

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Twelfth Legislature
10th Day

Friday, February 25, 1955

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

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Thursday, February 24, 1955, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Dewhurst for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, before commencing my address, this afternoon, I would like to bring to the attention of the House this group of Grade XII students in the Speaker's gallery. They are the Grade XII students from the Turtleford Unit. I may be prejudiced, but I consider the group of young people here, today, to be the finest-looking group of young people that has visited the Legislature since I have had the privilege of being in this seat. Not only are they good looking, but I think they are unique; they have made history. This group has travelled some 350 miles in order to visit the Queen City, the capital, and their own Legislature. I am sorry the weatherman has been so unruly; I hope that when they have completed their visit they will have considered it worthwhile. I think that the Unit Board ought to be complimented on their vision and progressive outlook in seeing that these young people were able to come so far to see their Legislature in action and to visit places of interest in Regina.

In entering the Throne Speech debate, this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my word of appreciation to all those who, so far, have spoken in this debate, especially the mover and seconder.

I would also like to add my brief word of congratulation to the Leader of the Opposition on his successful bid for the leadership of the Liberal party. It is no mean achievement to be called upon to lead one of the major political parties in our province. However, I cannot help but note a remark he made in his opening address, the other day, when he referred to himself as being saddled with the leadership of the Liberal party. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is a far cry from the nominee who had boasted that he had driven 8,000 miles in pursuit of his crown of laurels — or, is it a saddle?

I listened with mixed feelings to the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield) the day that he attacked the Government and government employees. However, I have just one comment to make, and, of course, this can apply to all of us. Hanging in a very prominent position on the wall of a southern Air Force office is a placard captioned "Caution: Be sure the brain is in contact before you turn the mouth into gear."

The hon. member for Estevan (Mr. Kohaly), the other day, in his address to the House, made some statements I cannot quite agree with. Personally, he claimed that the clay supplies in the brick plant were exceedingly low, and he also made comparisons of labour security as between the coal mines and the Estevan brick plant, statements that, I feel, were misleading. Purposely or otherwise, he conveyed to the House the impression that the clay bins at the brickyard were so empty that a shut-down of the plant was imminent. This, Mr. Speaker, is just not so. There is a probable 5,000 tons of clay in the bins,

February 25, 1955

and the clay is being mined continuously. Two types of clay are used in the Estevan brick plant; one from the river pit, which, by its name, we naturally expect to be located along the river. This pit may, and does, flood at times; but clay from the river pit is in the bins in sufficient quantity to keep the plant operating until spring. The other type of clay comes from the bluff pits up on the hills, and may be, and is, mined continuously. Nothing but an extreme storm could shut the plant down for want of clay. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the actual situation does not compare with the impression left by the hon. member for Estevan when he spoke to the House a few days ago.

The second point I feel I must take issue with is the impression that the labour situation at the coal mines is very much more secure than that at the brick plant. Again I feel that the opposite is the case. With the exception of a few key men there are continual lay-offs at the coal mines whenever the weather turns excessively mild or coal consumption is cut down. There have been few exceptions when the workers at the brick plant have been off work, and there is little possibility that the brick plant will shut down this winter, in spite of the dark picture painted, the other day, by the hon. member.

We, in Turtleford constituency, are no exception to the rule of the province in regard to the disappointing crop returns. Coupled with too much moisture and retarded crop development, was a killing frost which has put the farmers in a very difficult position so far as coarse grain seed is concerned. I was very happy that the Minister of Agriculture extended the seed freight policy to include graded and tested commercial coarse grain seed. This will assist considerably.

During the past year, two blocks of farm power were completed, the first rural electrification to take place in Turtleford constituency. Also, the village of Paradise Hill was added to the list of villages served by the Power Corporation. The town of St. Walburg installed mercury vapour street lamp lighting, such as you have out here in front of the Legislative Building.

I am also delighted to see that the Speech from the Throne makes provision for the largest rural electrification programme that the province of Saskatchewan has ever undertaken. I am interested in that because two more areas in Turtleford constituency are signed up ready for the 1955 construction programme. One of these areas covers that historic district, Fort Pitt. We still have many areas in the constituency that, as yet, are not served by the Power Corporation. Some of these are sparsely settled areas that are naturally going to be a little difficult. You know the motto of the Power Corporation — that they do the difficult things immediately and the impossible take a little longer. The greatest menace, however, to a continued and increasing construction programme so far as rural electrification is concerned, is the steady decline in farm income, making it very difficult for many farmers to finance.

I am very pleased, this afternoon, to be able to announce that, excluding the unforeseen (and I wish to repeat that, excluding the unforeseen) a highline will be run from North Battleford into Glaslyn, this year, with possible connections to Medstead. This line will bring power into a totally new area in the constituency, and I hope, in the near future, will be serving many rural homes and villages not at present receiving power.

Speaking in the House, a year ago, to a resolution asking the Federal Government to take measures to improve the lot of our native people,

I think you will recall that I said that if an economic recession occurs, the Indian population will be the first to suffer. Mr. Speaker, this has already taken place. Owing to poor crop conditions, and again to this steady drop in net farm income, the Indians are finding it much more difficult to procure work and are faced with a steady decline in wages. Irrespective of the fact that the question of our native people is a difficult one, something should be done. The lot of our native people is on the whole very bad, and how can Canada, as a nation, speak effectively for the native people of any land who are being exploited in degraded, so long as our own native population is in a similar plight.

In spite, perhaps, of my hon. friend from Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs) to the contrary, I am pleased that 1954 has seen the first decline in the liquor consumption for several years. However, the fly in the ointment is that this decline is due, in part at least, to economic conditions. There will naturally be a drop in revenue, but I am sure that this will be offset by a similar decline in administration costs in all those departments affected by the menace of over-indulgence. To give the House a down-to-earth example of the close relationship between drinking and auto driving, I would just like to relate the experience of a person I know who went out, last spring, and gathered bottles along the highway, a stretch of 16 miles, just on one side. He came with no less than 136 dozen, and, by the way, mine were not amongst them.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — You must have saved yours.

Mr. Wooff: — I saved mine and sold them! With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on international affairs, and I want to say, at the outset, that I am not posing as an authority on world events, but I am very much concerned over the approach many statesmen have, of many different lands. I cannot understand how, in a world situation in which we, the common people whose very lives and the lives of our families are at stake, can merely shrug our shoulders at the injustices, the wilful and flagrant violation of the rights of small and defenceless peoples, by larger and well-armed nations. Certainly, I believe we do it, in the long run, at our own peril. And further, by your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote at some length on the question of U.S.A. intervention in Guatemala, this last year; and I wish to quote, because I shall be dealing directly with excerpts from a white paper issued by none other than the State Department at Washington. So that there is no misunderstanding I am quoting from the ‘Christian Century’, which is an American publication, which by no means or stretch of the imagination can even be called ‘pink’:

“How does Guatemala balance sheet stand today, five months after the Arbenz government and its agrarian reform programme were wiped out in an armed invasion by air and land from Honduras and Nicaragua? Leftist President Jacobo Arbenz, it will be remembered had rejected our State Department’s claim for \$15 million in behalf of the United Fruit Company, labelling it ‘illegal . . . unjustified . . . monstrous’. Moreover, he had failed to comply with the American embassy’s demand that he dismiss known Communists from the government payroll and outlaw the Communist Party. His attitude was deemed sufficient reason for the U.S. to take a hand in his overthrow.

February 25, 1955

“Our State Department has since issued a White paper which deals exhaustively with Communism in Guatemala. Here is the score:

“The Guatemalan Labour party (a Communist party) claims a little more than a thousand members, but is believed by the State Department to have anywhere from 1,500 to 4,000. The number of Labour party members employed by the entire Arbenz government was fifteen, plus one wife of a member. Two of the fifteen held better than clerkships or inspectorships; one was chief of the agricultural department’s land section, and the wife was a secretary in the same bureau.

“Also, since the White paper, the Arbenz government employed seven ‘veiled’ Communists (i.e., fellow-travellers), four of them in fairly responsible positions. It should be pointed out, however, that some of those named opposed the Labour party and were bitterly attacked by it. One had been a member of the Mexican Communist party but was expelled from it prior to 1945.

