

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session – Twelfth Legislature
17th Day

Friday, March 2, 1956

The House met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day:

Museum of Natural History

Hon. J. H. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural and Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to announce to the House that in the Provincial Museum of Natural History we have now completed the historical case which illustrates a meeting between fur traders and the Indians in the early days. The case is dated about 1855, and the site is typical of what might be found in the Pipestone Valley.

It has been arranged that we will have an official unveiling of this case, and it is my privilege and pleasure to invite the members of the Legislature and their wives to be present on that occasion. The date is Thursday, March 8th, and the time is 8:00 o'clock p.m.

I would like to have been able to invite the public, but it is a question of room, and with the galleries as they are, with the members and their wives and a few officials, it will be plenty crowded. That will be a good opportunity, too, for a 'sneak preview' of the Buffalo case, which is about completed if not entirely completed; and, incidentally, an opportunity to look over any part of the Museum which the members wish. I understand that arrangements have been made to have tea served after the ceremony. I hope all members will take the opportunity to be there on that occasion.

Boxcar Allocation and Distribution

Moved by Mr. Dewhurst, seconded by Mr. Willis (Elrose):

“That this Assembly requests the Government of Canada:

- (1) to make a sufficient number of boxcars available for the movement of grain, so that at all times grain may be moved into available terminal storage space; and
- (2) so to amend the Canada Grain Act that allocation of boxcars among the various elevator companies may be on the basis of the preference indicated by the application in each producer's permit book; and
- (3) to instruct the Transport Controller to make a more equitable distribution of boxcars as between shipping points, the allocation to be on the basis of need.”

Mr. F. A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, on rising to move this motion, I realize that the situation we have had in the province, this past few months, has created a greater interest in the number of boxcars than maybe normally would have been created. The people of this province are quite aware of the seriousness of the boxcar situation. After the Minister of Highways (Hon. J. T. Douglas) telling this House that he has a number of students from his constituency from the 'Grain Belt' of Saskatchewan in the Legislature here today, I am sure that they will be interested in boxcars which help in the movement of grain.

At the outset I would like to read a quotation or two from the 'Western Producer' of January 19th. I think the board of directors of the Wheat Pool summed up the situation better than I can sum it up myself, even if I used twice as many word, so I shall quote part of their report as published in the 'Western Producer' of January 19th, 1956. It says:

"Up to the end of the first week in January, railways had loaded 36,000 fewer boxcars than to the same date last year. More than 1,000 boxcars a day must be loaded at western country elevators from now on until the end of July to equal last year's grain movement," the Wheat Pool said.

And further on, they gave six points as to what should be done, and I would like to read those six points. It says:

"The concern of the Wheat Pool arises from these considerations:

- (1) In spite of substantial amounts of space in terminal elevators at the Lakehead and at the Coast, reported recently to be about 48 million bushels, insufficient numbers of boxcars are being supplied to take care of the shipping orders which have been issued by the Canadian Wheat Board.
- (2) The Board has been required on occasion to pay demurrage charges on boats in harbour waiting to load grain for export, because there was insufficient grain of the quality required at Vancouver. Paying these demurrage charges is an added expense to the Wheat Board and comes out of the farmer's pocket in the end.
- (3) More than 1,000 cars a day will be required for the remainder of the present crop year to equal last year's movement of grain, and to make up the deficiency which has accumulated so far this year.
- (4) The railroads appear to be under-powered in some parts of the province where they have been unable to cope with recent storm conditions to keep aiding and elevator tracks open for the movement of grain.

- (5) Too many boxcars suitable for grain hauling are in the United States, whereas U.S. cars in Canada are not of a type suitable for grain hauling. The result is prejudicial to western agriculture.
- (6) The result of all these factors is that farm deliveries in Western Canada are about 70 million bushels less than they were a year ago at this time.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that, in itself, points out the serious needs for more boxcars, because if we do not have the boxcars to make use of the available storage space at the Lakeheads and at Vancouver, we cannot supply our overseas customers when they are ready to take grain. It is true that, at this time of the year, we cannot ship from the Head of the Lakes, but when we know that ships are being held at Vancouver waiting for grain, and we have to pay demurrage on them, as the Wheat Pool points out, which later comes out of the farmers’ returns, I think that is a very serious situation. And the cars haven’t yet come in sufficient quantities to relieve the situation.

