

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session - Twelfth Legislature
25th Day

Wednesday, March 16, 1955

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

On the Orders of the Day:

Re: EDITORIAL LEADER-POST

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I wish to draw the attention of the House to an editorial appearing this morning in the 'Leader-Post'. I saw my name mentioned and thought it worth reading. Then I saw it related to an earlier news release which itself was generally fair and reasonably accurate; but this editorial is certainly not. I thought I made it clear in my speech — because I made very brief mention of these projects when I dealt with flooding conditions and the need for drainage — that I was dealing with the whole area in the north-eastern part of Saskatchewan.

The second impression they tried to leave is that when I mentioned the supplementary vote which will be brought down, I was referring to the entire vote. In reality I only mentioned that part that was to cover the work-and-wages programme which was carried on, again in the entire north-eastern part of the province. I believe there were some 20 municipalities involved in that work-and-wages programme. The attempt is made here to leave the impression that that whole supplementary vote was used to take care of the small area in which we had carried on some farming operations, and I want to correct both of those statements.

It is just another case, Mr. Speaker, where we have unfortunately, a daily newspaper in this province that is most unscrupulous in their editorial policy. I hate to realize it is necessary for anyone to have to get up in this House and correct statements such as are made in this editorial.

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Just to keep the record straight I want to say to this House that not one cent of the money that was contributed to work and wages by Highways was spent in the area referred to, the Veterans' Settlement areas, Mr. Speaker. I would think that the Leader-Post ought to have their facts right. Just as recently as October 9th they received a full report from the Department on this north-east drainage problem.

BUDGET DEBATE

The House resumed from Tuesday, March 15, 1955, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair. (The Assembly to go into a Committee of Supply).

Mr. Feusi (continued): — Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate, yesterday evening, I did mention that the highlight of the budget, this year, insofar as Pelly constituency was concerned was the fact that we are going to

March 16, 1995

have our turn at the highway programme. Last year we did have a beginning, but were unable to carry on for the simple reason the moisture conditions prevented any highway construction in our part of Saskatchewan. I am very pleased to know that the programme of last year is going to be continued and a further extension made this year. I would like to point out that the portion of the highway that we are getting to is probably a fairly old section of highway insofar as Saskatchewan is concerned.

I would like to go into the history of the highway insofar as this is the Jubilee Year, and I thought it a matter of interest to go into the early construction of some of the highways and, in particular, the one that I am referring to today, Mr. Speaker. I found, as a matter of interest, a very interesting story in the Saskatchewan Journals of 1931. You will note, Mr. Speaker, that I am not referring to the Leader-Post or some of the other articles that the gentleman from Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) referred to, yesterday.

Incidentally, this does carry him into the picture, and it deals with a question asked in this House back in the year 1931 and the question No. 1 is:

“Did A. Loptson, of Saltcoats Constituency, obtain a contract from the Department of Highways in the year 1924 on the Highway north and south of Togo, Saskatchewan?”

That referred to Highway No. 5, Mr. Speaker. The answer:

“No, but a contract for the construction of the Togo north and south Highway, Project 5, section A, was awarded to A. Loptson, on September 20, 1923. The major portion of the work under this contract was performed during 1924.”

Question 2: “If so, what are the details of the prices therefor?”

And the answer, Mr. Speaker, and I think a lot of people in this House and the listening audience would be interested in it, is:

“The contract was awarded at the following prices:

Earth excavation	24½ cents per cubic yard
Loose rock excavation	60 ” ” ” ” ”
Rock excavation	\$3.00 ” ” ” ” ”

Hauling and installing culverts:

	15 cents per lineal foot
Corrugated iron 12 inch	20 ” ” ” ” ”
” ” 18 ”	30 ” ” ” ” ”
” ” 24 ”	75 ” ” ” ” ”
” ” 36 ”	\$1.00 ” ” ” ” ”
” ” 48 ”	

And so on down the line to 24 inch, 50 cents per lineal foot.

Timber culverts,	\$20.00 per 1,000 F.B.M.
Guardrail,	.40 ” lineal foot
Clearing,	30.00 ” acre
Grubbing,	5.00 ” 10,000 square feet
Riprap,	5.00 ” cubic yard.

Question 3: "Was any of the work let to subcontractors, and, if so, to whom?"

Answer: "Yes. Subcontractors employed under this contract were Topham Bros., and S. Sveinson."

Question 4: "How much was paid A. Loptson, and how much was paid to the subcontractors?"

Answer: "Paid to A. Loptson under terms of contract, \$19,516.39. Department of Highways has no knowledge of amounts paid to subcontractors."

Question 5: "What are the details of the prices allowed by A. Loptson to the subcontractors?"

Answer: "According to information received from Topham Bros., their prices were as follows:

Earth excavation	.20 per cubic yard
Guardrail	.05 " lineal foot
Overhaul	.03 " cubic yard per 100 foot
All other prices as in original contract.	

"The Department has no knowledge of prices paid to Sveinson by A. Loptson."

Incidentally, it is interesting to go back to one item in which he obtained contracts for guard rails at 40 cents per lineal foot, subcontracted it at five cents per lineal foot.

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. That statement is absolutely untrue and unreasonable. There isn't any guard rail operable for five cents a foot. It is ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I understand the hon. member is quoting from the Journals of this House.

Mr. Loptson: — It's ridiculous.

Mr. Feusi: — Mr. Speaker, he had the opportunity of refuting this many years ago in the House. I might point out that, yesterday, the member for Saltcoats did quote the fact that some individuals were making a tidy personal fortune, and I would submit that this was the start of the first million dollars for the member of Saltcoats.

Mr. Loptson: — I would also ask my hon. friend how many miles Topham Bros. did. I think you will find that there were only one or two miles.

Mr. Feusi: — Mr. Speaker, we will get to that a little further along the page. Another question asked:

"Was a foreman by the name of James Bridgewater, on the contract, sued by one of the employees for his wages?"

March 16, 1995

The answer is very interesting:

“James Bridgewater, foreman on this contract, was sued by John L. and E.C. Rooke for the sum of \$24.50 being payment for oats used on this contract.”

Q.7 “Was judgment rendered against the said James Bridgewater?”

A. “Yes.”

Q.8 “Did A. Loptson pay the said judgment?”

A. “Yes.”

Q.9 “After said A. Loptson claimed to have completed the said contract was an inspection thereof made, and, if so, was the work found to have been properly completed?”

A. An inspection was made and it was found that the work was not completed in accordance with the terms of the contract and specifications.”

And, incidentally, hereby we are going to find how he obtained much of his contracting experience in the next page or two, Mr. Speaker.

Q.10 “If not, what additional work was ordered to be done by the Department?”

A. “The following work was ordered to be done to complete the contract: (incidentally, a station is 100 feet.)

Station 475 50 483:

Trimming; level waste bank, pile rocks.

Station 380 to 390:

Raise one foot.

Station 360 to 373:

Raise one foot and install culvert 12” x 28’.

Station 305:

Cut knoll off and raise grade Station 306 to 309 plus 50.

Station 296:

Deepen cut in ditch on East side; use dirt to raise grade from Station 295 to 296.

Station 292 to 295:

1. Cut out berm between two ditches on west side of road and use material to raise fill to Station 291.
2. Level waste bank on east side of road, Station 292 to Station 275.

Station 292, South:

Raise bridge floor to 10 ft. above creek bed. Cut hill to east to Station 289. Shape up road from Station 292 to 295.

Station 268:

Reduce curvature at road intersection by widening 10 feet at corner.

Station 265:

Raise fill to take bump out of roadway.

Station 257:

Widen grade for guard rail.

Station 240 to 267:

Level up shoulders.

Station 235 to 237:

Ditch only 4" deep on west side; dig standard ditch and raise road one foot. Level waste banks on both sides of road, placing material back on the roadway.

Station 186 to 192:

Standard ditch required on east side, (present ditch 4 to 6 inches deep).

Station 186 to 200:

Rock to be piled at edge of right of way.

Station 188 to 192:

Ditch required on west side.

Station 161:

Approach to culvert not covered.

Station 143 to 151:

No attempt to build a road – some sods pulled in from sides where Resident Engineer instructed a fill to be built from end haul. Grade to be raised one foot and properly trimmed. Stones to be piled at edge of right of way.

Station 100 to 107:

Stones to be piled.

Station 90 to 100:

Ground simply rooted up – no road built. Ditches 6 to 8 inches deep and not grubbed. Earth wasted to be put back on road.

Station 66:

Farm entrance to east. No dirt on 18" culvert.

Station 52 to 70:

Level waste banks.

March 16, 1995

Station 19-24 to 43-92:

Corner built to tangents, requires to be built to curves.”

Q. 11 “Did the Department receive a resolution from any rural council complaining of the work done on said contract, and, if so, what was the nature of the said resolution, and from what council?”

A. “The following letter dated August 5, 1924, containing resolution passed by the Council of the Rural Municipality of Cote No. 271 was received by the Department:

‘Deputy Minister,
Department of Highways,
Regina.

Sir:

In the process of building the Federal Aid Highway near Togo numerous rocks and spare dumps were left scattered all over the road allowance, which makes the road appear unsightly and besides will promote the growth of noxious weeds.

This Council understand that your Department will look after the road in future, but they believe that if a little more care had been taken in placing these rocks and spare dumps in suitable locations and not left scattered around, that a great deal of money would have been saved in future maintenance.

I beg to submit for your consideration a resolution passed by this Council.

“WHEREAS numerous rocks and spare dumps have been left scattered around, by the contractors building Highways under the Federal Highways Scheme;

“AND WHEREAS these scattered rocks and spare dumps will promote the growth of weeds and render the destruction of same very difficult;

“THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that this Council recommend to the Department of Highways that in future a clause be included in contracts, whereby the contractor will be required to pile the rocks, and place the spare dirt in suitable locations. (Preferably on the road).

Respectfully submitted,
Your obedient servant,
‘S.B. Harper’
Secretary-Treasurer.”

Mr. Speaker, that gives us an idea of the problems that they had in road construction in the early days. But, of interest to me is the fact that this was a Federal Aid Highway, and the rest of my time I wish to devote to the need for further Federal aid.

The Federal aid to the Trans-Canada Highway may end. The agreement between the Federal Government and the Provinces terminates. It is imperative that Federal responsibility and aid continue. The Trans-Canada agreement became effective in December, 1949, and was to extend for seven years. Federal contribution was up to 50 per cent of the cost, and there was a further limitation placed on the contract or the arrangement, and that was that \$150 million was to be the complete amount of responsibility that the Federal Government had. The provincial governments were saddled with the cost of right-of-ways. The Ottawa interest in the highway was to cease after construction, placing all future maintenance costs with the provincial governments. The agreement specified a two-lane highway, with a 24-foot top, 10-foot shoulders, with an overall mileage of 4,591 miles. Saskatchewan's share of this mileage is 414 miles.

Incidentally, there was no Federal maintenance responsibility attached, and it is a responsibility that we are going to be faced with in the future, provincially, Mr. Speaker. The western provinces are anxious that Federal aid to our highways be continued and extended. Canada's past record of assistance on Canadian roads has been very poor. So much so, that in the late 'forties, Robert Ripley in his column 'Believe it or Not' stated there was no road across Canada worthy of the name.

Canadians who wish to journey any distance across Canada would have to leave their roadway and instead of going very far east or west would have to go down south and into the States, cross a portion of the States and then come up into Canada south of the destination they wished to reach. Today, we have a step in the right direction in this, that we have under way a Federal-Provincial highway, Trans-Canada highway, an agreement, and we feel that it is a good beginning, but we do not know what is going to happen after 1956.

Let me go back into the history of some of the road aid. In comparison with the U.S.A., Canada's aid to the highway system is very meagre and patchy. In 1919, \$20 million was allocated to aid the provinces. Again in the 'thirties and 'forties some \$28 million was allocated, and I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this Highway I spoke of that was built in 1923-24 was a Federal aid highway, and you can see from that just about how some of the Federal funds were spent. It all did not go on to the road.