“Finally, eleven ‘suspected’ Communists were employed by the government. Seven are so labelled by the White paper because a local ‘smear’ sheet once mentioned them as ‘Communists’. Another had a Communist brother. Still another was once called a ‘Communist’ by a friend. And the tenth and eleventh had names resembling those of two registered Labour party voters.

“Four Labour party men — fewer than the government opposition — had been elected to the Congress, a 56-member body.

“Six ‘popular front’ organizations, the White paper continues, existed in Guatemala. Of these the ‘Peace Committee’ was the only one with a majority of Communist officers. There were several Communists in the students’ federation. As to the high school confederation, there is ‘a supposition that it is under party influence’. The younger writers’ and artists’ group had one ‘veiled Communist’ and one Labour party member among its officers, and is labelled ‘Communist’ on the word of a disgruntled secretary who declared that its propaganda in favour of F.D.R. and the good-neighbour policy was merely a Communist trick.

“Also outside the government, the General Labour Confederation (104,000 members) had seven Communist officers — including its general secretary — out of a total of 49. In the much larger Peasant Confederation the White paper could find no ‘Communist control’ whatever, although that organization had among its officers one Labour Party member (not named). The National Democratic Front, a policy-making body for the government parties supporting the administration, admitted two Labour Party delegates after 1952; but the White paper claims that at least four delegates in the early 1954 meetings were ‘veiled Communists’.

“The White paper is suspicious of all Guatemalan intellectuals. It leans heavily on the built-by-association theory, and labels ‘Communist’ any reform in which a ‘Communist’ or ‘veiled Communist’ participated, without any consideration of the value of the reform in Guatemalan terms. Nevertheless, it is a fairly sober document which avoids the worst clichés.

“Thus far our State Department. Whatever the shortcomings of its assessment of the Guatemalan situation, the fact remains that the Arbenz government was hostile to the United States and even more so to the United Fruit Company, and that it was overthrown by armed force. Now let us take a look at the results.

“From the political side it must be said that, however desirable the elimination of Communism in Guatemala — as far as this has occurred — the establishment of a reactionary military dictatorship can scarcely be called a victory for freedom, democracy and progress. Indeed, the pro-feudal, anti-democratic, anti-Indian regime of Castillo Armas has disfranchised 70 per cent of the voters and compels the rest to vote viva voce, in the presence of soldiers, for only one candidate — himself. All political parties, all labour and teachers’ organizations have been abolished. This smacks of the Fascist and Soviet methods to which this country is at least theoretically opposed.

“With the farmers driven off the idle lands where they were installed by the Arbenz government, wages in rural areas are being slipped back to the 15 cents-a-day level. Forced labour is being revived. About a million newly cultivated acres, which for the first time in history had freed Guatemala from the necessity of importing food, are being recaptured by the jungle.

“For Latin America, Guatemala has become a test-tube in which American methods and intentions can be analyzed. If our policy there is to be successful, if Communism is to be beaten, the people cannot be denied democratic freedom. They cannot be compelled to accept drastically reduced wages, to be excluded from the land, to suffer forced labour and serfdom. Neither they nor we can afford to sit idly by while the new education is curtailed, while the new farm schools, the new hospitals, clinics and travelling medical missions, and the improvements in sanitation and housing are abruptly halted. Above all, we cannot afford to quench the hopes that were created by land reform — a programme that is now completely shattered. Here lies the acid test for our policy. To improve the people’s condition is an obligation we assumed in bringing about the overthrow of the Arbenz government. If we fail, we shall have done Communism a great service in Guatemala and everywhere else. The stake is not merely Guatemala; it is all Latin America.”

And so the White paper, issued by the State Department of Washington itself, tells us how the basis of ‘guilt-by-association’ is the measure for conviction

February 25, 1955

and attack. That is the point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker. Truly, we none of us want to see these governments appear. We are all interested in keeping them out; but where people are being ground down for the sake of a concern like the United Fruit Company that has now turned people off the land, has stalled all land reforms, all the education forms, I am afraid it has increased the danger of Communism rather than getting rid of it.

These are not my words, Mr. Speaker, and these are not the words of the 'Christian Century'; these are the naked truths of the State Department's own White paper.

Mr. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, May I draw your attention to the fact that notes are being taken in the gallery?

Mr. Speaker: — It is against the rules of the House for notes to be taken and its must cease.

Mr. Wooff: — I feel, Mr. Speaker, that if we, the free nations of the world, are going to hold the respect of the free world we must be very careful how and whom we attack, such as was done in this particular case. I feel that the people of South Africa are probably making blunders, if we are ever going to cement together these people who are underprivileged, who are being made slaves of. The daily wages dropped in Guatemala again to a 15 cents-a-day levels; and the people are again faced with servitude and serfdom. I think that this challenges every one of us to lift our eyes above the glitter of gold and gain, and above the love of might and power, and to serve justice and righteousness. Yet, Mr. Speaker, I often feel that the cry is "how long", and you and I hold the answer — we, the common people of the free nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the motion.

Mr. D. Zipchen (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, at this moment I would like to pass my congratulations to the mover (Mr. Dewhurst) and the seconder (Mr. Heming) of the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne, who so ably presented their addresses. I would also like to congratulate the hon. Leader of the Opposition, the member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald). This is my third session, and I have sat with three Leaders of the Opposition. I realize it must be quite a strain on the Liberal 'machine' to have a new leader every year.

Mr. Speaker, this is our Golden Jubilee year, and you may ask what does a Jubilee year mean? It is the time when we give our prayers of thanksgiving for God's help in the past 50 years, and ask for His blessing in the future. It is a happy time of reunion, when we have a big birthday party and invite all our old friends and our new neighbours to come and enjoy themselves with Saskatchewan. When The Saskatchewan Golden Jubilee Act was brought into the House on April 4, 1952, the Premier called on the people of the province to honour our pioneers; to teach the present generation the rich heritage of experience to be found in our history; to remind ourselves that our province has been built on a foundation of co-operation and tolerance among people from many lands; to promote projects and activities which will have a continuing value for the cultural life of the province in the second half of the century. This practice has become the groundwork of the Jubilee thinking and planning.

Speaking on the same subject at that time, the ex-Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Tucker, said the Golden Jubilee brings to the attention of all

our people, whether they were born here, or whether they have come here in recent times, the great accomplishments that have been wrought by those who opened up these plains. I cannot feel that it should be otherwise than inspiring to those who are here and who will be carrying on the work that they have done.

Mr. Speaker, why was Saskatchewan set up as a province? By 1905, in the North-West Territories, there was nearly half a million people. There was a great demand for more roads, bridges, schools and public works. The Territorial Government was not permitted to borrow money to spend to meet these demands. People in the Territories wanted to be able to plan for the future as a province; they wanted the right to run their own local affairs. Some wanted the northwest to be one big province, or at least wanted it to be set up as two provinces. Sir Wilfrid Laurier decided, in 1905, to set up two provinces, Saskatchewan and Alberta, to be members of Confederation. Today, many people comprise the population of Saskatchewan. According to racial origin, in the 1951 census races with fewer than 2,000 are omitted. They are: from the British Isles, 351,862; German, 135,584; Ukrainian, 78,399; Scandinavian, 62,439; French, 51,930; Netherlands, 29,818; Polish, 26,034; Indian, 22,250; Russian, 19,453; Hungarian, 12,470; Austrian, 7,220; Czechoslovakian, 5,976; Rumanian, 5,556; Belgian, 4,079; Chinese, 2,144; Jewish, 2,702 — making a total of 831,728.

There were many good reasons for immigrants coming to Canada from different parts of the world, where oppression, poverty, high taxes, strict military services and congestion was their lot. To these people Canada offered free a homestead policy, whereby, for \$10, a man could own 160 acres of land. It was a land with no racial or religious distinctions; no prejudices. If a man worked hard and lived frugally, he could make a good living for himself and his family. Canada was a land of opportunity: children could be educated, people could vote for their choice of the candidates, and laws were fair and just. Mr. Speaker, there were also other opportunities here. Firstly, they were free; secondly, everyone was pioneering so no one was better than his neighbour; thirdly, though they endured many hardships, yet they were happy to make Canada their home.

