer, but not so for the Company, because it is their new machines that the farmer is taking out and they set their sale price on it without trade-ins. The local dealer cannot contribute to his share of selling for the Company, and in some instances may have to make a 'wild deal' (as they call it) just to get the business; but it doesn't take many wild deals before he goes broke, not because he wants to, but because he is trying to do his best to sell for the machine company which dictates to him how to run the business. This not only applies to dealers in machinery but to automobile dealers and many others that I will not take the time to mention now.

I would like to say a few words on mixed farming as compared with grain farming. Mixed farming is better for the province as it gives the economy a wider base. It gives more real security if prices are stabilized. Mixed farming means more work it is true; therefore, you must have the assurance of steady prices to get farmers to raise cattle and hogs. With prices fluctuating farmers turn to straight grain farming and their land actually loses its fertility.

I would like to propose a few thoughts of my own, that I think might be a solution to this problem. The farmer should know that he will receive a certain price for his cattle and pigs when they are ready for market, just like the companies who manufacture tractors, cars and other machinery know before they start how many they are going to manufacture and how much they are going to get for them. If the farmer was assured of a basic price for his livestock when they were ready for market, and was sure the price was going to hold, he could more or less plan his production campaign. True, he would not know how many cattle or hogs he might have in the year – that would be in the hands of fate; but the farmer is used to leaving things in the hands of fate. But he would have a fairly good overall average picture of what he could expect as far as the prices were concerned.

From Hansard of November 11, 1953, I quote:

"Mr. McCullough (Moose Mountain): — With regard to the cattle markets I agree with the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Zaplitny), who spoke yesterday in this debate. He indicated the financial situation existing in western Canada – farmers were shipping cattle to the stockyards, and there was no adequate system of grading whereby they would be assured of receiving a just rate for the cattle they ship."

And that is true, Mr. Speaker. That situation does exist. Just before coming here for the Session I was talking with a shipper who had sent a carload of cattle to Winnipeg – one white cow was de-graded and knocked down 2 cents a lb simply because it was a white cow. I have also talked with shippers who have told that they had shipped cattle to Winnipeg which were a cross between Hereford and Shorthorns, with mottled white faces; and they are also de-graded. In other words, simply because it is a buyer's market, the buyers now have it in their hands to enforce a discount of two or three cents a lb and disregard the quality of the beef.

I would like to ask whether or not the housewives ever consider, when they go to the butcher to buy beef, whether it comes from a white cow or a black cow; and whether or not she would get a discount if it were from a white cow. I am sure she doesn't care just as long as she gets her hamburger and doesn't have to pay too much for it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, either the Federal Government through a marketing board, or the Federal Government, in conjunction with the Provincial Government, should look after the stabilization of prices and market. I believe that the Federal Government should establish a board of livestock commissioners to assume the responsibility for the orderly marketing of livestock products in much the same manner as the board of grain commissioners for wheat and other grain.

I think it is important that the farmers of Saskatchewan should raise livestock as well as grow grain. It is a wonderful source of revenue; but I can also understand why they have become so discouraged in doing so, with the present setup for the marketing of livestock, because, after all, it takes a good many years to build up a good herd of livestock and after you have done this and you put them on the market, disappointment is sure; and in that case they cannot be blamed for letting this type of farming slide through their fingers in favour of raising a marketable commodity such as wheat.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to say that being a farmer I am a friend of the farmer. I always will be a friend of the farmer and will protect his interests at all times to the best of my ability.

I will support the motion.

Mr. Louis W. Larsen (Shellbrook): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

SECOND READING

Bill No. 32 – An Act to repeal The Well Drillers Act.

Hon. J. H. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, the principal use to which this Act was put in the past was for the purpose of getting samples of the drilling of wells throughout the province – this refers to water wells. We do not consider that any longer necessary. We are getting samples from oil and gas wells, exploratory wells, and feel no need for those samples to add to the knowledge in regard to geology. Under the Act well drillers were supposed to be licensed, and they will no longer be required to be licensed when this Act is repealed. I would move second reading of the Bill.

(Second reading agreed to)

SECOND READING

Bill No. 34 – An Act to amend The Secondary Education Act.

Hon. W. S. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, this amendment will reflect the amount of fees which a district can charge to a high school student coming to that high school from another district. Hon. members will probably know that the maximum fee which could be charged has, for a number of years, been \$50 per student. The cost of providing the education for that student is, of course, much more than \$50, and we have been asked by the Trustees' Association for several years now to increase it; and we are, in the amendment, increasing the maximum from \$50 to \$70.

We hope this might serve to impress on the high school student in the galleries the value of education. Other sections of the Bill are in part to bring it into conformity with sections of The School Act, which, I think, can be better explained in committee. I would move second reading of this Bill.

(Second Reading agreed to)

The Assembly adjourned at 5.40 o'clock p.m.