A number of the provinces were unable to foot their share of the bill, hence they lost the Federal aid. I believe the aid was on a 40-60 basis: 40 for the Federal Government and 60 for the provinces, and quite a few of the provinces were unable to meet that commitment at the time. In comparison with the United States of America, Mr. Speaker, Canada is 40 years behind. I would like to quote 'Tax Review' of July, 1954, a periodical put out by an American tax foundation in New York:

"While the year 1916 may be said to mark the beginning of the programme of sustained federal aid to highways, the interest of the national government in roads may be much older. From the very beginning of our nation's history, in the opinion of some authorities, the government of the United States have supported national highways and other transportation."

Just recently, President Eisenhower has asked Congress for another \$25 billion over a 10-year period to rebuild and modernize much of their road system. This \$25 billion for that 10-year period is in excess of the existing road programme that is in effect and in excess of further benefits that

March 16, 1995

are being proposed for the next few years. I have in mind a bill to the tune of \$900 million that is proposed by Congress for the federal aid programme that goes before Congress this winter. I believe it is before Congress at the present time. This \$900 million roughly corresponds to the revenue obtained by Washington through the transportation industry, i.e. gas tax, excise and sales taxes. American federal aid to date has been approximately on a 50-50 basis with the states, the moneys being divided into three portions and allotted on the following basis – and I feel that basis would be a very fine thing for Canada to adopt:

1. In proportion to population;
2. According to area;
3. According to total road mileage in each state.

This formula has been in operation since 1916.

Further, the federal government of the U.S.A. takes an interest in most types of roads. The \$900 million can be broken down in the following manner: \$270 million for primary or main highway systems, such as our Trans-Canada; \$180 million (this is yearly) for secondary or feeder highways; \$150 million for urban road systems such as cloverleaf dispersal on the outskirts of cities, by-passes of cities, and streets within cities that are used for highways; \$200 million for interstate or market roads – and this, Mr. Speaker, is on a 60-40 basis, 60 per cent for the federal government share and 40 per cent the states, and this would be a tremendous asset for the counties or municipalities or local governments (if they have them) similar to ours, in the states. And, finally, \$100 million for strictly federal, or park roads. There isn't a road of note in the United States today, Mr. Speaker, that does not come under federal aid. Surely, we should have corresponding responsibilities in Canada. The tremendous increase of transportation rolling on rubber has made the road construction problem a real burden for provincial and municipal governments these days, and I would like to read to the House the cars sold over a number of years. The amount of rolling stock we have at present in Canada.

For instance, in 1934, the cars sold in Canada were 61,500; trucks sold, 11,855, making a total of the smaller type of vehicles, 73,355. Including buses that figure would probably come somewhere around 74,000. In 1953 (the latest figures that I was able to get hold of) the cars sold in Canada were 359,000; trucks, 103,000, in round figures, making a total of 462,526, or $6\frac{1}{3}$ times the number of cars sold in 1953 than were sold in 1934, which gives us some idea of the problem that the roadmakers of the nation have, and today the Federal Government is not very much of a roadmaker in comparison with the provincial and municipal governments.

Incidentally, before passing on to the next item, in the province of Saskatchewan, today, we have some 267,000 vehicles licensed – a tremendous amount for the population of Saskatchewan. Back to another set of figures, Mr. Speaker. About a year ago, Ottawa obtained \$106,096,757 from the excise tax on automobiles, tires and tubes, and a further \$54 million from vehicle sales tax. This makes a total of around \$160 million obtained by Ottawa from the motor vehicle business. And yet, Mr. Speaker, though the provincial and municipal governments are the main roadbuilders of this nation, they have very little share in this amount of money.

I went to the task of doing a bit of figuring and looking up some of the facts, and I found that a further comparison can be made: the increase in revenue or income of the three governing bodies over a period of 20

years (that is, from 1934 to 1954), the period in which road problems and motor vehicle traffic developed most. From 1934 to 1954, the municipal increase in revenue or taxation was 658 per cent; the provincial increase in revenue or taxation was 580 per cent; the federal increase in revenue or taxation amounted to 1,293 per cent. Incidentally, much of the federal increase was through hidden taxes, some of them paid through the automobile industry. An example would be a medium priced car, say, at \$2,800. There would be education tax on it, provincially of three per cent, which amounts to \$84. That \$84 remains within the confines of the province and gives service, Mr. Speaker. The Dominion excise and sales tax amounts to 25 per cent of the factory cost, and I believe in this case would amount to somewhere over \$400. We have little or no return from Ottawa to either the provincial government or the municipal governments for that amount of money. This means, Mr. Speaker, that in the past 20 years, while road construction problems were on the increase, municipal taxes went up 6½ times; provincial taxes went up 6 times, and the federal taxes went up 13 times. Much of the need for the increase in taxes was due to the automobile industry during this time, while the provincial and municipal governments taxed to the limit for road construction.

Saskatchewan spent, in 1954, some \$18 million for roads, for which a little less than \$2 million was an assist to municipalities. If one checks the provincial revenue from the automobile industry, one would find that the revenues approximate the expenditures that the province made on our roads here in Saskatchewan, plus the amount of assistance given to municipalities.

I would like to make a further comparison. I would like to compare federal aid between two adjacent states – Montana south of the border in the United States, and the province of Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan has a population of around 840,000; Montana somewhat under 600,000 – around three-quarters of our population. Highways – Saskatchewan has 8,300 miles; Montana has 5,860 miles – again approximately three-quarters of Saskatchewan's highways. Main market roads – Saskatchewan has 12,000 miles that we plan for the market road grid; Montana has 3,511 miles that they are already working into their grid system – a very much smaller percentage than Saskatchewan's. Trans-Canada aid – Saskatchewan, last year, obtained \$2½ million in round figures in aid from the Federal Government on Saskatchewan's portion of Trans-Canada; the state of Montana obtained, last year, an amount of \$6,349,113 in aid from their federal government. I would like to point out that the plans for Montana in 1955 are in excess of \$9 million and in 1956, in excess of \$13½ million. I would like to point out that Montana obtains this year from the federal government of the United States for rural roads (that is the main market roads) a half million dollars; in 1956, they will obtain approximately \$2,400,000. I bring out these points, Mr. Speaker, because there is a terrific load upon provincial and municipal governments these days, and they have a great worry right across the board, I know in western Canada, for a need for an overall long-term federal aid programme for our road schemes.

Millions of dollars have been poured into our railway systems by Canadian governments in the past. The governments of Canada always considered railway aid a national responsibility. In fact the early history of Canada shows that governments rose and fell on the principle of aid to the railway system. Our road systems are also a national responsibility. For greater national unity it is imperative that the Federal Government adopt a road aid plan for Canada, particularly for western Canada.

March 16, 1995

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comparisons between the highway budgets and highway responsibilities in western Canada. I do so not to belittle the neighbouring provinces, because I feel they have done a fairly good chore, but to bring out these facts to point out that I think our Highway Minister and Highway Department have probably done the very best job of any government in Canada. In fact, I think the Minister of Finance in this government will have to look to his laurels. Our Minister of Highways, I believe, has done a very good job, so much so that he . . .

Mr. Cameron: — I wonder if he could prove that.

Mr. Feusi: — . . . could probably do a very efficient job also on a finance budget, and I hope in the future that we can see our way to give him more towards our road system in Saskatchewan.

Saskatchewan spent, last year, approximately \$16 million on 8,300 miles of highway. Manitoba spent \$16 million (and these are round figures, Mr. Speaker) on approximately 2,300 miles of highway. Alberta spent \$50 million on 3,300 miles of highway.

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — Social Credit.

Mr. Feusi: — Mr. Speaker, it just means that with the population factor being almost equal – I believe Alberta has a little lead on us in population, but not enough to upset figures; it just means that our highway dollar in Saskatchewan has to go, or be stretched, over four times the area of that of the province of Manitoba. I know that the province of Manitoba has built a very high standard of highway. We have not been able to compete with that on all counts, but we have met the commitments or the needs of Saskatchewan on a terrific task.

I note the call from the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, for more aid and assistance from this Government. They are calling for more highways in their constituencies, more rural aid to municipalities. The only way we can obtain more aid is by greater taxation of the people – and yet, they wish to cut taxes. They are very inconsistent. I believe the only approach is to get aid from where they have already admitted responsibility, through the ‘Green Book’ in 1945. I hope to speak on that on a later resolution, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to compliment the Minister of Highways on the aggressive modern young department that he now has. When you compare the type of highway department that we had some ten or twelve years ago, the difference is so terrific, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to say that not only has the Minister of Highways a monument to himself in some of the good roads in this province, but if anyone takes the time to go through and check the department, and the efficiency of it, and the ability of these young men who are going to be of service to this province for many years to come, it is plain there is no deadwood, or very little deadwood, in that department.

Finally, if there was a definite federal responsibility toward the provincial road system this would be of immeasurable aid to the provincial governments. In turn, our provincial governments could set aside a percentage of the federal returns for aid to municipalities, and put our municipal governments on a sound footing whereby they could do much better planning than they are doing today. I made some comparisons with the United States, Mr. Speaker. I did not do that with the idea that we were slavishly to follow the United

States, I believe, though, that much more federal aid is required here in Canada. In the United States they overdo it; there is a duplication which we in Canada do not require. Our provincial governments and our municipal governments can manage the construction angle of roads, and if we can carry on the Trans-Canada Highway scheme on a little greater pattern, then, Mr. Speaker, I feel that we can provide the services for the people of Saskatchewan such as they deserve.

Before sitting down, I would just like to mention one factor. My friends opposite have been making quite a song-and-dance about our lack of interest in the north, our lack of development in the north, and I am going to state here again, as I did a couple of years ago, I had the privilege while I was still in uniform in the spring of 1945 of flying across the north, and at that time there had been, to my knowledge, no provincial Cabinet Minister, either Liberal or Conservative, from the provincial governments through the north until our Minister of that day had gone in there. I would like to point out that much of the Federal Government's interest should be in northern Saskatchewan. They have the opportunity of obtaining the greatest share of revenue through corporate and income taxes if the north was developed. And to date I have a question or a motion for return I had hopes of getting before this, but it will be on the Orders of the Day under Routine Proceedings. In there it will point out the factor that the Provincial Government has built highways, and I have in mind the road to Lac la Ronge, which is the stepping-off place to the heart of the north; and there are other roads.

I have in mind the air transportation that the Provincial Government spent very much on and which has provided a great deal of service to our people. There should be immeasurably more federal interest and aid for a programme of opening up the north.

Mr. Speaker, it is a foregone conclusion that I am happy, on behalf of Pelly constituency, to endorse the Budget of this year.

Mr. Harry Gibbs (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate I think you will notice it is the first time I have spoken during the Session, so I would like to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on the position he attained prior to coming into this Legislature. I know he has a tough job, and I do not envy him. I think he is going to have a tough row to hoe. There is no doubt his predecessors had the same thing, and I feel kind of sorry for him.

Mr. McDonald: — Save your tears.

Mr. Cameron: — Save yourself.

Mr. Gibbs: — Now, in regard to the Budget, I just want to say a few words on it. I find nothing wrong with it outside of just one or two things that I will relate; but I want to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer once again in bringing down a very, very fine budget. Once again he has spent a lot of money and, as I have said in previous addresses in this House, if we are going to develop and expand in the province of Saskatchewan, we have got to spend. I don't think it is out of turn that we brought down a balanced budget of around \$79 or \$80 million. I did not hear the Opposition members mention how Alberta brought down — I think their budget this year was around \$223 million.

March 16, 1995

Mr. Danielson: — Correct.

Mr. Gibbs: — So other provinces are spending money and we are doing it. We get criticized for spending money. We get damned if we do and damned if we don't. I don't know how we are going to make out about that.

Mr. McDonald: — You make a poor job of it.

Mr. Gibbs: — I would like to refer for a moment to the proposed increases for the old-age senior citizens of our province. I think it is fine. I am very pleased; and I am sure that the old-age people of this province are pleased. It is true that probably I thought we could have given them a little more, but evidently we could not do it. I am very, very glad indeed to see that the ice was broken and something was done. It is true that our Government thought (I did too) that it was a Federal responsibility and there is no doubt about that; but I want to say that if the Federal Government does not move, or any other province does not move, I am always glad to see our Government move and do things — first things first and give these people a little better living than they are getting. That to me is true democratic socialism, and I believe in that. As I said, I am very glad indeed that our older senior citizens have got a little more to tide them over the way, and it came, as I said, from this Provincial Government. We have nothing to thank the Liberal federal government for.