One may ask what has been accomplished by pioneers in the past 50 years. In 1905, the seeded wheat acreage in Saskatchewan was 2,104,583 acres; by 1952, the acreage was 24,199,000. In 1905, Saskatchewan produced 46,193,000 bushels of all grains; in 1952, our total production of wheat, oats and barley was 679,000,000 bushels. In 1905, there was no oil production; yet in 1954, over 6,000,000 barrels of oil was recovered. Mineral production, too, increased from \$253,000 in 1905 to well over \$50 million in 1953. Population figures show that, in 1905, we had only 257,673, while the latest census indicates 878,000 people in 1954.

The difficulties of the early years in Saskatchewan made people realize that they could improve their lot by working together for the good of all. Out of the need for more stabilized economy grew the first attempt at setting up co-operatives. The movement spread rapidly, and in the 1920's the province-wide Wheat Pool was organized, and that was the basis for the Saskatchewan Co-operatives, Limited, of today. At present we have more than 1,200 co-operatives operating in Saskatchewan, with a membership of over half a million.

Agriculture, at the time Saskatchewan was formed, was carried on with crude machinery on small farms, where a farmer, by devoting long hours of hard work and simple methods, was able to be out in existence for his family. Agricultural methods of today, with labour-saving machinery and modern techniques and knowledge, have made farming a far cry from the struggle it was to our pioneers.

February 25, 1955

In the old days care of the sick was a haphazard affair: isolated hospitals, lack of roads and transportation made it difficult for overworked family physicians to carry on their work. Our doctors deserve a great deal of credit for the wonderful job they did, more often than not with the odds against them. Today, with the hospitalization plan in effect, and with the increased number of up-to-date hospitals, we now have 7.5 beds per 1000 population in the province, the ratio necessary to provide adequate services to the public, according to authorities, and the residence of the province are able to have the best care medicine can provide.

Saskatchewan's wheat fields, its prairies, its towns and villages have been put on canvas for all the world to see. Artists from other lands, as well as artists born here, have recognized the beauty of our vast province. A number of Saskatchewan artists have gained recognition outside the province as artists in the true sense of the word. We never need apologize for, but rather point with pride to, the outstanding musicians who were born in Saskatchewan. Some of Canada's finest composers, singers and instrumentalists were born here and got their start within the borders of our province. Writers have done their part in writing the history of our province and our people, giving the story of the prairie folks. Their beliefs and their ideals, their struggles and conquests, have been told both in prose and poetry. Saskatchewan is a province with vast resources of land, forests, streams, but perhaps more important than any is that resource of our people. No country, no matter how well endowed with natural resources, can become great without pioneers, and the sons and daughters of pioneers who have the courage, fortitude, resourcefulness and humility which has been back of the progress of this province.

Redberry constituency has been in existence since 1905, the year the province was created. The first member elected for Redberry was George Langley, a Liberal who defeated Samuel Alexander Hamilton, a Provincial Rights candidate. The late Mr. Langley also held the portfolio as Minister of Municipal Affairs from 1912 to 1921, which was an honour for the constituents of Redberry.

Much progress has been made in the last 50 years in my constituency. Last year, on March 1, 1954, the village of Blaine Lake joined the ranks of growing communities when it was incorporated into a town. I am quite confident of my people and Redberry constituency, as they are confident in this Government, that they will not make the same mistake in the next provincial election as they did in 1948, when they turned the Redberry constituency back to the 'old machine'.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition said the Government was mapping and mapping grid roads for the last 10 years and nothing had been done. I would like to invite the Leader of the Opposition to campaign for the next election in my constituency, and I will show him my roads. I would like to congratulate the councils of municipalities whose co-operation has made possible these roads. We all know that, in 1905, there were no roads — nothing but trails; but at present we have a provincial highway system with bituminous surface of 1,135.01 miles; gravel surface, including oil treatment, 6,437.45 miles; standard, 409.25 miles; improved, 293.88 miles; long bridges, 3.87, or a total mileage of 8,279.46. We have secondary highways: bituminous surface, 1.58 miles; gravel surface, 474.93 miles; standard, 443.87 miles; unimproved, 90.67 miles, or a total mileage of 1,010.85. We have rural municipal and local improvement district, 43, or a total of 13,902 miles; improved municipal, 35, 597; local improvement, 2, 882; or a total of 38, 479 miles; unimproved earth, municipal, 97,683 miles; local improvement district, 1,630, or a total of 99,313 miles. The total

mileage of municipal roads is 146,639; local improvement district roads, 4,555, or a total of 151,194 miles.

In 1905, we had no bridges while in 1955 we have the following: timber pile bridges, 2,920; steel bridges on piles, 141; steel bridges on concrete, 97; reinforced concrete bridges, 278, or a total number of bridges which the Department has erected of 3,436. In addition, there are between 200 and 300 bridges in rural municipalities and local improvement districts of which the Department has no record — that is, bridges known to be in existence but for which no file has been set up in the bridge department.

Before I sit down, I would like to commend the Government for indicating in the Throne Speech that more assistance will be given to municipalities for the construction of main market roads. I would like the Government to know that in Redberry constituency main market roads are the most pressing issue at this moment.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion may I say that Canada was built by Canadian people who made many contributions towards her greatness, but the greatest contribution that has been made was in the first and second world wars, when so many of our young men and women offered to sacrifice their lives for our country and our democratic system. It was built on faith in one another, and I hope we can preserve it by educating our youngsters to follow the principles of our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, in congratulating the Government on its excellent programme outlines in the Throne Speech, I think that I am indicating the approval of all of the people of Saskatchewan. Certainly I am indicating the approval of the people of Cumberland constituency.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply to the Throne Speech. I think there was a thorough coverage of the social and economic problems of our province that need attention, and particularly in the Jubilee Year. I think also that I might say at this time that I believe that it is parliamentary tradition for us to review the past history of the Government and, of course, the policies that are proposed or desirable for the future. That is what I intend to do to some extent today. However, before dealing with the subject I have in mind, I would also like to be permitted to mention something about the Jubilee Year.

To many of us, this year is not just a year of celebration, Mr. Speaker; it is a year of thanksgiving. It is quite true that many people came to this country because they saw opportunity; they saw a change to improve their economic status, to find a better standard of living. But, sir, there are also people that came to this country — farmers, teachers, businessmen and others, who came here for the simple reason that they could not find just opportunity but freedom to develop their traditional cultures and amalgamate that culture with the culture of Canada. Many of these, I think, in this year of the Jubilee, will thank whatever Gods they believe in, that they had an opportunity to come to this country and be able to celebrate a great anniversary.

I say also that the same people who came here from the British Isles, from the Scandinavian countries, from the Ukraine, from Poland, and from all the other countries of the old world, as has been mentioned by the previous speaker, and particularly was it noticeable

February 25, 1955

during the last world war that their sons, yes, and even the older ones, were prepared to give their lives for the democracy and freedom they had found in this country in which they desire to preserve.

At this time I, too, as one of the speakers said yesterday, have old parents, and I would like to recite a little poem that I wrote recently when I was returning home from Regina. I dedicate it to them and to all the pioneers who love this province as I do. It is a simple little thing and I make my apologies to Pauline Johnson, but I will quote it, Mr. Speaker. I called it 'The Prairie':

“There is no end to our prairie land;
It's as vast as the open sky,
Except for aspen bluff and willow stand,
Or a hill, alone and high.

Its verdure sheen covered with dew,
Like a mantle, warm and rich;
Yet sprinkled wide with radiant hue
Of lily, paintbrush and vetch.

White daisies, peavine and hairbell blue
Like stardust cover the plains;
I love my land; it's harsh
But true to those whose faith it retains.

But soon the steppes shall turn to gold
And harvest of crops begin;
And the golden wheat and flax in the hold
Will prove Nature's kindness to man.

For ever and ever rolls the prairie land,
Sleeping under a broad mantle of snow,
But for leafless aspen or willow stand
Or brown hill where wild winds blow.