I note from the ‘Western Producer’ of February 16th that the number of cars required to move as much grain as last year fell over 150 cars a day behind the January estimates. In the article I just read the Wheat Pool estimates that it would take 1,000 per day as of January to move the same amount of grain, between then and the end of July, as we had last year. On February 16th, “due to the lack of cars in January and February, we would now need over 1,150 cars per day in order to get the same amount of grain out as we did last year.” So it is necessary that every effort and all persuasion to put on the authorities who are in charge of these facilities to see that more cars are available.

I would like to read another small quotation from the ‘Western Producer’ of March 1st, and this also deals with the grain delivery situation, and is released by the Wheat Pool officials. They say:

“The delivery situation as it emerges from information reviewed by the Board was as follows: ‘On February 22nd, 32 Saskatchewan shipping points were still on the unit quota of delivery. At the same date 612 points were on a quota of one bushel to the specified acre, and there are only 1,107 shipping points in the province.’”

So half of the shipping points in the province of Saskatchewan have a one-bushel quota or less. My own towns, back home, are among those which don’t have even a one-bushel quota yet. Something is very seriously wrong when that is the case.

In my own district of the northeast, we have had, this past few years, considerable loss of crops due to excessive flooding conditions and due to the inability of the farmers to be able to get their crops in and get them off in good condition. In 1954, many of the farmers in that district had no grain whatsoever; did not harvest a bushel of grain. This year, the acreage that was seeded was on a very much reduced basis from

March 2, 1956

what it is normally, and yet one week ago, when I made a check, Archerwill was still on the unit quota. Yesterday, I was talking to a fellow from Rose Valley by phone, and I asked him what the situation was at Rose Valley. He pointed out they only had the unit quota there. These areas which have had no crops these past few years and are still only on the unit have had no crops these past few years and are still only on the unit quota, I think is a very serious situation, one which calls for all the action and attention which our Federal authorities can give to this situation. If these farmers are not going to be able to sell their grain, more than just the unit quota, how are they going to provide for themselves and for their families this winter (we have had a severe winter too, Mr. Speaker), and pay their taxes? It is no wonder that part of the province, when you take the arrears of taxes, shows by proportion heavier arrears of taxes than other parts of the province.

The result of this lack of boxcars on February 24th, meant that the Wheat Pool, as of February 24th (last week end) had over 8,000 shipping orders from the Wheat Board which they were unable to supply on account of the lack of boxcars. Just see what that amounts to, Mr. Speaker, when there are 8,000 orders in the one company alone, in the Wheat Pool, which they can't supply because they are waiting for boxcars. They have the grain, but they haven't got the cars. That situation can be extended to the other companies of this province, the same as it is the Wheat Pool. I do not have the statistics as to how many cars the other elevators are short on the orders they have, but you could safely assume that it would be about the same number of cars. That would give considerable more storage in our local elevators and, at the same time, ships at Vancouver would not have to go away short of wheat, nor would the farmers eventually have to pay demurrage on those empty ships.

Recently, a friend of mine who was quite perturbed about the situation wrote to the Canadian Wheat Board and asked if he could have information as to how the boxcars were allocated and what the setup was. I would like to quote an extract from the letter which my friend received, and this is part of the letter written by the Canadian Wheat Board:

“With respect to the situation of car allocation in the calling of our grain forward from our country elevators, our Board distributes orders to the various elevator companies on a percentage basis rated to the volume of business concluded by the company over a period of years. The procedure is for the Board to allocate shipping orders of grain for a certain quantity of cars to each individual elevator company. The companies in turn allocate these cars at their discretion to the various grain delivery points, giving preference to the low quota points, provided that the types of grades of grain required for our sales are available at low quota points.

“The percentage allocated to each elevator company is a matter for Board information only. We decided at the outset that we were not going to give the percentage to the companies concerned, but we are endeavouring to administer this policy fairly as between the various companies in the calling of our grain forward from country elevators.”

I wonder why the policy of the Wheat Board, which is a Federal Government agency or body, is such a hidden secret? Why are they not prepared to let the producers of western Canada know what the policy is? I would like to refer again to that one line: "The percentage allocated to each elevator company is a matter of for Board information only." I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers should have a right to now on what basis these cars are being allocated.