Mr. McDonald: — No, only \$40 a month.

Mr. Gibbs: — I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to bring to the notice of the House that when the Leader of the Opposition was speaking (and I believe this was over the air, February 8, 1955, during his remarks — I don't think that the Leader of the Opposition ever put that speech together) . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Like the one just read.

Mr. Gibbs: — And he said:

“During the last session of the Legislature in Saskatchewan Mr. Herman Danielson moved and Mr. A. Lopton seconded a motion that the Government give consideration to an increase in the supplementary pension paid by the province to \$10 a month.”

Mr. Danielson: — And that is correct.

Mr. Gibbs: — “And that this supplementary pension, together with medical and other health services be provided for those age 65 to 69 who are receiving old-age assistance. The C.C.F. moved their customary amendment, passing the buck to the Federal Government.”

Mr. Cameron: — Correct.

Mr. Danielson: — Correct.

Mr. Gibbs: — “All the C.C.F. members who were in the House voted for the C.C.F. amendment and therefore voted against the original Liberal motion.”

Now, I want to ask, Mr. Speaker, how did the Opposition members vote on that amendment? If the C.C.F. voted against it, so did the Liberals in the Opposition. It's all according to the Journal – here is the record.

Mr. Cameron: — Come on now, Harry!

Mr. Gibbs: — The original motion, then the amendment, the original was 42. So evidently – here are all the names – outside of our own chaps over here: there are Loptson, McCarthy, Cameron, Danielson, Horsman, Dunfield, MacNutt, Carr and Kohaly.

Mr. Cameron: — Where were you, Harry?

Mr. Gibbs: — So, you must have voted against it, too, as well as the C.C.F.

Mr. McDonald: — You're the only person – you voted with us that time, Harry.

Mr. Gibbs: — It doesn't matter anyway as far as that goes.

Mr. Cameron: — That's the time you were with us.

Mr. Gibbs: — We got something anyway for the old-age pensioners and I am glad about it, and I think every member in this House is glad about it.

Mr. Danielson: — That is quite a performance you are giving.

Mr. Gibbs: — Now, yesterday, we got quite an insight into the history of this province, both from my hon. friend from Rosthern (Mr. Carr) and my hon. friend from Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson).

Well, I came to this province a few years after it was made a province, not very long after; and when I arrived in Moose Jaw in 1910 or 1911 (I think it was), things were pretty good, and I am not going back now to the 1800's because I don't have to. I am going back now to show, or try and show, to this House how prior governments acted and worked in this province. We got a good illustration today as regards the highways. My hon. friend has just told you. But back there in the early days of 1911 we were just in the fringe of a boom – 1911 and 1912; and then the bubble burst. And I have heard my hon. friend from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) always harping about the dirty and hungry 'thirties.

Mr. McCarthy: — That's right.

Mr. Gibbs: — Well, I am going to take you back now a little previous to the dirty 'thirties under Liberal administration.

Mr. McCarthy: — I was there, Harry. I was through it.

Mr. Gibbs: — You were there; you went through it. So was I; I went through it, too, and so did a lot more.

Mr. McCarthy: — I was there before you were.

Mr. Gibbs: — But we don't want to go through it again, and that is why we are trying to pull something out of the bag that is right for the people of this province.

March 16, 1995

Mr. Cameron: — What are you going to pull today, Harry?

Mr. Gibbs: — Now, when the bubble burst in 1912, 1913 came along and there was unemployment. I saw friends of mine, married friends, young people up to middle age, go on the rockpile, in 1913. I saw soup kitchens opened in 1913. I saw that damned old immigration hall you had up there in Moose Jaw, and what was it? Just like a prison.

Mr. Kramer: — A Liberal government.

Mr. Gibbs: — I saw these things, and it went on under Liberal administration and you didn't try to do anything about it. A single man could not get a job. He could hardly get enough to eat, because the rockpiles were for the married people in order that they could eat, and their wives and families. A single man had to take his chance. It started people thinking right then and, of course, in 1914 the war broke out. Thousands of the young citizens of this province enlisted to go overseas to fight for democracy, which they did. Still there was no improvement. Things went on just the same and you know it. Okay, the war was over; we came back in 1919 and what did we find? There were still no jobs for a great many of the returned soldiers who came back from the first world war.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — How about the rockpiles?

Mr. Gibbs: — Yes, the rockpiles were still going. And, for your information again, after the first World War, which was a disgrace to our nationality as Canadians, we had V.Cs on the breadline in Toronto. We were still under Liberal administration.

Mr. McDonald: — Still are.

Mr. Gibbs: — And how in the world – to see young fellows like Mr. McDonald and Mr. Kohaly who have fought in the services of the country, young people, young lads, right in the prime of life, getting down and thinking they could do something under Liberal administration, I cannot see it at all. There is something wrong someplace.

Mr. McCarthy: — Watch them, Harry, watch them!

Mr. Gibbs: — Okay, I know you don't like to hear these things, but they are God's truth.

Mr. Cameron: — We're enjoying it.

Mr. Gibbs: — But you cannot deny it.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — He's just warming up.

Mr. Gibbs: — Well, all right.

Mr. Danielson: — You get so mixed up on politics.

Mr. Gibbs: — No, I am not getting mixed up at all.

Mr. Danielson: — That was a Torry . . .

Mr. Gibbs: — . . . went through it. I don't know whether to use it or not.

Maybe he had lots of dough in those days, but I didn't.

Some Hon. Member: — Went homesteading.

Mr. Gibbs: — After the war in 1919, sure, there were a few jobs scattered around then, but in 1919 the big strike at Winnipeg took place and our late leader, J.S. Woodsworth, and Bill Irvine and John Queen, Dixon, Ivens; they spoke about this strike in Winnipeg, and they went out to defend the labouring forces in Winnipeg and J.S. Woodsworth was sent to prison and was convicted because he said a few paragraphs out of the Bible, I think it was from Isaiah. But he went to gaol and so did John Queen go to gaol.

Mr. Danielson: — You're all wrong.

Mr. Gibbs: — And I am going to tell you, my friends, that I don't know of any of you fellows going to gaol for any thousands of people of this province. Then things started to move.

Some Hon. Member: — Under the Liberals?

Mr. Cameron: — You make apostles out of them.

Mr. Gibbs: — And while John Queen was in gaol, they elected him to the Manitoba Legislature, and J.S. Woodsworth was elected to the House of Commons in 1921.

Mr. Danielson: — Right when the Liberal government came in.

Mr. Gibbs: — And they formed a group of true independent labour men in the House of Commons, Bill Irvine and J.S. Woodsworth. Things were still bad. The administration of this province was still bad. We couldn't get dollars. There were no jobs; there was no activity; there was no nothing, unless it was giving jobs to the Liberal heelers of that time.

In 1932 they had been talking about the conditions of this province, Manitoba and the rest of Canada, and J.S. Woodsworth and Bill Irvine – yes, and our present Provincial Secretary-treasurer, Hon. C.M. Fines, Mrs. Telford, Mrs. Lucas, quite a few of them, got together and they said under these conditions something has got to be done. If we had had administration that would have looked after the people of this province, we would not have to go to this sort of thing. But, we have got to do something; we have got to start a new political party. And, in 1932, they had a meeting in Calgary, just a small group, and of course, the first thing that was mentioned was a name for this new political group that was going to smash the former governments and political parties that had never done us any good.

Mr. Cameron: — Big ideas, all right!

Mr. Gibbs: — So, various names were suggested. I believe our present Provincial Treasurer went for the National Party. I believe J.S. Woodsworth went for the 'Canadian Co-operative Federation'; and a good old friend of mine, Walter Mantz, from Edmonton, and Mr. John Feinstein from Regina, put out 'Co-operative Commonwealth Federation', and that is where the name originated from at that day. Oh, I believe there was added, at that time, Labour and Socialism, or something to that effect. Then, things started to move. We started to send representatives of the new political party to both Legislatures

March 16, 1995

and the House of Commons. Our present Premier went to the House of Commons in 1925.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — In 1935.

Mr. Gibbs: — In 1935?

Mr. McDonald: — He was a Social Crediter then.

Mr. Gibbs: — Well, I have the records. I . . .

Mr. Cameron: — What name did he carry then, Harry?

Mr. Gibbs: — Wait a minute now – yes, 1935, that's right. And as I look at this picture here, Mr. Speaker, he just looks like a little boy sitting there. And they are in that parliamentary group there. M.J. Coldwell took over the leadership and things did start to move, and we came along. You know everybody was disgusted with what was going on from 1910 until we came along to 1944. Neither the workers or the farmers of this province were getting a square deal, and in 1942, the farmers of this province, as you all know, banded together and by public subscription took a delegation to Ottawa. What for? To get a decent standard of living and decent prices for the products they had produced on the prairies, and we all know what happened down there. The Liberal back-slappers and everyone else – we know what they did; but the farmers didn't get the price. After that, 1944 came along and we swept the Liberals of that time out of office in this province, and I think it was coming to them, too; and I believe the people of this province were glad that eventually they had broken the back of Liberalism in this province and swept them out of office.

Our friends opposite can't do anything else but oppose everything we do over here; but look what we have put into operation since this Government has come into office. It is something marvellous, comparing the years I have just gone over and shown you what they did prior to us coming into office; it is something wonderful, the achievements in 10 or 11 years, since 1944. Well, I don't know – sometimes you wonder whether they are appreciative of the changes in this province.

Mr. Cameron: — How many men are walking the streets, today, Harry, even in Saskatchewan?

Mr. Gibbs: — Yes, you can laugh, but you will never get in here again, and I am going to tell you if the people of this province ever put a Liberal government in power again they deserve everything they get; and I am going to tell you they are not going to get back.

So we came back into office, and it is only natural that the Liberal opposition is going to try and get back into power again. Now I am not blaming these fellows. Some of them were not born in the days I was talking about . . .

Mr. Kramer: — But some of them were.

Mr. Gibbs: — . . . and I am not going to call them their predecessors – I will call them their ancestors in the Liberal party because that is what they are. And then, right in the present Session, up until now, since we have come here, they have heard the different Ministers of the different

departments from the Premier down, and every one has given the workings of their department, the money that has been spent (I am not going to go into figures) the highways that have been built, the power distribution and expansion, the health services, the co-operative development. They have all given you something that you fellows couldn't do because you didn't know a damn thing about it. You didn't know a thing about it! So, what have you got to kick about?

Mr. Cameron: — Is that a parliamentary remark, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Gibbs: — You haven't anything to kick about at all. You are getting the services, today, and when the Minister of Education was speaking – and I think you will remember this, too, Mr. Speaker, because it was you who was out with me speaking back in 1943, prior to the 1944 election; and we went to a little schoolhouse in my constituency, in the afternoon; and I heard, I think it was the Minister of Education, speaking about the dilapidated schoolhouse and one thing and another. We went to one schoolhouse, and as true as I stand here – we had a meeting at that schoolhouse in the afternoon and the present Speaker who sits there was with me, and spoke that afternoon; and after the meeting we asked the school teacher all about the conditions. She said they were terrible. I looked around. I said, “Where is your chalk?” She said, “we haven't got any chalk to chalk on the blackboards, and we don't know when we are going to get any.” That was under a Liberal administration! Now Mr. Speaker was there and he will bear me out. That sort of thing was going on all over the country, and you fellows know it, but you won't admit it.

Mr. Cameron: — Was that in 1921, Harry?

Mr. McCarthy: — What were the school boards doing?

Mr. Gibbs: — The school boards? They had none in those days.

Mr. McCarthy: — We had one.

Mr. Gibbs: — You say you had school boards, eh? Well, when I come to that part I will read you something about schools. I think you will change your mind then about having school boards. Why, they were only playing at it.

And then, Mr. Speaker, the C.C.F. came into office, and despite what the Liberal Opposition or the Conservative Opposition say about it . . .

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Or Social Credit.

Mr. Gibbs: — . . . we have done good work and they have to admit it. There are one or two of them who do admit it. I believe the member from Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) is one who does, every year, give us quite a lot of credit for what we have done – in your own way –

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Don't . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Be careful there, Jack.