Mr. Speaker, and during this past debate for some days now, this Government has been criticized over the alleged waste of money, particularly as it concerns the policies that are being carried out in the northern part of the province. I would like today to indicate to the Assembly and have members decide for themselves, as well as all those who are listening in to me today, whether there has been a waste of money under the policies that are being carried out. One of these policies, Mr. Speaker, is a clearing and breaking programme that was initiated in 1945 by the C.C.F. Government of that day. It is particularly, I think, carried out in the local improvement districts. It may not be too well known, but the policy is one that has the general approval of the people there, and it is a good policy. It has raised the standard of living; it has brought more land under cultivation; it has brought in greater incomes, and it is a policy that I would like to see this Government expand to a greater extent.

Now, what is that policy? First of all, what the Government did was to recognize the fact that people who settled on forested lands or on raw land that had nothing under cultivation required that some breaking or clearing be done. So this Government initiated, as I have said, in 1945, a programme under which anybody could get assistance to break up to 50 acres, at that time — at present he may break up to 100 acres. Up to the first 50 acres we today advance the settler \$14 an acre for clearing and \$10 an acre for breaking. Over the 50 acres, it is \$12 an acre for clearing and \$10 an acre for breaking. This has meant that a farmer who sat on a quarter of land, which was raw, and on which he could make no living, could be assisted to the extent of breaking 100 acres of land, and

by doing so, Mr. Speaker, it is very obvious that he could not only make a living — not too good a living — but he could also pay taxes, and he could exist on the minimum standards which we expect people to live on.

Let us compare that policy to that which existed at the time the Liberal governments were in power; at that time we had a government by the people opposite who today say that we are wasteful. I recall a time back in the 'thirties, Mr. Speaker, when I was the secretary of a municipality, and in those days we had relief. In those days I saw rig after rig, wagon after wagon, coming from the south loaded with a broken-down bed, an old mattress and maybe a stove and half a dozen kids in the back. They came into that north country and they squatted on any piece of land that they saw. If they saw some trees growing on it, or some hay, they thought, "Well, here is Paradise compared to that dried-out area", behind them. There was no direction for these people as to where they could settle. They were left to their own resources, and there were many such people who, under former Liberal administrations, settled in my district, and I felt sorry for them. I knew they had to have help of some kind or another.

At that time I wrote to the then Hon. Mr. 'Tommy' Davis, telling him that I would be very willing to assist in administering relief or any other assistance that they might have in mind for those people, without any charge on my part whatsoever. I was willing to do the job free. However, as usually happens with governments of that type I noticed I received an appointment as a Relief Inspector. Well, I was a Relief Inspector for about three months, and here is what happened. These people were handed out a paltry sum that could not keep soul and body together. I remember the time when a man came into my office who, when he was issued a \$10 relief order, wept like a child. I can still see it in my mind. That was the kind of policy the Liberal administration had during the 'dirty 'thirties'.

But, getting down to land policy: as a re-establishment policy of that day, what did they have to offer? I wrote a letter to the Hon. T.C. Davis at that time and pointed out that, in my opinion, there were three types of individuals or people that were coming in to the north. Some were farmers who had considerable experience, but who, due to the harshness of nature, had to leave the land in the south and try to find a home in the north. But they were men who had potentialities, who would make good farmers. That is one class.

Then I pointed out to him in my report, at that time, that there was another class that had potentiality but had no experience, and that they should be given some assistance in learning how to farm in that part of the world. Then I pointed out, also, that there was a third group coming in to the north, because I met them every day. They knew nothing about farming, and they would never make farmers. I suggested in my said report that it might be a good thing if these people were established in industry in the cities or somewhere else.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I received a very favourable reply from the Hon. T.C. Davis, who was Attorney-General at the time, saying that he was very pleased with my report, and that he would have copies distributed to all the members of the Legislature. Now, those who

were here at that time (if there are any) may recall getting a copy of my letter or report to Mr. Davis.

What I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, is that a short time following this report, a Northern Re-establishment Branch was set up in the province of Saskatchewan. I think a Mr. Simmons was appointed head of the branch, and here is the plan, here is the way they did not waste money. Under this programme — by that time, by the way, I was not the Relief Inspector; I quit. Under this programme they had all these inspectors throughout the north. These inspectors helped the northern people to get a team of horses and an old plough and a broken down wagon and probably a harness that would not stick together, and I know that in many cases where a horse was worth \$40 or \$50 the inspector approved the sum of \$100. I know that a plough that should have been on the scrap heap was paid for \$10 or \$15 — I am referring to walking ploughs; for an old wagon which may have been worth \$10 or \$15, an authorization was passed through for \$40 or \$50. And yet my friends opposite say that we waste money under the programme that we are carrying out to re-establish the northern people, and they insinuate that when the Liberals were in power, they had a government that did not waste the people's money. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, there was money advanced to break land, but there was no plan. As usual with Liberal governments, there was no plan.

Yet under the plan that we have I might add that when this man breaks this 100 acres and he owes the State \$1,400 or \$2,000, he enters into an agreement under which he returns to us, to repay the capital, a one-third share of the crop from all the land that has been broken. Did the Liberals have a plan of that nature in the days they had a re-establishment programme? Sir, they did not. They paid out money. Some land was broken at a very high cost, and the debt was charged up against those settlers in the north and, as members of this Government will recall (those who were here), in 1944 these people still owed those debts. Those debts were never repaid. Some were fortunate to have good land, but most of the debts had to be cancelled. Today we are not only doing a good job, but we are helping the people to help themselves. They are paying back the capital costs to us with not too much difficulty to themselves. Let the people of Saskatchewan judge whether we have a good programme or not.

We have another programme in the north that I think is a very good one, and it concerns tax arrears. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that, years ago, when a farmer got into arrears, they sold his land and, of course, he had to go out on the road or find some other place where he could find a spot for his children and his wife. We recognize that there are lands that are sub-marginal; that there are lands where a considerable amount has not been broken and for this and other reasons the settlers got into arrears with taxes. It has always been the policy of the C.C.F. Government to give some security to the man on the land. We have given that security in the north, Mr. Speaker.

Today, in the local improvement district, in many cases I know farmers who are indebted to, say, the extent of \$400 or \$500, who may lose title to the land; but we don't take the land away from him as was the case formerly. We come back to this man and say to him, "This is your home; we would like you to stay here; we would like to re-establish you back on this far; maybe with a little more land broke and you will be able

to make a decent living.” And he asks us what the plan is. Well, the plan is very simple. We lease this land back to him for a period of time, and he pays us back, every year, one-sixth of the crop to the amount of these tax arrears. The liability is no longer tax arrears, Mr. Speaker. It is a debt that is set up separate from his current taxes, and to which there is no further penalty added. In other words, if a farmer has a debt of \$500 a day and he has lost his title, we set up an account for him of \$500 and, as I have said, from his one-sixth crop, paid over to the local improvement district every year, he can repay the debt, and as soon as he repays it we give him back his title. That is a human way of doing things. It is a sensible way, and I think my people up there are proud (certainly I am proud) of what the Department of Municipal Affairs is doing in the north.

I recall, too, when we are referred to as wasting money, what we did to bring about better educational facilities for the people. I remember in the olden days the School Act provided that if you put up a new building, the most you could get for a public school was the \$250 grant. I know there was one case where there were some friendly Liberals who are somehow or other able to by-pass the Act and get a \$500 grant. It is the only case I know. But this Government realized the need of the people all of the sub-marginal areas and came in and said, “You are entitled to schools; it is the responsibility of the people of Saskatchewan, and we will amend the School Act to provide for the necessary grants.”

As I mentioned at a previous time, Mr. Speaker, not only did this Government build schools right across the north in the trapping and fishing communities, but this C.C.F. Government assisted in building schools in the northern settled areas where you have the sub-marginal lands. Can this be charged as a waste of money?