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask if the member will table that letter.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Mr. Speaker, I said that this quotation was an extract from a letter which was sent to a friend of mine, and I take full responsibility for it, and I do not have to table it. I believe that is correct. This is an extract from a friend of mine, who wrote to the Wheat Board, and it is only a portion of the letter, Mr. Speaker.

The farmers, I believe, should have a right to know what the policy is. Not only can the farmers not find out what the policy of allocating boxcars is, but also the grain companies themselves cannot find out what the policy is. I can recall reading the debates that went on in the Agricultural Committee of the House of Commons, when the Agricultural Committee had before them the Board of Grain Commissioners, the Wheat Board, the Transport Controller and others. Different members of that Agricultural Committee questioned these officials on the policy of allocating boxcars. It just seems to be a vicious circle of passing the buck from one to the other, and as of yet, nobody seems to know who is responsible for the allocating of boxcars, under what policy they operate. I think it is about time that the Government of Canada assumed their rightful responsibility to see that these inequities are ironed out, and to see that this information is made available to the public. I am sure that, if the western farmers and the western grain organizations, including the Pool and the line elevator companies, had full information as to what their policy was, it would be possible for the farm organizations and the elevator companies concerned to suggest ways and means whereby it could become more practicable. I do not see why it should be the hidden dark secret. We hear a lot of these hidden dark secrets, but they don't help the farmers.

From August 1st to February 3rd, last year, the Pool had 47 per cent of all the cars in the province of Saskatchewan. This year, for the same period of time (from August 1st to February 3rd of this year), they received 45.98 per cent of the cars. In other words, the Pools' percentage of cars which they have received of the amount allocated is down over one per cent of what it was last year. I am sure that the allocation of cars needs an overhauling.

In the province of Saskatchewan we have some 112,000 farmers. The Wheat Pool records show that, last year, there were over 80,000 farmers who hauled some of their grain to the Pool. It is quite evident that they were not able to haul all their grain to the Pool, or otherwise the percentage of the Wheat Pool handling would have been considerably more. But the 80,000 farmers who hauled some of their grain to the Pool, constituted five-sevenths of all the farmers in Saskatchewan.

March 2, 1956

That is the number of farmers which are on the Pool's records, to whom the Pool is paying small patronage dividends.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, in face of the letter which I have just read an extract from, and in face of the fact that the Wheat Pool is a farmers' organization, and five-sevenths of the farmers like to do some (if not all) their dealings with the Pool, if that is one of the reasons why they keep it a secret, and say it is for the information of the Board only. Does this explain the letter of the Canadian Wheat Board?

This past three years in the House of Commons, a private member's Bill was introduced asking the Government of Canada to amend the Canada Grain Act whereby the farmer could have the right to deliver grain to the elevator of his choice. I do not, for one moment, say that legislation should be passed at Ottawa in amendment to the Canada Grain Act whereby it would compel people to haul their grain to the Pool, just because I personally believe in the Pool. I will admit and concede to others the right to haul to line elevators if they so wish. What I am asking for is that the amendments be made which will allow each and every farmer to deliver the grain to where they think it should be delivered; not to where you or I may think, but to where the individual farmer thinks it should be delivered.

If we believe in freedom and democracy surely we can let the farmer have the right to deliver the grain where he wants! We don't tell the merchants what wholesalers they must buy their goods from. We don't tell them when they can get a car to bring their goods in. They have that freedom of choice to buy the goods from where they want. Why can't the farmer have the right to deliver his goods to where he likes, regardless of the elevator company concerned? If we had this, Mr. Speaker, then neither the Pool members nor those who believe in the patronage of line elevator companies would have any complaints.

As I mentioned, for the past three years a Bill to do just that was moved in the House of Commons at Ottawa. On each occasion that Bill was voted down by the Government majority at Ottawa. I am not aware that any such Bill has been moved as yet this year at Ottawa, but maybe it will be before the present Session of the House of Commons is over. Some amendments were made last year to the Canada Grain Act, but they do not go far enough. They do not give to the farmer the right to deliver grain to the elevator of his choice. Last fall at the Wheat Pool convention, which was held the first 10 days of November in the city of Regina, the Wheat Pool delegates passed a resolution along the following lines. This was the resolution which was submitted to the Wheat Pool delegates by the directors of the Wheat Pool, and the delegate body passed it. It reads:

"Your Board recommends that we continue to urge the need for amendments to the Canada Grain Act to provide for the placing of boxcars at country elevators in accordance with the farmers' preference, so the farmers may be able to deliver to country elevators of their choice, and at the same time retain to individual growers their right to order cars under the Car Order Book section of the Canada Grain Act."