Mr. Gibbs: — Before I get off that topic of the C.C.F. I want to point out to the Opposition that we have some real good men in this movement of ours, gentlemen who have been lauded all over the Dominion of Canada. There is one sitting right there, too; but when J.S. Woodsworth passed away Bruce

March 16, 1995

Hutchinson, the writer – I don't think you could call him a C.C.F. – said this, and I will not read it all . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Social Crediter.

Mr. Gibbs: — He said this:

“Mr. J.S. Woodsworth was a more important figure in Canadian history than most of his contemporaries realize. He was important to what he represented, rather than for his actual accomplishment. He was a symbol and a portent of a new day. History will mark him as one of its great milestones in this country.

“He was an indifferent politician, too scrupulous for political compromise, which is the essence of democracy; too high minded for the intimate company of most men; too theoretical for the practical workings of parliament; yet, in a curious way, he was precisely the right man in the right place when he emerged after the great war. Here, in every aspect of his character, was the prophet of a new ideal. He had been martyred for his beliefs in the Winnipeg strike. He had been brutally gaoled as I have heard him say with a twinkle of merriment, for daring to read publicly a few verses from Deuteronomy.

“He has chosen poverty and labourer's work on the waterfront, this frail and delicate scholar, this minister of God, rather than seek favour from anyone. He was the most Christ-like man ever seen in Parliament, and his white beard, his flaming eye, his anger at injustice, his gentleness with everyone and his deep booming voice of moral protest, made him appear like a prophet out of the Old Testament.”

I will just read you the last paragraph:

“In Mr. Woodsworth you could see this great struggle of ideas, individualized in the soul of a single man. He wanted democracy and freedom, but he wanted the state to provide economic justice for all men. If he did not see precisely how that was to be reconciled, it was not surprising, since the wisest of men of the earth have not seen the end of it yet; but he did erect a new force in Canada. He lit a fiery torch which burns with increasing light, and more than any public servant of his time he gave everything – gave himself entirely to his beliefs and to his fellowmen. He was the saint in our politics, and all men who knew him, gained a certain purity from his presence and lost a friend in his passing.”

If you fellows can get a tribute written from an independent source like that man did, then you will have something to talk about.

Now before I mention my constituency, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention the peace delegation we had down here, last Friday. I was really

glad to see that peace delegation, because, Mr. Speaker, we can talk about what we are going to do, what we have done now, in both this province, in this country and all over the world, but if the 'powers that be' deem it justified to use the nuclear weapons and hydrogen and atomic weapons they have today, all our works will have been in vain, because we will all be on the way out.

I just want to read, quickly, some of the things about this, and this is from Washington (not Canada) under the Eisenhower administration:

“Defence mobilizer Arthur Flemming laid the plan before a Senate armed services sub-committee and said the commission’s first task should be to work out a method of dispersing the country’s prime atomic targets.

“As a result of the enormously expanded power of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, Flemming said, a standard designed to discourage new defence facilities within a 10-mile perimeter of industrial and population centres now is out the window.

“Earlier, government scientists translated the H-bomb for the Senate group in terms of death and destruction.

“Dr. Willard F. Libby, a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, estimated that a hydrogen blast could damage homes severely over a 122-mile radius.

“Dr. John C. Bugher, head of the AEC’s biological and medical section, told the sub-committee ‘all agriculture would cease’, at least for a time, in a wide area up to 140 miles away from an H-bomb explosion. This would be in the ‘fallout pattern’ area, downwind from the blast. Bugher reported that the radiation in such an area would kill many animals, as well as human beings.

“Bugher said a . . . possible delayed effect of radiation exposure which has been demonstrated in animals is a statistical shortening of life expectancy.

“‘This phenomenon does not result from any specific cause of death’, he continued, ‘but apparently from a general acceleration of the aging process. Whether this factor can be recognized in a human population is as yet unknown’.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, that’s it. I believe that the people of this province (and I understand that Saskatchewan leads the way as far as peace advances are concerned) and there are millions of people all over the world wanting to end wars, and striving for peace, and I think it is up to each and every one of us, especially in this province, to get behind the peace movement that is going to abolish once and for all this terrible, demoniac hydrogen bomb and nuclear weapon destruction of war. You fellows that haven’t seen it do not know anything about it. Those of us who have, do know about it. It is a terrible thing, and I am sure neither you nor I want to see our children and our grandchildren, whom we all love, having to fact that in this country.

I want to touch now on my constituency, Mr. Speaker. As you know, Swift Current is expanding with great rapidity, and I think we are paying

March 16, 1995

quite a contribution to the way of life, work and economy of our province. As you know, a few years ago, when Mr. Tucker was the Leader of the Opposition, he always said that oil would never be found in the province of Saskatchewan. Well, today, it is just a joke. We know that the words of those days were just a fallacy, absolutely. Today, in Swift Current constituency, I think we have four or five established oilwells. We have gas there – I am not giving you the figures because I believe the Minister of Natural Resources gave you the figures the other day, and you have them right on your desks now; but the development is something terrific. These are things we can look forward to in the future – the future development of these things, development that is going to give people work, bring prosperity to our province, bring better conditions, the very things we have always advocated, and our Liberal opposition are criticizing us because we are doing these things.

They say we are not trying to bring private enterprise into our province or anything else. We are doing those things, and they know it. It is only just a matter of them blating their faces off just because it is a political situation; but why don't they tell the people the truth like we are trying to do? We give you the things from week to week. We give you those things; you don't have to ask people. You can get the information sent right to your door; and you can get all the information you want by just writing into the various departments. We are glad to give accounts of what this province and the Government of this province is doing; we are glad to give the people and show them the expansion and development that is taking place. We have nothing to hide; we want the people to know these things; you guys never did – you never did . . .

Mr. Cameron: — That's hard on the blood pressure, Harry.

Mr. Loptson: — Keep on going, Harry.

Mr. Gibbs: — In Swift Current, Mr. Speaker, we are expanding, as I said, with great rapidity. Our schools are going, we have new schools going up and everything, and I hope that we are going to get a nursing home for the old-age people. We got a very very favourable report about it. We have a committee set up under the chairmanship of W.W. Smith, and they are working hard and I believe at the present time sanction has been made by the city council of Swift Current to turn over 23 acres for the establishment of the old age and nursing home. Furthermore, one of our farmers, a well-known farmer of that district, Mr. Bernard Blank, whose father was Henry Blank (he died last year I think) and was rather a good old pioneer has a farm up there where they can grow everything, all kinds of fruit, different kinds of fruit. I think my friend from Maple Creek will know just about where it is; and it is really wonderful. You go through the gates of that farm, and you would think you were out in B.C. They even have apple trees with four and five different kinds of apples growing on the one tree. So in honour of his father, this young lad has come forward and told us that when we commence the landscaping for the old-age home and nursing home, which I have mentioned, he will give, free, dedicated to his father, shrubs, trees and plants in order to round out the transformation of the landscaping of this pioneer village we hope to have.

Premier Douglas: — A very fine gesture, indeed.

Mr. Gibbs: — I do believe we are going to see that – I hope so; and there is no doubt about it that things will go along fine, because we can assure the co-operation of everyone up there, as far as that is concerned.

Now, as you know, it is Jubilee year and Swift Current always puts on a good celebration around the 1st July, for three days. This year they have their beards again, and naturally, if you have any friends up there you probably won't know them. I will have to look twice when I go back to know who I am talking to anyway, because a beard sure alters a person. Anyway, I believe the first sod is going to be turned for this pioneer village for the old-age people around the 1st July; that is if everything comes up to expectations. We are going to have a wonderful time. Everybody up there is behind these things and I cordially invite each and every one of you to come up there if you have time to spare and spend a few good days in a Frontier City, and I think you will enjoy yourselves very very much.

I want to touch, Mr. Speaker, a little bit on labour. I know that we are going through some trying times right now. We have got unemployment in our province, as the Minister of Labour told you a few days ago. Over the expanse of Canada we have over 600,000 unemployed – 21,000 in the province of Saskatchewan, or probably more by this time. We have to face these things. We have to try and work out something surely to offset those things like the breadline and the rockpile. We do not want to see those days again, and I am confident that this Government is going to do everything in their power, rather than sit there and do nothing, to see that that does not happen again . . .

Mr. McDonald: — They had better get started, Harry.

Mr. Gibbs: — . . . and I am very glad that our Premier has already gone into action, asking for a Provincial-Federal conference to deal with the unemployment situation. He didn't wait. He could see that probably within a short time, unless something is done, there is going to be a labour crisis in this province. So he has done something, all to his credit; and he is not waiting, like you fellows waited back there in the hungry 'thirties when you spent millions and millions of dollars on relief and there was no work-and-wages programme in the whole set-up. They probably didn't know enough to put one in. That's a fact! You saw those things just as well as I did, and you cannot deny them. So I am very gratified indeed to know that the Premier of this province has done something already to try and offset this possible crisis that faces us now.

We do not want to see unemployment. I never did. I want to see men and women eat and live as they should, to be happy and comfortable in a home, not to be worrying where their next mouthful of bread and butter is coming from. That is why we believe as we believe today, because there has been too much of that kind of thing in this world now; and after we have fought two wars, two world wars, and men and women of all political stripes took part in those wars, to furnish us with a democracy and a life that should be happy and comfortable, then surely we should do something about this crisis that is probably facing us today. And I am not going to agree with my hon. friend and colleague from Shellbrook who spoke, yesterday, when I think he suggested that possibly we should have compulsory arbitration. No, I don't like that. My friends, those who have been in the labour movement in Canada and other countries have had to fight bitterly for what we have got. There has been quite a lot of suffering for what the labouring people of this country have got today, and we don't want to lose it. It is all right for some of our big capitalists to talk about what they would do, and I know what they would like to do to labour – they would like to crucify it, like they did years ago. But, today, we have built up our institution and today, as the Minister of Labour said a few days ago, we have one of the finest labour legislations in this province that there is on the North American

March 16, 1995

continent, and I am proud of that and I believe you all are proud. This was the Government that brought it in, this Government here – not a Liberal government, but a government that was a people’s government and believes in the very things they are doing today; and I am proud of this Government that they have taken these things into consideration. We have done the same for the farmer, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Oops!

Mr. Gibbs: — No matter what the Opposition says . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Tell us all about it.

Mr. Gibbs: — They can talk all they want, and they have voted against everything we have brought in here about the farmers.

Mr. Cameron: — Are you an authority on farming, Harry?

Mr. Gibbs: — When we voted protection on the homesteads . . .

Mr. McDonald: — It was in effect before you came here.

Mr. Gibbs: — . . . and the funny part about it is the most of them earn their living as farmers, at that.

Mr. Loptson: — We should know more about a farm than you do.

Mr. Gibbs: — Well, perhaps it’s true, but I like to see the farmers get on. But there is one thing, and I challenge the Opposition in this House to point a finger at me and say that I never supported the legislation that was built for every farmer, wife and child in this province.

Mr. Loptson: — Lots of their legislation isn’t good for the farmers, and you support it.

Mr. Gibbs: — So, you know after the great war we did bring out the four freedoms – and they spoke: freedom of speech – a wonderful thing, because I saw the day when you couldn’t speak, and I came back and couldn’t get a job; they wanted to know my political stripe, but they didn’t need to, they already knew it, that is why I didn’t get a job.

Mr. McDonald: — You got a pretty good job.

Mr. Gibbs: — Freedom of worship, freedom from want and freedom from fear. Well, they say we have freedom of speech – oh, by the way, I did want to read this to my hon. friend there from Arm River (Mr. Danielson). Now listen – this is good:

“Mr. Danielson warned Harry Gibbs, C.C.F. member for Swift Current, who last year split with the government in supporting a Liberal motion to increase supplementary assistance . . .”

Mr. McDonald: — Whoops! That’s the one you read to us.

Mr. Danielson: — That’s the one you denied a little while ago.

Mr. Gibbs: — “Members of the Government who don’t toe the mark don’t stay around very long.” I don’t think they will do anything very bad. Freedom of speech, freedom from fear, and if I think I am right I am going to support those things that I think are right. And I hope some of you lads over there do, too. Get up and be counted!