This year, in particular, the difference in the thinking of the people on this side of the House and the people on the other side of the House is noticeable, because, as I pointed out previously, when we had a relief programme in the olden days, all they did was give you a \$10 relief cheque, or a \$5 relief cheque, and if you were a good Liberal you got a dollar or two more, and if you were a Conservative, of course you were supposed to take a little less. I know what I am talking about because I was handling relief and I was a Relief Inspector. I remember the time I wrote to our good friend, Mr. Walter Dawson, who was in charge of the Direct Relief Branch in Regina, and he came up to Meath Park to see me. I told him of the distressing situation in the north and how unjust it was to have a system of that kind, where people lost their self-respect, their soul — and I was told by people that they were losing their soul. I told Walter, “Can’t we do something to provide a public works programme for these people? Give them jobs and have them make enough for a minimum that is necessary to keep their families in food and clothing?” He said, “Bill, we can’t do a thing. You will remember reading, a few days ago, where the Hon. Mackenzie King made a statement to the press that Canada was spending \$7 million on relief and if we spent more we would go broke.” I don’t blame Walter Dawson for what he told me. He had his orders from the government here and of course the government here had the orders from the government at Ottawa.

We do it differently. This year, due to the harshness of nature, as I have said, we have been flooded out. We haven’t had too many

good crops in the last five years, and this has been an exceptionally bad year. But this Government did not wait until the very last minute and then be called upon to give social aid to the people.

Mr. McDonald: — They haven't done anything yet.

Mr. Berezowsky: — This Government has gone out in my own constituency, and I know, when I was here in Regina and conferred with the Ministers, they had already considered the people of the northern area and they had outlined a plan under which any able working man could get a job. It might be brush clearing, or gravelling a road; it may have been jobs in the forest; that they had made provision to see that these people could get work opportunities and, Mr. Speaker, that is much better for the self-respect of an individual than to be handed at \$10 voucher called relief, or social aid.

Mr. Feusi: — How about \$2 vouchers?

Mr. Berezowsky: — Or \$2 vouchers. I have seen those too. The other day the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield) — I am very sorry he is not in his seat, because I would have liked him to hear what I have to say in reply. I had, just as I have today, Mr. Speaker, a little flower, I think it is a chrysanthemum, in my lapel and after the hon. member for Meadow Lake finished speaking, it wilted and I was just wondering today if this one would wilt when I got finished speaking, but so far it is standing up.

Mr. McDonald: — Must be a pretty hardy flower.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, after I listened to that tirade by the hon. member for Meadow Lake the other day, it reminded me of a birch broom in a blue panic trying to sweep everything before it.

At this time, I am going to make some comparisons of living conditions of the natives (as they are sometimes called) in the north under the Liberal administration, and under the C.C.F. administration. I am going to take some of the very settlements that we have there today that have similar populations. One such settlement is the settlement of Green Lake. True, the Liberals started a plan; but again, as I said, they had no good plan, and we had to take over, and I think we have a good programme. Very briefly, what have we in there today? We have a much higher standard of living among those people than is found anywhere else in Saskatchewan in areas of that kind, and why is it so? In the first place, as I have mentioned, we have, as in the local improvement districts and in other parts of Saskatchewan where there has been some hardships, a work-and-wages programme. There is bush work there, such as lumbering, cutting pulpwood and cordwood. I noticed in Public Accounts, just the other day, that there were something like three million feet of lumber cut a couple of years ago, through contracts. In any event there are about 700 people there and they are doing all kinds of jobs. On top of that, during the summer time they are encouraged by our advisers (if you want to call them that) to go out and take jobs on farms and in industry, and I understand that at certain times of the year as many as two-thirds of the 700 people are out of the district to supplement local earnings.

Not only that. We have broken, in that area, over 1,300 acres of land for them. When you think of 1,300 acres, it isn't a great number of acres, but when you consider the heavy growth, the heavy bush there, that is a good achievement. I understand that 57 Métis hold 40-acre plots and more than one in some cases, and are established and trying to make homes just as we made homes in the early days when my father settled on a homestead. The only thing is they are getting assistance to help themselves; in those days we had to fight our own way.

I do not think it is good enough; I think that much more can be done in that settlement. It is not in my constituency, but I have been in there. I do know, though, in my own district in the Cumberland constituency, of three or four families that have moved to Green Lake because they thought they could be more happy there and the conditions were satisfactory to make a living. But this is one settlement of 700 people, and those are the conditions, more or less. They have a hospital there; they have a good school, and they are happy.

There is another settlement operated by, you could say, the Liberal administration at Ottawa today, and I am referring to the Pelican settlement up in the far north. I was up in that settlement, Mr. Speaker, three years ago, the year before I was elected to this House. I came into that settlement by plane, and I was working for the Department then and visited the area. But here is what I saw, or what I did not see. There was no school — 700 people in the community — no school; there was no hospital; there was no doctor; there was no nurse; there was nothing there. There were two churches, it is true, and those people were hard up, and all that was left of them was to go to church and pray; but there was nothing else. Most of them are Treaty Indians; there are only five, or six or maybe 10 families for which this Government have some responsibility. But at the time I was there, Mr. Speaker — and I am not being sentimental; I am giving you the facts; Mr. Norris of the Mineral Resources was with me at the time. I happened to be in the building talking to some of the natives, discussing their problems, and a woman fell to the floor in a spasm of pain. I could see that she was terribly ill. I don't know what happened, or what the cause of it was, but you could see. You don't have to be a doctor to be able to tell. I knew if that woman was not attended to, she would not last very long. At that time I conferred with Mr. Norris and asked the pilot of the plane to fly this woman to the nearest hospital, which he did, and we saved her life. She was a Treaty Indian. I suppose this Government collected the cost of the aeroplane trip; but that is not the point. The point is that this could happen any day, and what has the Liberal Government in Ottawa done to protect the health and the security of those people?

We have done something even in Pelican Narrows, Mr. Speaker. In 1951, after considerable discussion with Ottawa, this Government decided to go in and build a one-room school to provide for the education of the children who were our responsibility, and there were not very many. We could not put up a large school, because Ottawa told us at that time that the people were provided for as far as education was concerned. Why, there was a school at Sturgeon Landing for the Catholics, and there was another school just 200 miles away (just as the other one was) at Prince Albert, for the Anglicans. You see, that is why they had two churches there. There were the Anglicans and the Catholics living in one community, so the children had to be kept separate — some were sent to Prince Albert

and some were sent to Sturgeon Landing. So the Dominion Government were not interested in helping or assisting this Government to put up a school. But apparently they wisened up, and did not like the publicity that was being given, and so now they have entered into some kind of an agreement (the details of which I do not know too well) whereby they are assisting us now with a three-room school. We have built the one-room school and now they are putting up the three-room school. There is an example.

Take another community, very similar, and in this one we are responsible, and that is the community of Cumberland House. Mr. Speaker, what are we doing there? We are doing the same thing that we are doing in other parts of the province; we are considering that those people are just as good as we are, and we have initiated various programmes. Not so long ago I was with the hon. Minister of Natural Resources in that area, and I spoke to the people. I told him I did not bring them any whiskey or cigars — they had that experience, I think, during election time; but I said, “I came down here to talk to you about your problems, to see if this Government could not help you to help yourselves.” I said, “What are your problems?” And they told me their problems. They had been flooded out for the past three years. The rat population was down; the beaver population was down; and I will tell you of the percentage, Mr. Speaker. Three or four years ago, they caught 100 per cent of the quota for the estimate; then three years ago a drop down to I think 80 or 85; then two years ago a drop down to somewhere around 40 per cent of the quota; last year it was only 18 to 20 of the quota. It was not our fault; it was not anybody’s fault. It was the fault of nature, because of the extensive floods we had. So incomes are down and they are hard up, and we have to help them to help themselves. I told him, “No social aid. We will help you fellows; we will try and see if we can get you jobs.”

Of course, the hon. member for Meadow Lakes would not consider that was a good thing, that would be wasting money. We should not help people to help themselves to build respect and dignity. Well, we have done this. Immediately I got back home and authorization went through so that these people could cut half-a-million or a million feet of lumber through the co-operative organization that they have, and I have a letter which I received today, excerpts of which I will read to this House, Mr. Speaker. And, we provided, as I said, in other places where there has been a new survey there, to clear some of the streets. We provided work for them cutting pulpwood with a private operator. And another private operator, by the name of Knutson across the Saskatchewan River has a lumber camp, and he has taken some of them in to work for him in his woods operations.