It is quite plain to be seen that the Wheat Pool delegates, or the farmers' organizations who have passed resolutions, are not asking for preferential treatment. They are only asking that they may have the right to have a freedom of choice to be able to do what they think is right in the interest of themselves and in the interest of the organizations in which they believe.

The third section of my resolution deals with the Transport Controller; that he should allocate boxcars to these shipping points on the basis of need. All too often, Mr. Speaker, we find that some towns are on the two railroad lines. There may be three or four elevators on one line, and two or three on the other railroad line. I have a good example of that, last fall in the town of Wadena. Wadena has the two railroad lines. There is only the Pool elevator on the C.P.R., but on the C.N.R. there are four or more elevators. Late in the fall, it would be on or around the 25th of October, I was talking to the Pool elevator agent in Wadena. He told that, up until that date, he had only been able to take in 58 bushels of the 1955 wheat crop. He pointed out to me that one farmer came in with a small load of grain, 58 bushels on it, he was filled up; but this farmer came in a-ways with this grain and he had to have some money; he hadn't been able to get any of his quota out. So they went up into the elevator and shovelled the grain back on top of the bin enough to get the 58 bushels in. Yet, on the C.N.R. line, which goes through Wadena on down through Quill Lake, they always are able to get more cars than we are on the C.P.R. line. I think there is a job there for the Transport Controller to see that the Canadian Pacific Railroad makes at least as many cars available for the movement of grain as does the Canadian National Railroad.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, without further elaboration – there is lots more I could say on this, and I hope other members will add something. I move this resolution, seconded by Mr. Willis (Elrose).

Mr. W. J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, in reading the 'Star-Phoenix' of Thursday, March 1st, I find an article "Boxcar Shortage Cuts Deeply Into Farm Income – Pool." I would like to quote two or three paragraphs from this article. One of the paragraphs says this:

"At half the shipping points in Saskatchewan, farmers were still restricted to one bushel per acre delivery quota on February 22, the date of the last official figures. This meant that the grain income for most half-section farmers at these points since last August had a ceiling of \$720. Section farmers at one-bushel quota points might have received an income of \$1,080 from the sale of wheat during the last six months."

I would like the members for this House to note the figures – for the half-section farmers \$720, and for the section farmers a possible income of \$1,080. Not a net income, it is a gross income.

It points out here in the article that the Wheat Pool at their meeting were quite concerned about the situation, and they made a

March 2, 1956

study and found out certain facts. One of these facts, as quoted from this article is that:

“The railways had loaded about 26,800 fewer boxcars at prairie points during the present crop year than during the same portion of the 1954-55 crop year.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question: where have these 26,800 cars disappeared to? They were available in 1954-55 to the farmers of Saskatchewan, why are they not available in 1956?

I think the answer is quite simple. I think that as in the past so also at the present time, certain industries in Canada are getting a preference in car allocation and it is my duty to stand up and object to that. You don't find our hear anything in the press today that the iron is not being moved out of the iron mines. You don't hear anything about the pulpwood not being moved out of the pulp areas. You don't hear that the oil is not being moved. The only industry that is suffering is the industry which produces grain.

I would like to make a comparison, Mr. Speaker. The farmer, I think, can be compared to a mining company such as the Crown Corporation that the Dominion Government has up at Uranium City. They product the ore there and they stockpile it, just as the farmers stockpile grain on the farm, and they see to it that it is moved, and I have not heard a word anywhere that the ore up in the Eldorado district has not been moved to its destination or to market.

That is the story across the board with all the other industries, except this one industry, and I can only say it is rank discrimination against the producers of the West.

The remarkable thing and the amazing thing is that we always get the same kind of story when we try to get answers from those who are in government in Ottawa or on the other side of this House. We were told last fall that there wasn't any room for the grain in the terminals; and later on they told us “well, there is room in the terminals, plenty of room, but there are no boxcars.” They are always telling the same story to please a certain group or, if they get caught up, then they make a different story, just like the hon. members opposite of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald) down at Saskatoon, yesterday, (I am just making this comparison) when he says, “as far as the Dam is concerned, once you kick out the C.C.F. in a year's time you will have a dm.” But what did he say up north in Meath Park. . .