Mr. Danielson: — That’s right, stand up and be counted.

Premier Douglas: — Will you sit down and be quiet?

Mr. Gibbs: — Or sit down and be quiet, whatever you think.

Mr. Danielson: — We’ve got the Social Credit on one side and the C.C.F. on the other.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Gibbs: — While I am dealing with freedom of speech, I have to touch now on what might be a very touchy problem, but what I tell you I am sincere about. I have the right to my opinion like any other man in this province, and I don’t care what political, religious, or any other society he belongs to, and I just want to bring to your attention “Gambling hit by city clergy.” Yes, this is in Regina. It said: “The Regina Ministerial Association issued a statement, Monday, expressing concern over alleged increase of gambling in Regina, as expressed in big bingo nights, Kinsmen’s Carnivals, car lotteries, pari-mutuels, football pools and lucky ticket draws.”

Mr. McCarthy: — Anything about poker?

Mr. Gibbs: — No, it doesn’t mention that. And they are all right. They can have their opinion, but I think sometimes they go too far with it and we have a right to express our opinion, and I am going to express mine now.

Mr. Danielson: — Good for you.

Mr. Gibbs: — He mentioned bingo, which we know – that was one of the games that was legalized in the British Army. There was a time for playing bingo back in the early days of the first great war, and you get quite a lot of pleasure out of it, and I know that people in this province get pleasure out of going out with their wife on Thursday night (or whatever it is) and having a few games of bingo. They can play all night for about 50 cents or a dollar, and they stand to win some very substantial prizes . . .

Mr. Lopton: — If they could play a little penny-ante too, it would be all right.

Mr. Gibbs: — Now, I say this: if our Ministerial Association wants to go after gambling, let them go after it in a big way. Let them go down to the bucket shops and the stockbroking houses and so on, where gambling is done. You can’t tell me. Some fellows will go in there and they will put it down, what for? – to see if they can make some money, that’s all. It is not for any economical reason or anything else, it is just a matter of pure gambling. Sometimes they come out broke, sometimes they come out loaded for bear. Why don’t they get after that sort of gambling places?

Mr. Lopton: — Some fellows seem to know all about that.

March 16, 1995

Mr. Gibbs: — Leave the working-class people alone. I think that is about all I will say on that matter anyway; but, there was another minister. He talked about the Navy giving the boys their tot of rum, and all that sort of stuff . . .

Mr. Cameron: — What about your sweepstakes, Harry, you haven't mentioned them.

Mr. Gibbs: — Well I say, hands off our fighting services. I say it from the bottom of my heart. I had a lad that went through five years in the last war in the Navy. He went all over the world. He didn't have his tot of rum because he didn't want it, and when he didn't take it he got a little money, and his money was put away for him. He didn't want it, so he didn't take it; but don't forget, these things – and I know we can all sit around and we say these things and then hide behind ourselves and all this, that and the other, but come out with it. They have no more right to deny people a drink of beer or a drink of liquor if they desire it than I have of telling them to stop the drinking of tea or coffee. I like a nice sparkling, golden-coloured glass of beer, and I don't care who knows it.

I am going to tell you another thing. I know that the brewers of this province and the brewers of Canada who are making the product of beer, and which comes under government laws and regulations, I know one thing: they are paying quite good wages to those people who work in those businesses. There are quite a few wage-earners and families. I will tell you another thing, too: they are getting a darned sight more than the coolies over in China and Ceylon picking the tea. You can bet your life on that. I think it is about time some of these Ministerial Associations were told about it too. Probably they wouldn't like their tea taken away. Mind you, I am not saying I drink beer all the time, nor could I drink tea all the time; but when I feel like it I want to have it, and I am sure you fellows do, too. I know a lot of you take it and never say anything about it till you are caught; but it is all right.

Those are my sentiments, and I think, as far as I am concerned, it should be hands-off as far as our fighting services are concerned. We fought world wars; we have always come back victorious; we have never let you down. And as far as I know, Canadian people, Canadian youth, no matter what sort of a conflict we get into, we will never let you down and we will keep the old flag flying.

So, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to quote what Henry Wallace said when he was vice-president of the U.S.A. This is what he said:

“Men and women cannot be really free until they have plenty to eat and time and ability to read and think and talk things over.”

I agree with that; and if the people of our country stay with the ever-expanding proposals of the C.C.F. party, then I believe this will come about. I definitely think it will. I think you all know I am going to support the motion.

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I am going to have a difficult time following the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs). For one thing, I will certainly not be quite so vociferous. For the other thing, being very modest, I also would not want to be quoted as being the originator of something attributed to Henry Wallace.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer for bringing down a budget that is realistic and in conformity with the needs of the province and isn't, however, a cautious budget, as was suggested by the hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly). It is a budget, I believe, that reflects the growing responsibilities of the Government for education, for health and for taking care of the social needs of the people of the province.

I notice particularly that the chief criticism of the budget by members of the Opposition, including the hon. member for Souris-Estevan, follows pretty well the same pattern as the criticism during the Throne Speech debate. There was simply more and more of everything as far as the Provincial Government is concerned, but less and less actual responsibility as far as other government agencies are concerned, both federal and local.

Apparently the Opposition, in its desire to make some political capital, has overlooked the fact that the costs of provincial administration have also increased as a result of inflation, and that general services have been expanded tremendously in the past years. The attitude of the Opposition now is in strange contrast to past years when general economic conditions were good and revenue prospects on the increase. The chief criticism then was that our budget was too big, and the Government was held up to the public as being a spendthrift, irresponsible lot of bureaucrats. Now, despite the fact that this province has experienced a major crop failure, with revenue prospects less buoyant, the Opposition with reckless abandon want the Government to pull out all the stop-logs and make further increases in this budget that has already been stretched to the limit.

In light of self-evident facts, the attitude of the Opposition is completely irresponsible. In fact, the budget is \$1,800,000 higher than last year. It is intended to provide additional money for increased grants to municipalities and school districts, additional money to provide social assistance and homes for the aged. And, of course, there is the added expenditure provided for the operation of the University hospital, and for the medical college, as well as the Mental Hospital Training School at Moose Jaw.

The Opposition overlook the fact that there are expenditure commitments for standing statutory services that must be provided for before embarking on new projects. Members opposite have even made so bold as to suggest that we should now assume what are recognized as federal responsibilities – unemployment, for example. Surely, members opposite do not expect that the Government or the people of Saskatchewan will attribute their grandiose proposals to lack of understanding of the budget situation. In my opinion, members opposite fully understand the utter irresponsibility of some of the proposals made. The facts have been placed before them time and again. I can only conclude that the purpose is to mislead the public in a desperate bid for some cheap political gain. The people of this province know full well the budget limitations of their provincial government and what is more, the people of this province know also that every member of the Legislature understands the facts in this regard, and that the unreasonable criticism made is merely so much political eyewash and an attempt to discredit a government that has served the needs of the people of this province so well.

The Opposition expresses great concern for rural education and assistance to municipalities. I wish to remind my Opposition friends that it was their callous disregard for the well-being of municipalities and individual farm people that was the prime reason for their defeat in 1944. They should

March 16, 1995

dry their crocodile tears, because this is well remembered. And it is well known, too, that school units and municipalities on every count are in a much better position, as mentioned yesterday by the Hon. Mr. Lloyd, as to buildings, equipment, standard of services provided and also financially than they were in 1944. Any argument to the contrary will not be accepted as genuine by the people of the province.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at their attitude to municipalities and farmers in the period before we assumed office as the government of this province. I was a reeve of my municipality during the 'thirties – and I don't want to and I wouldn't harken back to this particular criticism if it would have involved any additional expenditure of money, at that time, but what I wish to refer to did not involve any expenditure of money at all. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, taxes by law come ahead of everything else as far as municipalities are concerned. In the fall of 1938, one year after the 1937 crop failure which was the worst in the history of Saskatchewan, when the total cash farm income from all sources in that year dropped to \$85 million as compared to some \$700 million, the annual cash return for farm products in recent years, the Liberal government at that time and under those conditions set out a general order of priority under which the farmers at that time were expected to pay their creditors. It is well known that taxes have a priority, as mentioned, over other obligations, especially payments to machine companies.

Let us take a look at the facts in this particular case. I remember it very well, and since some of the older members opposite can dig to the bottom of their trunks for old documents, I can do the same, Mr. Speaker. I attended the Municipal Convention in 1938 and a resolution was passed which pointed out the serious drought conditions that existed the previous year in 1937 and which practically cleaned out everyone because farm income dropped to the lowest level in the history of this province. Those things were pointed out when the following resolution was passed:

“Be it resolved that we ask the Government to enact or make a ruling that the first charge of the 1938 crop after harvesting expenses are taken care of, shall be a sum sufficient for running expenses and maintenance of the grower and his family for the ensuing year, the next charge to be for municipal taxes, and that no creditor be allowed to take action until these charges be satisfied, notwithstanding any agreement between vendor, mortgagee or other creditors.”

The reason the resolution was passed was because of the fact that the government of the day put out a statement in the fall as to how the farmers' proceeds should be distributed. I am glad the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) is just coming in. He will probably remember this.

Mr. Danielson: — Read it again.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — This statement, put out by the Attorney General's Department, being instructions to the representatives of the Debt Adjustment Board, was an interpretation of government policy in regard to the disposal of the 1938 crop. It mentioned the objectives were to be:

- “1. To interpret the policy of the government to both the farmer and his creditor as hereinafter explained;
- “2. To prevent the creditor from obstructing the farmer in any way in carrying out the policy of the government.

“3. To prevent the farmer from taking advantage of the policy of the government to the unfair disadvantage of their creditors.”

They talk just the same today; they talk both ways. But let's see how it worked out. The order of priorities was set out first in payment of harvesting expenses and it looks quite proper that the first charge should be the payment of threshing accounts, wages to hired help, etc., engaged in harvesting and threshing, and I thought this item would be normal harvesting expenses. But, lo and behold! under item 1, which was in payment of harvesting and threshing expenses the following was included – and here are the instructions to the agents of the Debt Adjustment Board at that time, which was supposed to protect the farmer against his creditors. It says:

“To be fair to the farmers' other creditors it is equally important that you see to it that the allowance for any one or all of the six items are reasonable and that there may be something left for other creditors where the crop warrants.”

There wasn't much left, Mr. Speaker, for anybody. There was not enough, in fact, to pay taxes, pay farm expenses and provide living expenses for another year.

But, under item 1, Mr. Speaker, in payment of harvesting expenses, what did they include? I can recall the day when I read this as reeve of the municipality. I was simply amazed, and it certainly was a source of disappointment to every municipal council in this province, and that is why they passed the resolution at their annual convention, but, again, without results as far as the government of the day was concerned. Under harvesting expenses were included:

“Harvesting labour, repairs, binder twine, and so on . . .”

natural expenses.

“(b) Where the farmers grain is threshed or combined by contract with another party at a price per bushel per day, allow the going custom rates; and the same for other harvesting operations such as swathing or cutting of the crop.

“(c) Where threshing or combining or other harvesting operations is done by machinery owned by the farmer, but subject to lien or balance of purchase price, allow the following schedule: . . .”

And this is what the farmer had to pay to the implement companies before taxes, before providing a living for himself and his family at these rates:

“1½ cents a bushel for the tractor for the threshing of wheat and barley and 1½ cents for the separator on which the farmer might owe some money; and for oats a cent for the tractor and a cent for the separator for every bushel of oats that was threshed; for the combine one dollar per acre to the machine company; for the binder 25 cents to the machine company.”

March 16, 1995

Hon. members will say that perhaps this is not correct, but it just so happens that a member of the municipal council at that time had paid his taxes first and the implement company got after him for it. The Secretary-treasurer of the municipality wrote to the agent of the Debt Adjustment Board and asked him what should be done, whether the municipality should keep the money that the councillor had paid on his taxes or whether they should turn it over to the implement company. The answer came back crystal clear, Mr. Speaker, to pay it to the implement company. That is what the government of the day thought about municipalities. I hope members opposite keep talking the way they do because I have a whole lot more documented information; not press reports, but documented certification of what their actions were when they were in power that I would be glad to reveal at any time during an election campaign, if they want to fight an election on the issue of not being generous enough to municipalities and school districts.