We encouraged the others to go out and do all the trapping they could, not to sit around and waste their time. On top of that, what has this Government done? It has a man in there that has been giving some assistance and instruction to the local people as how to grow gardens and raise cattle. I know one case — and I have a letter from him, too. He is not only a cattleman now, but he was a fisherman (and still is) and he has, I think, eight or twelve head of cattle. I saw the cattle, and he is very proud of them. He is doing quite well. Some of the families, as I say, are doing quite well; some have not oriented themselves to the conditions to which they must adapt themselves. But we are doing good work and it cannot be denied. The conditions in that community are much better

than those at Pelican. They, too, have a good hospital at Cumberland House; they have one school at Cumberland House and another just a short distance away at Pemmican Portage, and I think that the people as a whole are fairly happy. If it is thought they are not then I would like to read an excerpt of the letter I received from one of my constituents today. He may be a Liberal or a C.C.F., I don't know; but he is my friend. I asked him whether they had the work that we were trying to provide for them, and he says:

“I received your most welcome letter shortly after your visit in here. It is very nice for us to know that you have not forgotten us. In the past we have met our M.L.A.s, but the only time they know you are living is just before election day. Sometimes they would shake hands every time you met them. That would be four or five times in one day. From there on you go to hell.”

Then, towards the conclusion, Mr. Speaker, he says this — and he is talking about asking me if I could not persuade the department of government to help them to obtain a sawmill, because he mentions in the letter here then instead of getting \$28 as they are now, they could make \$42 if they save the lumber themselves. And, towards the conclusion of a letter he says this:

“Maybe some of the members will say ‘no use wasting money on those Indians; they don't know anything anyway.’”

That reminds me of a speech from across the House: “They don't pay taxes.” Yet he says in the letter here:

“There is plenty of money collected in royalties and licences and so forth, and we have already made a deal with a millworks and a sawyer to work for us, if we can get a mill. So we are waiting for your reply.”

The reason I read part of this letter, Mr. Speaker, is that those people at Cumberland House, at Green Lake and, yes, the Treaty Indians at Pelican Narrows, are just the same kind of human beings as we have here in this House. Maybe they did not have the advantages of an education or experience in the world, but when you come down to these things that are important in life, respect for themselves, a willingness to work and do all those things that we do to make a living, in that way they are just as good as any of us.

I don't know if I should take up any more time, Mr. Speaker, on the north. I did not intend to speak — I would have preferred to deal with some other matters which I felt were important and needed the attention of this House. However, I will leave life in the North for the time being and it may be that at some future time I may have much more to say on the subject.

What I want to discuss with you today, Mr. Speaker, is something that has been bothering me for some time and it concerns the mining activity in the north. I want make a recommendation, seeing that the

February 25, 1955

Opposition has failed, as usual, to make constructive recommendations; I would like to make a recommendation to the Government, and particularly to the Minister of Natural Resources, that it is high time that the royalties on mines be raised so these would be somewhat comparable with the royalties received from oil. The reason I say that is because only recently on reading an article (I think it was in the 'Northern Miner'), it was stated that it does not cost any more to produce a mine than it does to produce an oil well. I don't know just how right the writer was, but in any event, it got me thinking.

I do know that, with the capital that the mining companies have invested, they are making tremendous profits. As I said on a previous occasion, I know of one particular mine that — I think it was three years ago, in 1951 — paid the Dominion Government in \$11 million in corporation tax. We received a million and a half, roughly, of royalties. The company made \$17 million clear, and when we talk in this House that the natural resources belong to the people, I think that probably we are not getting as large a share of the wealth as we should.

According to the Minister of Natural Resources, the other day, I estimated (I may be wrong) that we had a production, or will have her production, of about \$50 million this coming year. On the basis of five per cent, if we got five per cent, we should receive about \$2 million of royalties. Now, I do not think that is enough, and I will try to argue my case. In the first place, in any other business that you go into, say farming; the farmer had a quarter section of land; he is the landlord, and he leases it out to the tenant. He puts in all his capital, the tenant comes in with equipment and tries to crop the land. The usual arrangement in our country is one-third share, 33 1/3 per cent. Now, that is fairly high.

Then, again, you come to the oil companies. The natural resources under the Crown belong to the people of Saskatchewan, and we know it is an expensive thing to drill for oil. But, they don't drill if they don't think they are going to make profits. Apparently they are quite satisfied to pay a fair royalty of 12 1/2 per cent and on top of that they pay lease fees, and on top of that sometimes they pay quite a substantial amount of money for the surface rights, or the rights to drill on that property. I think something like that should be done as far as hard rock mining is concerned. I don't know just what plan to propose, but I think that probably on the first million dollars of profit we could charge them say a royalty of five percent in order that they could recover some of their capital; but I do think that, after they produce over that amount, we should be able to get a fair amount of royalty back for the people of Saskatchewan, because, after all, that wealth does not belong actually to the company; they only have a right to take it out. It belongs to the people of Saskatchewan, and the five per cent royalty, in my opinion, is not high enough. It may be argued that other provinces are only charging five per cent. Well, does this Government have to fall in line with all of the provinces? I think that this Government should give leadership in that direction, and consider the point I have in mind.

Another point in connection with mining in the north that bothers a lot of people and bothers me is the leasing of the mineral rights under the quartz regulations. I do know that some statement has been made

that the lease fees be raised from 10 cents an acre to one dollar an acre, and I am very glad of that; but, at the same time, I do not think it is going to answer the problem. And the problem is this, Mr. Speaker: Throughout the north (and I think there are three or four hundred different areas), the mining companies have taken out leases on valuable properties. If there was no valuable ore there, they would not take a lease on it for 20 years. I may be wrong, but I cannot imagine how anybody would hold on to property for 20 years if there was nothing there. So, therefore, it would appear that many of these companies that have these leases must know that the ore is there, otherwise they would not have taken the 20-year leases out. Now, as is usual, mining companies do not think as I do and you do, about tomorrow. They look into the future 100 years from now, and as long as they can protect themselves for 20 years, and they do not need that particular ore, they are not going to do anything in that area. I like the policy that this Government has carried out insofar as oil is concerned. I think that what the Government does is hand out the lease to the oil company for two years, and if they do not start development they lose their lease. Why cannot some such a policy be brought into being insofar as the mining companies are concerned?

One way is to do it this way: Give them a lease, — \$1.00 an acre for the first year, the second year and maybe the third year, maybe to the fifth year; then, I suggest that we should have in the agreement the provision that if they have not started mining by the fifth year, the lease rental would be \$5.00 an acre and give them another five years at \$5.00 an acre, and as long as they pay us the money, which represents wealth, after all, we won't kick too much. And if they do not do anything in ten years, raise it to \$10.00 an acre. If the ore is there they are going to hold on to it; if not, they are going to get off the property and give somebody else a chance to get on to that property and try to prove it and make a mine out of it.

There may be some other way of settling this problem. In any event, I want to say again that I am very happy to see two things; the Government apparently is going to allow the prospectors to now stake 18 claims instead of the original nine, and also that they have suggested through the press that they will raise the rental on these leases from five cents an acre to \$1.00 an acre. I think this is going in the right direction.

One other thing I should discuss, of course, when I am discussing mines is mining roads, and I particularly think of a situation down in the Flin Flon region. I was up there or not so long ago. I inspected certain roads — some that this Government built and some that the mining companies built; and for the life of me, I cannot understand why mining companies should build roads. After all, they are going to be used by the public. I can understand that you can build say a few hundred yards of road from the mine, or a trail from the mine, or whatever you want to build to the main road; but they have built in that area 31 miles of first-class highway and, of course, that, in one respect, it is a good thing. We do not get enough royalties so they are building those roads, and those roads must cost them \$10 or \$12 thousand a mile. But I would prefer that the Government get a higher royalty and build those roads themselves. We have a responsibility, I think, to the mining companies to do that, and we have a responsibility to the people who live in those communities.