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — Is he discussing wheat now?

Mr. Berezowsky: — . . .”The only good the dam is, is to swim in.” So I say this to the Liberals whether in Ottawa or whether they are here, and I am going to quote Bacon. He said this:

“Stop lying and face the truth for truth knows no parties.”

I think it is worth considering: to stop lying, tell the truth, for truth knows no parties.

Now I want to quote further from this article in the Saskatoon 'Star-Phoenix'. It says:

"The situation was probably worse for some farmers than the general figures indicate."

And I could give you the general figures, Mr. Speaker, but I think the member preceding has quoted some of them. It says further:

"The existence of a quota at a shipping point has been no guarantee that space for the quota was available."

And I say, Mr. Speaker, when I think of the northern area where I know something about the grain there, just as the other members know about their own areas, that is very, very true. Any figures that you might submit in this House, or any other House, are only average figures or estimates. They do not tell the truth. In my community I know dozens of farmers who to this date have not sold a bushel of grain, and they cannot sell it because they are told "there is no room." There is room! But here is the situation with boxcars, and I suspect that somebody is to blame for it. I will have something to say on it later as to what my suspicions are, but here is the situation: A man comes to deliver grain to the elevator of his choice. It is filled up; usually it is a Wheat Pool elevator. He is told "Well, you can deliver to the line elevators." So we cannot get boxcars in there because the boxcars are being allocated or sent to the elevators that are filled up and if there is plenty of space, farmers must wait until that grain is moved. Those fellows get their share of cars and they are never full. Thus the man who delivers to the Wheat Pool probably gets a chance to deliver to his own elevator. Thus there has been a serious situation.

I said I would mention something as to my suspicions who is to blame for this state of affairs. First of all I take the stand that the railways, being subsidized by the people of Canada every year and raising freight rates, get subsidies to keep them in operation. The railways to some extent should be controlled by the Federal authorities. They should be told that they must give the same kind of service to the industry of farming as is given to the other industries.

I say someone is to blame. I suggest that the Federal Government has not taken appropriate action, and if they haven't, then it is our job to tell them so. If it is not the Federal Government but, say, a Minister, then he must take the blame and should look into the situation to see that it is corrected. If it is not him, then it must be the Wheat Board, or it must be the Transport Controller. Someone is to blame, but it is the responsibility of the Federal Government, which has the authority to see that whoever is in charge will look into this situation, and see that the farmers of Saskatchewan can ship their grain out, just as other industries ship their products out. After all, Mr. Speaker, we are at the mercy of the Canadian Government through their agency, the Wheat Board. We all agree the Board is a good establishment which provides farmers with an excellent sales service. If we are to continue a system of marketing such as we have through the Wheat Board, what good will it be if the grain is going to remain on the farms, and we are to be without

March 2, 1956

pennies to buy the food and the clothing for the families which we must support? I say it will be of no value at all.

Therefore, I am in favour of this resolution, and I suggest to the people who have the necessary authority that they do something about the recommendation. I say the figures quoted indicate that less than half the farmers of Saskatchewan have been able to sell a reasonable amount of grain; and half have sold either nothing, or very little.

This is one reason why I support this motion and I think if we press hard enough we may get some action from the authorities in Ottawa.

Mr. R. A. McCarthy (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add a few remarks to this and, like my friend from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky), I too would like to see more cars. He rather insinuated that they over there were the only people who are interested in this problem, but I can tell him that we are just as interested as he is. We have been at it for a long time, and we have seen this thing come through.

I can agree with the first paragraph of this resolution, where it says “we should have more cars.” I, too, would like to know how it is that we have space in our terminals, and our country elevators are plugged up. I am quite in favour of that resolution, and I would like to vote for it.

But I do not like the way this motion is worded, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to ask, before I get through, that it be split into its parts. There are three principles in there, and I am wholeheartedly in favour of the first one. I am not in favour of the second one, and I think the third one is on the wrong premises; but I shall tell you about that as I go along.

Now, as I said, this isn't the first time we have had elevators blocked. You know that, Mr. Speaker. I have drawn grain 20 miles with a team when I had an elevator six miles away, because I could not get there. This has come down through the years. We have had car shortages, heavy crops and light crops, and this is not a new thing, if any of you younger fellows think it is. You, Mr. Speaker, will agree with me that this thing has come down through the years. We have improved the situation. It isn't as bad as it was; but owing to our three big crops we have a surplus on our farms, and nobody is denying it. It is a serious situation, and nobody realized that any better than we on this side do. I say again, that I am wholly in favour of the first paragraph of the resolution.