This is their record, and I did not like to revert back to it, but I have seen no indication yet that if they were returned to power, they would be any different from what they were in the 1930's as far as protecting municipalities and farmers is concerned.

Mr. Lopton: — Just little junior. Hasn't grown up yet.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — When one considers the tremendous backlog of improvements that have taken place over the past years in regard to municipal services, educational services, improved buildings, replacements of old buildings, and also considers that the tax dollar today only has about 50 per cent of its pre-war purchasing power because of post-war inflation, one must conclude that any increase in taxation that has taken place was caused by forces beyond the control of the provincial government, or local agencies, including municipalities.

It is not the tax dollar that is worrisome, Mr. Speaker. It is not having sufficient tax dollars available to pay for local services after paying, for example, \$60,000 for a combine, and, of course, higher freight rates for practically everything that the farmer sells or buys. Is this the fault of the provincial government? Repeated representations have been made regarding freight rate increases and, as everyone knows, freight rates come under the jurisdiction of the Dominion Government, and since 1948 they have permitted a 100 per cent increase in freight rates, and still members opposite have the audacity to say and suggest that this Government has done things that have increased farm production costs. I would like to know where, specifically.

They mention grazing leases, for instance. I can tell them one thing, and it is this: the only item of cost that has been reduced as far as the stock raisers are concerned, are his grazing lease fees. The hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) read a newspaper clipping stating that municipal councils (and this is in quotation marks) – “Council objects to high tax rate — Larger Unit Administration Board seeks more aid.” It seems to me that this high school tax criticism, intentionally or otherwise, tends to develop an antagonistic competition for land revenues between rural municipal councils and larger units. The intended impression seems to be that the larger units are extravagant and require supervising. It was even suggested by the hon. member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) that the Minister of Education should do something about larger unit boards. It thus appears that the purpose of this political criticism is intended somehow or other to hold the Government responsible for high school taxes. Again, Mr. Speaker, this is being done by implication and inference. Those sponsoring this type of campaign are afraid to say in a forthright

manner that they are against the larger units of school administration. If they are, we would like to hear them say so.

I just want to quote from some of the statements made by the hon. member for Maple Creek when he was on his feet, and some of the suggestions that he has made in regard to increasing expenditures for local services. He said (or implied, at least), or he charged that the Government was using education money for capital expenditures on buildings that should have been charged to Public Works. I believe he had reference to the School Trust Fund when he made that statement. Further along, he goes on to suggest – again on the one hand complaining about high taxes, and on the other hand suggesting to the Government where they could spend a whole lot more money; he said the Government had about \$100 million in various trust funds for specific purposes, but the earnings from these funds could be used as a fund from which urban municipalities could draw. He suggested that . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I know that was carried in the press and that is not what was stated. It was stated that these funds, \$25 million of this fund, could be set aside and invested in these waterworks, not the earnings from such, but \$25 to \$30 million of the fund itself be set aside.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You are referring to the School Trust Funds?

Mr. Cameron: — No, not School Trust funds – all the funds.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Well, O.K. I would like to point out to the hon. member that all of these trust funds are committed for some purpose, and the principal trust fund we have is known as the School Land Trust Fund, and here again a suggestion is made where we can spend more money. Then I happened to glance over the new Liberal platform and what do I find? It is going to take a little while, Mr. Speaker, but here is what I find – platform No. 7. They nailed this platform together in a great hurry. I think they were thinking more about picking a leader than they were of devising a platform, and they were not fussy about bringing in a platform because it would have been very difficult to bring in any kind of a platform that would match the platform that the Government is implementing at the present time.

Mr. McDonald: — What platform?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — So they go about without reason making demands and submitting proposals to the people of this province hoping that the people of this province do not know any better, or that we won't expose some of the proposals that they are submitting. Here is one – No. 7 – this is a dilly:

“Restoration of the fundamental rights of the individual to acquire ownership of the land.”

I don't know when it was ever taken away from them, Mr. Speaker, and I don't know of a single person in this province who is worried about it. Then they go on:

“Present leases at the option of the holder to be converted into purchase agreements with all payments made on the leases credited as payments on purchase agreement.”

Mr. McDonald: — Right.

March 16, 1995

Hon. Mr. Nollet: —

“The purchase price of such land not to exceed the fair value of the land at the time of occupancy under the existing lease.”

Keep that in mind, Mr. Speaker – under their existing leases. I have heard the Social Crediters make promises – grandiose proposals that never could be fulfilled. Here is one that beats everything that I have ever heard coming out of Alberta, even in the early days of Social Credit.

Mr. Danielson: — Ask your Premier.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — These proposals are calculated to catch votes, but they know they will never implement them, Mr. Speaker. I want to tell you why, because in one breath they talk about more money for education . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Let us worry about that programme.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And then they propose a platform that will emasculate and wreck the School Land Trust Fund in doing so, Mr. Speaker, and I will tell you why. It so happens that we are up against this very problem at the moment, and we have to deal with it right now. Apparently, when they devised their programmes and platforms they did so without obtaining information, and I would suggest that whoever drafted this platform had better amend plank No. 7 as quickly as he can because it won't be implemented.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — They won't get the chance.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We discovered that 81 per cent of the veteran lessees hold leases on school lands. I have known for a long time, and your back-room boys ought to know the facts, that under the agreement between the Dominion Government and the Province of Saskatchewan as set out in the Act respecting the transfer of natural resources, dated May 30, 1940, paragraph 7 of the Act states:

“The School land fund to be transferred to the province and such land specified in Section 37 of the Dominion Land Act shall be set aside and shall continue to be administered by the province in accordance mutatis mutandis with the provisions of Section 37 to 40 of the Dominion Land Act for the support of schools organized and carried on therein in accordance with the law of the province.”

I go on, Mr. Speaker. Section 37 of The Dominion Land Act states –

Mr. Danielson: — What was that section, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Section 37 states, Mr. Speaker:

“Sections 11 and 29 in every surveyed township in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, together with the gold and silver, as well as other minerals contained therein, are hereby set aside as part of an endowment for education and shall be designated school lands and they are hereby withdrawn from the operations of the provisions of this Act, which relates to entry for homestead or sale.”

And the provisions of sale, as set out in the Act, provide that these lands will

be sold by public auction, and the Act also states that a reserve bid must be put up by the government. The whole purpose simply is that these lands are revenue lands, that they are to be sold to the highest bidder to obtain revenue for education. I am not altogether in agreement as to the manner in which these lands were disposed of by public auction, because I have had opportunity of going over the record and discovering that lands that had a productive value of only \$3.00 an acre have sold for as high as \$30 an acre when a farmer competed with his neighbour at a public auction for it.

Mr. Danielson: — You used that money to build piggeries up at the University instead of giving it to the schools.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Those rumblings that I hear over there don't make sense now, and they don't make sense . . .

Mr. Danielson: — \$400,000 in the building back here.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wants to make a statement let him get to his feet. He has been sitting here for four weeks, talking and carrying on a debate sitting in his seat. It is not only discourteous, but it is against the rules of this House, and I would request that he rise if he wants to say anything, or that he be quiet when he is sitting down.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Or leave the House.

Mr. Danielson: — Do as you are told. That applies to you as well as me.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I certainly don't mind — it's typical Liberal. I will have a little story to tell them at the conclusion of my remarks as to why I think it is typically Liberal.

Mr. McDonald: — It is against the rules of the House to read the paper in here, too.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — These lands were to be sold at public auction, but the House knows we have made special provision by agreement with the Dominion Government so we could sell these lands to veterans. Because of this we came up against this very problem, Mr. Speaker. Now, the suggestion being made here in the new Liberal platform has the effect of reducing the asset value of the School Land Trust Fund, which is represented either in lands or in money derived from the sale of school land; some \$25 million has been obtained as a result of the sale of school lands, and placed in a special trust fund. The income from this trust fund is used for the benefit of education and this fund is now also being used for the purchase of drainage debentures and provincial securities. At one time we were limited entirely to Dominion securities. So it is being used and it is earmarked for specific purposes.

We collect revenues from school lands. In the case of the veteran leases to date, we have collected revenues by way of rental from these lessees, some \$2,400,000. The proposal made here is that these rentals be applied to the purchase price. But, Mr. Speaker, this money has already been paid into the Education fund; this Department does not collect the money as part of their ordinary revenue. We get paid so much for collecting the money on behalf of the Provincial Treasurer for the benefit of Education, and it goes directly into that fund. Hon. members are suggesting that, in the case of veterans school

March 16, 1995

lands, we take some \$2½ million of income from the fund and apply it to the purchase price. This would have the result of reducing the asset value of the land, which is absolutely contrary to the resources agreement made with the Dominion of Canada and cannot legally be done.

But they go a step further, Mr. Speaker. They also propose that the sale price of this land will be the price of the land as when the lessee first took it – and it could have been raw land with a value of around \$5 or \$10 an acre, depending on its productivity. It could be northern land that would only be worth \$2 or \$3 an acre, or \$1 an acre, because of high development costs. Now, what they propose to do, Mr. Speaker, is to depreciate the value to what it was when the lessee first took up his lease and then apply the rental against the purchase price.

Mr. Danielson: — Who increased the value of the land?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I never heard such complete irresponsibility; this is an excellent demonstration. I haven't searched the records carefully, but I don't think there is a single lessee but you would owe much more to him than he would owe to you. You would be giving him the land free; you would be giving him back the rentals that have already been paid into the School Lands Trust fund for education and which you legally cannot do. My hon. friends have not thought about those things. I would calculate, although I have not looked over the records carefully, that this would mean a loss to education of well over \$7 million and yet they have the nerve to stand up here in this House and suggest that we should give more to education and on the other hand they want to reduce the very revenue on which education is dependent.

Mr. Danielson: — He made a mistake of about 10 years . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The hon. member for Arm River seems to think that what I say is not correct. It is absolutely correct, Mr. Speaker. It is incorporated into the laws of the province and incorporated into the agreement with the Government of Canada. I will have more to say about this when the amendments to The Land Act are before the House and before the Committee.

It has been suggested, too, by the hon. members opposite that this Government is always running to Ottawa for help.

Mr. Danielson: — . . . distress.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Carr) stated that the early pioneers did not go to Ottawa. The hon. member for Rosthern may be well studied in the matter of local history, but apparently he has not read the pioneer history regarding the struggle of the organized prairie farm people for economic justice. The history of this struggle is replete with stories about treks of unsuccessful delegations to Ottawa. Similarly, many representations were made to the provincial government, but all to no avail. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs), speaking a moment ago, made some reference to the origin of this particular political group, and the hon. members opposite should remember that it is because these delegations that went to Ottawa and that came to Regina were rebuffed – they came for bread and were sent away with a stone – that they finally decided the two old parties would have to go out, and we finally succeeded, as the hon. member for Swift Current said, in putting the Liberals out in the province of Saskatchewan, and that was a great day in the history of this province, Mr. Speaker.

Some Government Member: — And then it will be Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I want to assure the hon. members, especially the hon. member for Rosthern, that pioneers did not go to Ottawa and we do not go to Ottawa crying like babies, as the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) said. Both we, and the early pioneers, went to Ottawa demanding our just rights under our Confederation. I do not have time to enumerate in detail the various expeditions that were led to Ottawa by the early pioneers of the organized farm movements, from the Territorial Grain Growers right up to the present. I would like, however, to make reference to just one trip that was made to Ottawa within recent memory. You will recall that during the war years we had a Liberal government in power at Ottawa and Regina, and things became so unbearably desperate that two trainloads of farmers, businessmen and clergymen found it necessary to go to Ottawa, trek to Ottawa . . .

Mr. Cameron: — What year was that?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . and they did not go crying like babies to Mama's knee.

Mr. Cameron: — What year was that?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — In 1942 or 1943; it was just after the election when the Liberals promised \$1.00 wheat, and these delegations had to go down there to see to it that they fulfilled their election promises.

Mr. Danielson: — They got \$1.02.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — As the hon. member for Swift Current said, they got turned down. I think after some time we got another 25 cents a bushel, but that is what it took to move the government at Ottawa. So, this trekking to Ottawa is nothing new at all. And we go to Ottawa quite regularly.