Maybe I will regret what I am going to say — but I have never been afraid to say what is true, wherever I am, and I am going to say that I am not happy that the Government has failed in building at least a mining road from Flin Flon south to the Coronation Mine and the Birch Lake Mine. I think it is the duty and responsibility of this Government to have done that. Having done that, they could have done one other thing. They could have given a good road for the people from Creighton to travel on to Denare Beach. At the present time all we have is a little winding trail. When, Mr. Speaker, you consider that out of the one mine that exists up to the present time — and there will be three or four more, and if you take Manitoba into consideration, it will probably be five or six — I am actually ashamed that we have not done more. We have, over a period of years, taken over \$12 million out of that area, and we have not even a decent road. I am not going to say any more about it; I hope to have a chat with the Minister of Highways and tell him what the people think. I have plenty of correspondence on the subject. I was in the area. I only wish that you could go with me and take a look at the situation and I think something will be done. I hope this Government will do something. I think the people there are citizens as the citizens are here in Regina or in Saskatoon or in any big city, and they are entitled to some fair consideration as far as roads are concerned, and so are the mining companies.

Talking about roads, I noticed the member from Nipawin (Mr. McNutt) the other day mentioned that he only had \$8.42 spent on capital on highways in his constituency. Well, I wouldn't let him worry too much because I can say that I have had nothing spent on capital on highways in my constituency, and I cannot treble nothing by three times because I will still have zero. But I have confidence that the Government will get around to building a few roads both in the Nipawin constituency and in Cumberland constituency. I have to recognize the fact that this past year, in particular, has been a tough year for the Department of Highways, and I know, as it was with the money we had for municipal roads, instead of putting it into capital we had to use the capital money for repair work, and I would suggest to the hon. member from Nipawin that probably that is the reason why no work was undertaken on the highways that he has in mind. However, the hon. member for Nipawin, Mr. Speaker, in talking about some of the roads, and particularly the road which he would like to see into Flin Flon and which I would like to see, has insinuated that I had some ulterior motive in suggesting an alternative route through the north; and I think it is proper that I reply to him so that we do not get the wrong impression, both here, in this House, or in the country.

I do not need to repeat what my opinion is, as I have said before to other people that this Government will not build Highway No. 35, and the reason is of course obvious why I do not think they are going to build it — because the Dominion Government has reneged on their promise to give the 50 per cent assistance which they gave to Manitoba. The second reason, of course, is that the continuing of that highway on to Flin Flon, as is shown on the map now, would be going through an area of land which does not contain any particular resources. I would like to see that road, but I don't care where a road is built. Yet, on the other hand, if I was in the position of any of the Ministers of the Crown, I would have to consider that any money spent on roads should be spent in an area where

people would benefit from the resources in that area. Therefore, when I spoke in the community of Flin Flon to the Chamber of Commerce I told them what I thought. I was honest about it; there were no political reasons for it. I want a road into the north, but I do not think that the Government should build a road where it is not going to be in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan. Notwithstanding the fact that the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) would like to see a road through Hudson Bay to No. 10, which would be a good road, and notwithstanding that the hon. member from Nipawin would like a road, say east along the Saskatchewan river (one of the alternatives I suggested), the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that there will be a large number of people of Saskatchewan in the north and northwest who would still, if they wanted to go to Flin Flon, have to make a detour of about 200 miles extra. And on top of that, the fact remains that neither of those roads suggested by the hon. member for Nipawin or the Minister of Natural Resources contains the natural resources that are found along a route that I have suggested.

First of all, I would like to point out to this House, and the reason I am doing so is because I want your support; I want public support from the people because I think many of us believe that what we are promoting is proper and good and for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan. First of all, the road, either from No. 2 Highway to Montreal Lake or from Prince Albert by-passes a dozen lakes; for example, you have Candle Lake, Whiteswan Lakes, White Gull Lake, Little Trout Lakes; you have Little Bear Lake, Big Sandy Lake, Deschambault Lake, which opens up a whole north just as the La Ronge does, and then you have Suggi Lake and you have Beaver Lake. It would be a wonderful road for tourists, nothing like Highway No. 35, along which there wouldn't be one decent lake. Here you would have a tourist's paradise. Secondly, I have flown over the area, I have studied maps and I have looked at reports, and some of the best timber we have in Saskatchewan is found in the area between Candle and Flin Flon; and if we are going to have any development in the north, if we are going to utilize this mature timber that has been standing there for such a long time, I suggest to the Government that is the road to build. There is going to be work for people, and there is going to be material taken out, both for saw logs and for pulp. Probably more important than anything else — three weeks ago, just before I came into this House, Mr. Speaker, I had occasion to fly over Hansen Lake, which is 40 miles west of Flin Flon, and I stopped at a prospector's site there. He had invited me to come down and see him, and we stopped at one spot where he had trenched — I prospected for many years, Mr. Speaker, and I think I know a little bit about the possibilities of whether you are going to have a mine or not; and here is what I saw: I checked and he had 12 feet of chalcopyrite which is a copper sulphide containing, as he told me, six per cent copper, and the vein went right across lakes to the north. We went by plane and skidded along the top of the lake, and four miles up, and follow the same vein, and I saw another area trenched and there again he had 100 feet of mineralized zone with about 12 feet of high grade zinc sulphide and copper sulphide. Now if anybody tells me we are not going to have a mine there, I cannot agree with them; I think I would say he is going to have a mine there.

In that same area, while flying over it, I saw diamond drills drilling through the ice. They do that in the winter, drill through the ice, and, Mr. Speaker, they are going to be mines there. You may not see them and I may not see them, depending upon the policy of the Government

whether we are going to make the companies develop those areas or not; but the ore is there; and if a mine is begun by some private company in the near future, then immediately we will have a mining road into Hansen Lake area, and if you do that then you only have another 40 or 50 miles to join up with the Candle Lake trail which the Timber Board has built.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to touch upon one or two other matters which affect the people of the north, particularly fur marketing. First of all, I will say that I am absolutely in agreement with compulsory fur marketing with one exception — that the people who want compulsory fur marketing decide whether they want it that way. Now in such case it will be compatible with the establishment of the Canadian Wheat Board. I do not quite agree with the Minister of Natural Resources when he said, the other day, that it was like that Wheat Board. It is not, because in connection with the Wheat Board I think (I stand to be corrected) the farm organizations and the farmers themselves asked for compulsory wheat marketing. When it comes down to the trappers, they did not ask for it. As I said, Mr. Speaker, I am for the Saskatchewan Fur Marketing Service, because I know that, by having that service, they will get twice as much money as they would get on the open market; but I am not going to be paternalistic for the simple reason that I found out, through the years of my living with the people in the north, that we are not going to assimilate them and integrate them into our society unless we treat them on an equal basis as we treat our people elsewhere, and I am willing to sacrifice my thinking on that point. I am willing to see that those people who have motives, such as I think some of them have, to exploit in, the only reason they want fur marketing to be voluntary is because they feel they can go in there and make money on the poor trappers of the area. My reason is entirely different; it has to do with human spirit. Now to indicate to this House why I am in favour of the Fur Marketing Service — and I would like the support of everybody for it and try and encourage the people in the north to vote for compulsory fur marketing service — and my reason is this: During election time, when I was down in Cumberland House, I stopped off at The Pas. I used to be a fur buyer at one time (I have done a lot of things, by the way, Mr. Speaker), and I inquired at this place where fur was being bought what was being paid for muskrat, and I was told 75 cents average; the private dealer buys at so much on an average. If you have a lot of small fur, of course, you don't get that good average; but that was the average the buyer was paying for muskrats. I made note of the prices and proceeded on to Cumberland House; I had a meeting there, and of course after the hon. member from Athabaska (the gentleman who opposed me in the last campaign) got through, those people were aroused, and the first thing they told me was "We don't want the Fur Marketing Service; we are being robbed." I had some information from the Government before I got out there, too, so I asked them what they were complaining about. They said: "Well, we only got a 70 cent advance on our muskrat; we don't want to have compulsory fur marketing; we want the Government to get rid of it." When I asked them what they were paying for muskrat in The Pas, somebody got up and told me it was 75 cents. I then asked them if they knew they were getting another 70 cents, which was in the mail right then, in addition to the 70 cents they had already got, making \$1.40. I asked them which was better, 75 cents or \$1.40, and somebody else got up and said, "Well, we never thought about it."