When it comes to the second paragraph – and these are my own thoughts and are not necessarily the thoughts of anybody else; my own thoughts on the matter are that while I know the Wheat Pool's present policy (and, by the way, I am a member of the Wheat Pool and always have been; I have belonged to every farm organization in this province that was ever formed that was supposed to be for the benefit of the farmer,

and I still belong to them).

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — The C.C.F.?

Mr. McCarthy: — But in my own personal opinion the second part of the resolution would add to the difficulties rather than alleviate them, because, if you had to go along and say at the beginning of the crop year that you were going to deliver to this particular elevator, I think you would run into terrible difficulties, and I do not think it is worth it. For that reason I am not in favour of the second part of the motion.

When it comes to the third part I think it is set up in the wrong form, Mr. Speaker. I have here in my hand a report of the Agricultural Committee of the House of Commons, in the spring of 1955, and it says this:

“Your Committee gave particular study to the conditions of moving grain at this time relative to congestion and the inherent problems of equitable distribution of cars.”

I am not going to read it all to you, but I am going to read their conclusions, and this is the conclusion of the Agricultural Committee of the House of Commons. I don't know what date it was, but it was apparently last spring, and they sum it up in this way:

“In effect this means that when the Wheat Board wants a particular kind, variety, and grade of grain moved forward for export or to points of domestic consumption, it advises the elevator companies of the quantity each is to move, based on their stocks on hand.”

The member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) in his letter was at variance with that. I am not going to say which is right, but this is the report of the Committee, and I imagine it is fairly accurate. It says further:

“The elevator companies then distribute the cars provided for this movement among their own elevators, at such points as stocks of the desired types and quantity and grade of grain are available.”

Well, that gives you a pretty clear picture of what is happening. When they want so much grain they send it to the Wheat Board, and the Wheat Board has a list of all the grains in all the different elevators, and they do not attempt to distribute a car to Wadena or anywhere else; they sent it to the elevator companies and allow them, I imagine, proportionately as to the amount of grain they have on hand. They send it to those companies in proportion to that particular kind of grain they have got.

So when this motion says “to instruct the Transport Controller to make an equitable distribution of boxcars as between shipping points, and allocation on the basis of need”; the Controller isn't doing it actually, it is the grain companies that are doing it, so I claim this is set up on the wrong basis.

March 2, 1956

This motion is like the old gag about the politician who was caught beating his wife. If he says he has, why he is wrong, and if he says he hasn't, he is still wrong. We have too many of those in this House in times gone by. I could vote for the first part of the motion, but I certainly could not vote for the second part, and I have an open mind on the third part. There certainly is nothing very objectionable to the third part, except that it is on the wrong premises.

Premier Douglas: — My hon. friend can always amend this motion, or move an amendment to it, striking out the parts he doesn't agree with.

Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — He doesn't know how.

Mr. McCarthy: — I don't know how? Well, I will come and ask you when I want some advice. I am going to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that an amendment is not in order. It has three specific things in it, and I believe a motion is only supposed to have one.

Mr. Speaker: — The motion is in order.

Mr. McCarthy: — I mean the motion is. . . Oh! I am sorry. I think the motion is in order myself. As I understand it, you cannot put in double-barreled resolutions. I could not vote for that, because I want to vote for the first part, and I do not want to vote for the second part of it. So, where do you go? I suggest to you that you split it up, or do something with it; but I do not think it is in order the way it stands at the moment.

Mr. A. L. S. Brown (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) was quoting from a letter which he suggest was at variance with the information supplied by the member from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst). I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that they are both in conformity. One indicates a suggestion made by the Agricultural Committee in Ottawa to consider this question of car allocation, and this Agricultural Committee made definite recommendations to the Federal Government. This is the portion which he quoted, and I wish to relate it to the letter from which my friend from Wadena quoted:

“In effort, this means that when the Wheat Board wants any particular kind or variety and grade of grain moved forward to export or to points for domestic consumption, it advises the elevator companies of the quantity each is to move based on their stocks on hand. The elevator company then distributes the cars provided for this movement among its own elevators at such points as stocks of the desired type, quality and grade of grain are available.”