Mr. McDonald: — Every day.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I don't know anything that has called us to Ottawa more than this freight rate issue. Will the hon. members for Rosthern or Cannington suggest that we should not have gone to Ottawa and protested the increased freight rates?

Mr. McCarthy: — It wouldn't make any difference what I say.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I don't think he would. Well, Mr. Speaker, of course, we could go on and on and also say, should we have gone to Ottawa to attend the Dominion-Provincial conference arising out of the Sirois-Rowell Commission report and the Greenbook proposals and the taxation Agreement? Well, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals certainly speak with the voice of experience when they talk about going to Ottawa, because when they were the government here they beat a constant trail. There was a well-beaten path for us to follow to Ottawa, particularly in the 1930's, and we cannot blame them for going to Ottawa at that time.

They made repeated trips to Ottawa at that time with the net result that, when we came into power in 1944, we had on our doorstep an impossible burden of provincial, municipal and individual farm debt. I hope nobody is going to say that we should not have gone to Ottawa for negotiations in settlement of these burdensome obligations. A settlement was reached, and a

March 16, 1995

substantial amount was written off by the Ottawa government, but a disproportionate amount was accepted by the Provincial Government, and the Provincial Government in turn has removed this burden of debt from the municipalities and the farmers, and we are still paying that money back to Ottawa year by year. This is something that is overlooked by the hon. members opposite when they keep on talking about more for this and more for that and more for the other thing.

Mr. McCarthy: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. A lot of that was assumed by the municipalities after this Government . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — There is no point of privilege to that, Mr. Speaker. The Provincial Government assumed the major responsibility.

Mr. McCarthy: — No, it didn't; the municipalities did, too.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The trouble with those hon. men is that they just can't take it when they get a few facts . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — Just keeping the record straight.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It is said, Mr. Speaker, that we blame Ottawa for many other things, the implication being that many of the things we blame Ottawa for are things that are now our responsibility. I don't know of a single instance where Ottawa was blamed for anything that was not Ottawa's well-established responsibility. In fact we had to assume, prematurely, many of the responsibilities that are Ottawa's responsibility. For example, Ottawa promised a national health plan as early as 1919.

Mr. McDonald: — Who promised it, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We introduced the hospitalization plan alone. We have grants to hospitals long before Ottawa came into the picture at all, and we got no credit for it whatever. We led the way in free medical and hospital benefits to recipients of old-age pensions, mothers' allowances, blind pensioners and other handicapped people and although old-age pensions are considered Ottawa's full responsibility; at an early date we led the way and provided supplementary allowances for old-age pensioners. Yes, to be sure, since then Alberta has come in and British Columbia has come in, and in some instances they have paid more supplementary allowances than we have; but when you take the over-all picture into consideration, the benefits that are being given for free medical and hospital benefits in this province, we still, in the over-all picture, lead the way.

Mr. McDonald: — Nonsense!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Everyone knows this to be a fact. We have never been criticized for being backward in providing social services and discharging our responsibilities within the financial means of this province for handicapped and dependent people who are a social responsibility.

Suggestions are being made again that we should do much more, that we should assume still further responsibility, and that we should do something for unemployment. The suggestion has been made by several members, particularly the hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly), that we should immediately assume responsibility for unemployment which again is strictly a federal responsibility, and the reasons are obvious. The Dominion Government has complete

jurisdiction over fiscal matters, over immigration and, in addition to that it has been demonstrated over and over, as a result of study, that municipalities and provincial governments cannot begin to cope with the financial responsibilities involved in taking care of unemployment and all allied problems. This was amply demonstrated in the 1930's. It was amply demonstrated by the fact that there was a burden of debt on municipal and provincial governments that had to be cancelled, and it was a result of those experiences that finally determined that the responsibility for unemployment would be that of the national government.

I regret very much that the hon. member for Souris-Estevan is not in his seat. During the first session he was in his seat most constantly, but now I find him absent more often than not. I guess he must be pondering, Mr. Speaker; I think he is pondering a very important riddle – whether he should or whether he shouldn't – to be, or not to be, a Conservative. He has got quite a problem, and I wish he were in his seat. I would like to remind him, when he makes the suggestion that we should be doing something for unemployment, what one of his Conservative colleagues said at Ottawa. He said this, and he was right; a Progressive Conservative back-bencher said provincial and municipal governments should do nothing to alleviate unemployment and thus place responsibility for action on the Federal Government where it belongs. Michael Starr, Progressive Conservative of Ontario, a former mayor of Oshawa said Thursday:

“It is only a matter of time before municipalities start going bankrupt from paying relief to jobless as they did in the 'thirties.”

Speaking on the third day of the Commons debate on unemployment, Mr. Starr said:

“Municipalities and provincial governments should take necessary steps to place the responsibility for relief on the Federal Government. I feel at this time that the municipal and provincial governments should adopt a policy of doing nothing about the present situation, in order to force the Federal Government to take responsibility which is rightfully theirs.”

And he goes on to say other things, which I will not quote, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Cameron: — That sounds like C.C.F. propaganda.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It is not C.C.F. propaganda, Mr. Speaker. I was quoting from a Conservative member speaking in the House of Commons at Ottawa.

Some Hon. Member: — We'll have to hear it over again now.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — On again off again Finnegan.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I was just telling the House in the absence of the hon. member for Souris-Estevan that one of his party in Ottawa had made the suggestion . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Are you sure it was his suggestion?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . that instead of provincial governments accepting the responsibility for unemployment that provincial governments and

March 16, 1995

municipalities do nothing themselves but ought to go to the Federal Government and say to the Federal Government "Accept your responsibilities now." He said not to do so would mean that we would get back in the very same position we were in the 1930's when provincial governments and municipalities did make some attempt to deal with unemployment and relief problems, and to that extent I agree with Michael Starr, the Conservative member of Ontario. I wholly agree with him in that regard, because, believe me, anything that the Federal Government can get out of and put on the provincial governments, they will.

Mr. Cameron: — Anything you can put on them, you will.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — 'Jimmy' Gardiner is particularly adept at that. It is getting to the point that the Provinces are expected to do practically everything. I sometimes wonder if we have a government at Ottawa at all. They want everyone else to do something about their problems but themselves, and their little henchmen out here sing the same refrain, hoping that somehow they can thus detract attention from Ottawa and focus attention on this administration and by mysterious means, implication and distortions, (Mr. Speaker, absolute distortions, and often, I believe wilful, because they ought to know better) would have the people of this province believe that some of these things are our responsibility not theirs and we are thus to blame. All I have to say to the hon. members opposite is if they want to fight an election on the issue as to what are Ottawa's responsibility and what are our responsibilities, and also as to what we have done about our responsibilities as compared to what Ottawa has not done about theirs, I would welcome that sort of an election issue.

Mr. Cameron: — When are you going to call it, Toby?

Mr. McCarthy: — Are you going in to the municipalities, too?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — As far as the hon. members over there are concerned one can in this House repeat to them over and over, and I believe it has been repeated so much that they must thoroughly understand the situation, and I know the hon. member for Souris-Estevan must also understand, when he gets up on his feet and suggests that we assume added financial burdens for unemployment.

I just got through stating in the Throne Speech debate that we may be faced with the prospect of providing \$75 million for the construction of the South Saskatchewan River Dam. I don't know of a single thing that is more necessary to industrialization in this province than that project. Now, if the hon. members opposite were sincere in their hope for industrialization in this province, they would not be making proposals that would make it impossible to go ahead with the construction of the South Saskatchewan dam. They know, as well as I know, that there are limitations to the financial ability of this province. They know the trust funds referred to are all committed, Mr. Speaker, they know it full well.

There is one thing that I believe we urgently need, if we are to have more employment opportunities and industrialization, and that is the South Saskatchewan River project. This province is not naturally gifted — Nature has not provided us with cheap power sites. We have every disadvantage, and we have in addition to that the economic disadvantage of high freight rates. Those are some of the principal reasons why industry is not attracted to this province as it is attracted elsewhere. We have sincerely tried to correct this situation. We have gone even too far, some people tell us. We are, however,

prepared to commit this province to \$75 million towards the construction of this project, and still it is not being proceeded with. Are we wrongfully blaming Ottawa for this? If not, then who is to blame for this? I wish you would stand up and say so. I think it is about time that this Government be relieved of some of this Ottawa-blaming stuff and let the 'Leader-Post' take over for a while and let the hon. members opposite take over for a while and rightfully start blaming Ottawa for not going ahead with this project.

Mr. Cameron: — You haven't left anything — you covered it all. You're crying every day to Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I have never seen any one of the Opposition get up and say a favourable word for the project. Not one of them has indicated their support for the Government's proposals to Ottawa. Are you prepared to support a \$75-million contribution to this project? Either put up or shut up!

Mr. Danielson: — Small potatoes.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — They talk about small potatoes; that's down their alley. Small minds, small potatoes; but I am thinking about the future of this province, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Cameron: — Rant on.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And while you are making these other suggestions that you are making, you know full well that if you were the Government you could not take on all the suggestions made and at the same time take on this commitment too. All that I can take from their silence is that they are not interested in this project at all. Yet it is the one thing that will do more than anything else to bring industry here and to solve the problem of unemployment. It is going to cost a great deal of money. It is very apparent we went all out on it, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Gardiner has been talking about this dam for years. We are prepared to put up \$75 million against some \$65 million by Ottawa, and still they won't proceed with it — they who have been talking about it and promising it to the people of this province for years. What does Mr. Gardiner say today? I have here a press clipping which states: "Gardiner sees the dam some day." I suggest to you people that you go down to Ottawa and find out where the blame lies for holding up this very important project. We should have been at it six or seven years ago. Had we done so perhaps we wouldn't be talking about the unemployment which is now being referred to by the hon. member for Souris-Estevan. Here is Mr. Gardiner, the man who was going to get it and who has made the Liberal promises! And after you put him on the spot, and you put it on the line, then every time he comes to see us about it; it costs us more money. I hope he stays away for a while because we have gone just about the limit now. Then, when all conditions are agreed to and all is said and done, now he "sees the dam some day."

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Can you see it, Minty?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — This is a project that we should stand united on, regardless of politics, and, believe me, it is going to take some doing. Members opposite had better go down and convince the Prime Minister that it is in the national interest. We ought to stand united and tell those at Ottawa that this project is just as important as, and even more important, to us in western Canada than the St. Lawrence Seaway is to eastern Canada. When I was speaking, the other day, the hon. member from Saltcoats, as usual, said "was I for or

March 16, 1995

against the St. Lawrence Seaway.” What I was speaking about, and I say so again, is that we are not against it at all; but I want to say that when this project of ours came up, the question of power subsidization came up; but in the case of the St. Lawrence Seaway it was never raised despite the fact that it will reduce power rates in Ontario to an absolute minimum, and it will keep industry there, and prevent industry from coming here. Every one of the members knows that you must have cheap power, and you must also have lots of water for industry, and if you haven’t got these musts you just won’t get industry. You can do all the talking in the world and all the begging in the world and you will not get industry if conditions are not favourable to the establishment of industry. We all know this. And all this talk about Socialism driving people away is nonsense. This Government has a reputation and a good one . . .

Mr. Loptson: — Have you changed your mind about it?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . towards keeping its word. There is no concern felt by industries coming to this Province, and engaging in a business enterprise. Many have said that they come in with complete assurance, and that they would as soon deal with this Government as any other government in Canada.

Mr. Loptson: — You’re changing your mind about eradicating capitalism, eh?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I’m not changing my mind about eradicating capitalism at all. Happily enough, the people who are doing things in a big way haven’t got the same small minds as some of the hon. members opposite when it comes to social responsibilities and social implication.

There is another thing I would like to refer to, Mr. Speaker, and that was a statement made by the hon. member for Saltcoats, yesterday. He read from a Leader-Post editorial – he didn’t remember the date, but for his information, it was March 10th. I clipped it, too, because I found it most interesting.

Mr. McDonald: — I am surprised you keep those.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It was a nice little sort of a dream and I am sure the ‘Leader-Post’ must have got a lot of pleasure out of stating that private enterprise was assessed for income tax, but the wicked Crown Corporations were not, and that for this reason we can show a profit. It appears there is the closest possible collaboration between opposition members of the Legislature and the staff of the Leader-Post, because at the same time this paper came out with another one of its famous cartoons depicting a building with an imposing front: it shows the Saskatchewan Crown Corporations with a nice big front and nothing but failures behind. And so on March 10th, we have this editorial and cartoon in the Leader-Post.