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Fur Marketing Service is the best thing that the people of the north country have, but we cannot have it unless they vote it in; otherwise, our friends opposite and the fur trade in the north are going to use every argument, every threat. The hon. member for Meadow Lake said, the other day, that the people were in fear. They are in fear, and they were in fear of those people, because their lives depended upon them. But until we arrive at the time that the people will say to this Government, "We want a fur marketing service that is compulsory for all furs, either on a local basis or some other basis"; until that time comes, I think we should follow their instructions given to us at their conventions.

I would like to point out to the hon. Minister of Natural Resources that when he says he has left it to the fur advisory committee, he must remember that on the fur advisory committee there is only one member who is a representative of the Dominion Government — Mr. Hugh Conn, from the Department of Indian Affairs; and the other two members are working for this Government — Game Commissioner Mr. Paynter and the Deputy Minister, Mr. Hogg, and surely the two can out-vote Mr. Conn if it is in the interests of the people of the north to do so.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other item that I would like to bring up and then I will sit down. I think I have taken plenty of time as it is. I did not intend to take too much time, but I happen to represent one of those constituencies which is a large constituency, and I have not only farmers, but bushmen, trappers and fishermen, and even politicians. The other thing I want to mention is that I would like to see a policy on fishing. Maybe I should have taken this up with the Minister concerned. I receive complaints from time to time, and I have to bear out the member from Athabaska (Mr. Ripley) that the people who are fishing along the boundary of Manitoba-Saskatchewan are not too happy when Manitobans use, say, a 4 inch mesh and we require 4 1/2 inch mesh. Our mesh requirement should be the same as those for Manitoba in order to have good public relations, if nothing else. Maybe our laws are better, but again you have to consider the wishes of the people and see that they are satisfied. Another thing is (and I agree again with the hon. member from Athabaska) that the Government, through the Minister of Natural Resources, should see to it that if Manitoba allows the catch of 25,000 lbs. of sturgeon (which, after all, is not peanuts; it is \$1.00 a pound) there is no reason why we in Saskatchewan should not do likewise. And I am saying these things, Mr. Speaker, because trapping and fishing still are the primary sources of livelihood for our people, and I do not want this Government, or any other government, to do anything that would deprive them of a cent.

I will conclude with the hope that this Government will continue to follow the policies it has in effect now, of trying to provide work for those people instead of handing out relief vouchers as used to be the case in the past. I hope they will continue to provide educational facilities, and I am happy that, today — and probably the Minister of Education will have an opportunity to tell you — through the north we are getting youngsters who are going into high school for the first time in the history of this province. I am glad that this Government has been bringing roads into the north to help not only the native people, but to help the fringe settlers along the forests. They are fine people, and they are becoming interested, as a matter of fact, even in forest farming. I will go into that some other time. But many things that this Government is doing are good, and as I said at the beginning, Mr. Speaker, my people approve the Speech from the Throne and I am certainly going to support the motion

February 25, 1955

Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

SECOND READING

Bill No. 20 — An Act to amend the Farm Security Act.

Hon. J.W. Corman, Q.C. (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, if I should speak a few minutes longer than is my wont, I hope you will forgive me; but with the falling prices for farm produce, with increased prices of the things the farmer has to buy to continue in business, and with threats to world markets, I suggest there can be no slackening in our efforts by legislation and otherwise to give protection of different kinds to deserving farmers.

The ‘meat’ of the Bill now before the House is contained in Section 3, which proposes an amendment to Section 7 of The Farm Security Act. The Farm Security Act was passed in 1944 at the second session, and Section 7 is designed to give protection to farmers and their families against eviction or against dispossession under mortgages in respect of a homestead of 160 acres. Section 7 provides that all proceedings for possession under a final mortgage foreclosure orders shall be stayed as long as the farm continues to be a homestead.

It has been the practice to pass Section 7 for only two years at a time; that is, I believe, because the law officers consider it a moratorium legislation in certain respects. In 1953, Section 7 of the Act was amended to remain in force until July 1, 1955. I am now asking the House, in the amendment before us, to extend this protection to homesteads of farmers and their families against eviction under mortgage foreclosures until July 1, 1957.

I am not trying to run the House or to run the Opposition; I can assure you I have trouble enough running my own business and I cannot do that to the satisfaction of very many people. However, I suggest that it would assist all of us in the enforcement of this Section (that is, the Section re protection to the homesteads) and in explaining the need for it, especially to people outside the province, if the public knew where Her Majesty’s Loyal Opposition stand on this legislation.

I am not trying to put anyone on the spot. As far as I am concerned, for this Session I intend to follow a policy of peaceful co-existence, and I intend to respect the sincerity of the views of the members opposite just as I feel sure they will respect mine; but frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am not certain what their views are on this protective legislation.

When The Farm Security Act was introduced and passed, in 1944, the Liberal Opposition talked against this section, talked against giving this protection to the homesteads, and unanimously voted against it. We must face up to the fact that some Liberal speakers and some Liberal newspapers have charged, since that time, that the legislation is not in the public interest, that it is destroying farm credit and that it is keeping mortgage money out of the province and so on. We on our side of the House believe the legislation is in the public interest, and we believe it is necessary under present agricultural conditions or we would not be asking the House to continue the legislation.

I might point out here that no money was being loaned — this is in reply to the charge of keeping mortgage money out of the province; no money was being loaned in Saskatchewan on the security of farm mortgages by private mortgage companies for 15 years prior to the passing of The Farm Security Act, and I suggest it is not The Farm Security Act that is keeping these mortgage companies out.

Section 7 does not restrict the ordinary remedies of mortgage companies. They can still sue for their money; they can still distrain against the crop; they may also foreclose and obtain possession of all the land which is not the homestead of 160 acres, and they may even obtain possession of that 160 acres if they are successful in an application to the Mediation Board. I may say that the section was made binding on the Crown in any mortgages in favour of the Crown. It is not, however, binding on the Canadian Farm Loan Board, and I suggest that it is from that Board that Saskatchewan farmers should be getting their money, as many of them are.

Just in closing, Mr. Speaker, if the Opposition vote for my amendment I respectfully hope and pray that they will call off the critics within their own party who are attempting to use this legislation as propaganda against the Government. I know that my hon. friends opposite are too honest and too upright to want it both ways. I would, therefore, Mr. Speaker, after these few well chosen words, move that the Bill be now read the second time.

Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I was more than pleased to have the privilege of listening to the Attorney General here, this afternoon, as I think it is the first time since I came into the House that I have had the opportunity of listening to him, that is, in the Chamber. I consider his speech was very well given, it was very lengthy, considering that all we are asked to do in the Bill is to substitute 1957 for 1955; and I would suggest that if our good friend the Attorney General can make a speech as lengthy on some of the Bills that do have considerable changes in them, this will probably draw out to be a very long Session and the very enjoyable one. We will certainly take the Bill under consideration in Third Reading and probably the Minister will find out at that time just how the Opposition sits.

Hon. Mr. Corman: — Mr. Speaker, I might say, in closing the debate . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, you will have to warn that House, if the Minister is closing the debate, it excludes anyone else from speaking. I think that warning should be given to the House.

Mr. Speaker: — Certainly. It is my duty to warn the House, that the mover of the motion is about to exercise his right to close the debate. Any member who desires to speak to the motion must do so now.

Hon. Mr. Corman: — In reply, all I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, is that I think probably I would rather be criticized for not talking all the time, than be criticized for talking too much and saying nothing.

February 25, 1955

The question being put, it was agreed to unanimously, recorded division as follows:

Yeas — 43
Messieurs

Douglas (Weyburn)	Williams	Wooff
Wellbelove	Burton	Willis (Melfort-Tisdale)
McIntosh	Thair	Feusi
Brockelbank	Heming	Brown (Last Mountain)
Fines	Dewhurst	Begrand
Corman	Erb	McDonald
Lloyd	Gibbs	McCarthy
Nollet	Swallow	Horsman
Cooper (Mrs.)	Walker (Hanley)	Danielson
Gibson	Willis (Elrose)	Loptson
Brown (Bengough)	Buchanan	Ripley
Kuziak	Larsen	MacNutt
Darling	Zipchen	Carr
Howe	Berezowsky	
Douglas (Rosetown)	Brown (Melville)	

The Assembly adjourned at 6.00 o'clock p.m.