Then, Mr. Speaker, on January 7th of this year, I read another editorial in the Leader-Post that seemed to say just the opposite. In this editorial they said: “One out of four loses money”; and they go on to say – they had to defend free enterprise, you know, it is almost a virtue that free enterprise corporations should lose money apparently, and on the other hand they are always ready to try and convince the general public that the more successful capitalist concerns aren’t making vast profits – the implement companies, for example, and even now put up an argument that they aren’t making very much. It says:

“The volume of taxation statistics published by The Department of National Revenue contained material which should prove enlightening to the many in this province who appear to believe that corporations generally are rolling in fat profits.

“The statistics over the year 1952, the last one for which taxation data is complete: In that year, 44,484 corporations in Canada were taxable under the Income Tax Act. Of this number 12,733 operated at a loss in a year which was one of the most prosperous in Canada’s history. In other words, virtually one out of every four Canadian corporations ended up in 1952 in the red.”

Well, that is one out of four, Mr. Speaker, and I think our batting average as far as Crown Corporations is concerned is just about as good. I will leave the hon. member with his happy little thought that somehow or other maybe it would be nice if we had to pay income tax on Crown Corporations. The only thing I can say is that, unhappily, we would not be in a position to pass on those income taxes to our customers as the private enterprise firms do.

I would like to mention this for the benefit of the hon. member for Souris-Estevan, too, because he mentioned that he thought the Telephones were making a little too much money, and that, because they had a pretty good return this year, they should reduce rates. I should say to him that a good deal of the money that is invested in the Telephone Corporation has not been paid off as yet. However, in the case of a private enterprise company – sure, the investors expect some return. They expect some dividends. They expect an increased value on their shares, too; but that is not the case with the Saskatchewan Government Telephones. There is a good deal of difference between a public enterprise that operates for service and use and one that operates strictly for the profits and the benefit of the few shareholders that are fortunate enough to have shares in that kind of a corporation. It is a different matter entirely, and I think that the people of this province perhaps could demand, with some justification, that we should have telephone rates that would give us a return on capital that would permit some contribution from the system itself towards the expansion of the system. I think that would be all to the good; I don’t see anything wrong with it at all.

There is another thing that I would like to deal with, and it is an editorial that appears in the Leader-Post today. It was so very, very wrong that I cannot help but make some reference to it. I appreciate very much that the Minister of Highways made a correction. Apparently the editor of the Leader-Post would have liked to misconstrue some statements made by the Minister of Highways at Melfort to indicate that somehow or another his statements reflected some blame on the Department of Agriculture because of drainage problems in north-eastern Saskatchewan. They were talking about the added expense for work and wages in north-eastern Saskatchewan, and somehow or other this editorial is suggesting that it is the fault of the Department of Agriculture that we have a work-and-wages programme in north-eastern Saskatchewan, but that, for some reason or other, because we moved in, in 1950, to put drainage in an area that never before had drainage attention from a provincial government in this province’s history, somehow or other we are to blame, because there was a work-and-wages programme in the north-east, overlooking the fact entirely that this was a matter beyond my power. It was in the hands of Providence and who am I to presume to even give advice to Providence, when it permits a deluge of rain on

March 16, 1995

a particular area of the province. I want to say to the editor of the Leader-Post, it was only last November that we sent to him, as a result of other articles that he wrote, a complete statement on the situation, and he should have read the factual statement which he received from the Department before making any more silly comments or suggestions through an editorial of this kind.

It suggested somehow that the \$900,000 that was spent by Highways for work and wages was because of our getting into drainage in north-east Saskatchewan. Again I want to state that not a cent of this money was spent in the new settlement projects. This money was spent in the old settlement districts that had not received drainage attention by any other previous administration in this province. The problem requiring this expenditure was in areas where drainage should have been put in 30 years ago. It was because drainage wasn't put in then that some of the crop losses took place; but by and large, the fundamental reason was too much moisture for three or four years in a row, and everyone knows it.

The editorial also suggested that much was being done on the Manitoba side of the boundary. It said that the P.F.R.A. administration was carrying out a \$3,500,000 drainage and flood control project on the Manitoba side of the Carrot River Triangle. First I want to make a correction here. This Manitoba project has nothing whatever to do with the triangle on our side of the border. It is an area that has been settled for some considerable time. This editorial says:

“The land eventually will be sold to settlers for a modest outlay, on easy terms; a portion of the sale proceeds will go to the Federal Government to reimburse it in part for its outlay.”

They intend to make recovery for the cost involved in this drainage through the sale of the land. We have been providing drainage in new settlement areas without cost at all to the lessee, as part of our obligation to them. It is part of our partnership deal with lessees of Crown land in that area. I mentioned to the House during the Throne Speech debate, when I made a comparison with the experience of settlers on our side of the border as compared to those on the Manitoba side of the border in this very area being referred to by the article in the Leader-Post. And here is what it says – yes, they are veterans, too, and the land was sold to them. This article appeared in the Winnipeg Free Press, and, if you want to check on it, (I would suggest the Leader-Post does, too), it is dated Friday, November 5, 1954, and the heading is:

“PUT UP OR CLOSE UP ON VETERAN PROJECT, LEGION TELLS GOVERNMENT.”

It refers to the Manitoba government. It states that the delegation to the government said that provision must be made for drainage and roads for north-western Manitoba, especially to Birch River veteran farmers' project, or remove the settlers from the area. I am not going to read it all. The delegation said that, because of the debt situation, the province should arrange the consolidation of debt owed by the settlers to the Manitoba government, the municipality and others.

“It would also be necessary to postpone payments on those obligations until settlers have enough working capital to keep them going.”

And it goes on with the same old story we have always heard of debt-ridden farmers endeavouring to pay for land at a high interest rate, and at the same time endeavouring to develop the land in an area where development is very costly. The article continues:

“As a result, settlers all reported financial resources exhausted; difficulties in payment of instalments on land purchases, and other debts.”

We have no problem of this kind on our side of the border. By contrast, Mr. Speaker, in this year alone we will have paid very nearly \$1,000,000 to lessees on Crown land for clearing and breaking which was done on those lands. It is a partnership arrangement. It is an arrangement under which a young farmer can get established without a heavy financial outlay, because we assume some of the costs ourselves, and, in addition, we put in all the roads and the drainage, too. The article says:

“The Birch river project opened in 1906 . . .”

long before we ventured boldly, as the Leader-Post says, into new settlement projects in Saskatchewan. The veterans’ project in Manitoba was opened in 1946, sponsored by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the provincial Department of Natural Resources. Each veteran was granted a quarter-section. We are more generous, we give them a half-section here . . .

Mr. Loptson: — You don’t give it to them.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . at prices ranging for this kind of land (a good deal of it is undeveloped land) from \$1,700 to \$2,500, with 10 per cent down and 15 years to complete the purchase. The article goes on to tell of the difficulties experienced. I am mighty glad that we didn’t adopt a policy of this kind on our side of the border.

The experience just mentioned is one of the reasons why we have a lease policy. It is because we came in here with similar experiences. I know what it is to try to pay for land. I tried long enough, and know all the ups and downs; and I hoped that we would one day have a policy similar to our present lease policy, particularly as far as this northern settlement is concerned. Sometime perhaps in the future, when the land is completely developed and the settler becomes very well established, the Government of the day then might want to sell the land to the settler. Now, however, to get started I think our present lease policy is the best possible arrangement, and in addition it does permit some return on the capital investment. I wish to commend the Provincial Treasurer, and support this budget because he has made provision in it for a policy of paying out clearing and breaking accounts to Crown lessees as a permanent policy. I have hoped for a policy of this kind for a long time, and it is now in the budget for this coming year. The Government has also been good enough to provide extra money within this fiscal year to pay out all Crown lessees who had money owing to them for clearing and breaking Crown land. We will thus start with a clean sheet at the beginning of this coming fiscal year, and certainly, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of experience to date this is a good policy. It is not a matter of philosophy and it is not a matter, as I have often said before, of any perversity of mind.

Now in regard to this editorial – and I understand the hon. member for Nipawin (Mr. MacNutt) made the statement (I wasn’t at the meeting in Melfort) that somehow or other the reasons we weren’t getting similar help for

March 16, 1995

drainage from the Federal Government as Manitoba, was because of our land policies. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, I don't know where he gets his authority; but if that was correct and he thinks it is correct, I would be ashamed to tell the people of this province that the Federal Government at Ottawa, because it did not agree with our land policies, was refusing resource development to this province. He ought to be ashamed of himself for even suggesting that.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Typical Liberalism!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I don't think it is correct; but if it is correct, I would like to ask my hon. friend for his authority for his statement. I would like to have some evidence as to whether the Federal Government is refusing drainage assistance on this side of the border because of our land policies. Are they going to be like some of these 'Little Caesars' strutting across the country, dictating to every provincial government? It is our right to bring in the kind of policies that we desire, and the Federal administration has no right to endeavour to intimidate the people of this province politically, and refuse them reclamation assistance if they deserve it. Land policy has nothing to do whatever with reclamation, and I do not think the statement is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — Not a five-cent piece in reclamation.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Yes, not a five-cent piece.

Some Hon. Member: — The member quoted you as his source of information.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Well, he is wrong. He is wrong, as I am a poor source of information, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, in this article in the Leader-Post — first, I want to remind them that they told us we were too hasty and that the Minister of Highways agreed we were too hasty, and admitted that we were too hasty; then, down below, what do they say? They talk about a much more difficult area, the Carrot River Triangle. I don't think they know a thing about it, especially when they talk about a million acres being contained in it, because there isn't that much. They say this:

“Here is land for land-hungry young potential farmers of Saskatchewan awaiting only adequate drainage and flood control. The Provincial Government certainly hasn't much to boast about in the way it has mishandled this opportunity in its decade in office.”

In other words, in one breath they blame us for going into the veterans settlement, and in the next breath they turn around and regret that we did not go into the Carrot River Triangle.

At the present time the P.F.R.A. is undertaking a survey to determine if it is possible to reclaim this particular area. It is a great flood plain; it poses a real engineering problem. The problem is whether or not we will be able to contain this river within high dykes and get it through the very narrow passage at The Pas. The drop in this river is only about four-tenths of a foot a mile between Cumberland House and The Pas, and beyond this point it is two-tenths of a foot a mile. The problem is how to compress the river and overcome all dangers of flooding due to ice jams and what have you. These are problems that are still not answered, and as quickly as they are answered, and as soon as we know what the probable cost will be and that work can be proceeded with, then we will be in a position to go ahead and negotiate an agreement, and

as has already been indicated to me that we will receive help for the Carrot River Triangle. Surely, it is silly to even suggest that we should have gone ahead 10 years ago, when we didn't even know what the soils were like in that particular area. The Leader-Post had better do a little back-tracking. They are getting just about as irresponsible as members opposite. They have the staff, Mr. Speaker – sometimes I think when they talk about large staffs, and I take a look at the Leader-Post staff, there are people around there just like ants on an anthill. They have enough staff at least to get down to the facts and to write some constructive editorials for a change, particularly one urging Ottawa to go ahead with the South Saskatchewan River dam.

Now, again, I regret that I have insufficient time for my report on the Department of Agriculture, and here it is, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Dunfield (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister a question? Just to keep the record straight I have here a notation that there have been 2,123 settlers, veterans, settled on the land in Saskatchewan under the lease system. Have all of these veterans been settled on school lands only?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I mentioned in the House – 81 per cent, and when I bring in amendments to The Lands Act I will tell you the full story about it.

Mr. Dunfield: — Well, there is another question, Mr. Minister. You made the statement that these school lands had to be sold by auction to the highest bidder. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — That is correct. But we made a special exception. The Hon. Minister of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation was able (and after a whole lot of convincing, too) to get Ottawa to agree to make an exception under the Natural Resources agreement, under which we would be permitted to sell school land to veterans other than by public auction.

I will support the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. L.F. McIntosh (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

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