In essence, the Canadian Wheat Board is following that policy; but it is also following the policy in its general allocation of cars among elevator companies on the basis of a given percentage based upon, as they suggest, some past experience. So the two are in conformity, and there is no question

of difference between what the Board of Grain Commissioners suggest that the Wheat Board is doing, and what the Wheat Board themselves suggests that they are doing.

I do want to add, Mr. Speaker, that when we relate the movement of grain this year to that of last year, I think all of us will agree that last year was a bad year, and if we take the cut-off as February 1st, we find that there were 32,000 less boxcars made available for the movement of grain this year, as compared with last year; and that there was terminal storage space as of February 1st for over 55 million bushels in the terminals – that is, effective storage space that could have been filled. It would have meant that it would have been possible to have utilized the 32,000 boxcars which would have made a total of some 45 million to 50 million bushels of grain, and there was space where it could have been moved to. Further, Mr. Howe, when he was in Edmonton, made the statement that he had “instructed the Transport Controller to give first priority to the movement of grain from Western Canada to the terminals and to the Head of the Lakes.”

I suggest that the Transport Controller by virtue of the fact that we had the 32,000 boxcars less did not follow the instructions laid down by the Minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. I suppose an excuse might have been used that the Transport Controller, as such, did not come under his Department, and thus the Transport Controller did not have to follow his instructions unless he wanted to. But I did feel, and I think that we all felt, the Mr. Howe was, when he made state statement, speaking on behalf of the Government, and that we had a right to expect that the Transport Controller would have followed the wishes as indicated by Mr. Howe.

Mr. Hon. friend suggests that he cannot go along with the second and the third portions of this motion, asking that “the Canadian Grain Act be amended so that allocation of boxcars among the various elevator companies may be on the basis of preference indicated by the application in each producer’s permit book.”

We have come a little ways in this respect. The amendments which were made to the Canada Grain Act, last year, did help to some extent. It is true that the Pool organization, as an illustration, is now in a somewhat better position to obtain its more equitable share of boxcars than it previously was. I will agree that some improvement has been made; but, so far, it has not yet been worked back to the producer. I suggest that, if they are prepared to go this far, and they find out that it is working, they can take additional steps and work it right back to the producer, so that the producer himself, as of right, shall make that decision.

As far as clause three is concerned, while it is true, under the recent amendments to the Canadian Wheat Board Act, that the Transport Controller does not have the whole say as to the distribution of boxcars as between shipping points, nevertheless I do feel that, with the Transport Controller receiving the instructions that grain should have priority rights, he can use his position to influence a more equitable distribution of boxcars as between shipping points.

I suggest that we here in western Canada and we as members of this Legislature, can wholeheartedly support not only the first one; but that we can wholeheartedly endorse and support all three suggesting made by the

March 2, 1956

member for Wadena.

Mr. R. Kohaly (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak very briefly on this motion to indicate my support not only of the first, but of the second and third clauses as well, and to point out that we are all probably aware of the vast change that has taken place (I might even call it a revolution) in the agricultural system of the province of Saskatchewan through the Jubilee celebrations last year.

We saw the change from the steam engines, very slow and ponderous, through to the fast tractors that they use nowadays. We all know the change of the planting and the threshing. There has been a tremendous change in the transportation of grain. When the railway system of this country was set up, it was geared to take the grain as farmers were delivering it in those days. We all remember they were delivering it with a horse and grain tank. They delivered over a long period of time, because their harvesting was necessarily spread over a long period of time due to the machinery which they had.

The situation has changed drastically. The crops are taken off very quickly in a matter of days now instead of weeks. The crops are usually delivered right from the fast-moving combine into trucks, which take tremendous loads and hurry them to the elevators. Obviously our handling of the boxcar situation to take the grain from the country elevators to the existing terminals has not kept up with this revolution in agriculture, and, of course, this situation of boxcars being unable has naturally arisen. Now I believe, that the authorities, or be it the Government of Canada, must take immediate steps to alleviate the immediate problem. They must also be concerned seriously and at once, with the long-range problem, aware of the change of the agricultural system and the delivery of grain. They, I believe, must properly and fairly allocate the boxcars which exist, and, as I understand this motion, it is aimed at that immediate problem.

I believe that sooner or later the Government of the Dominion of Canada are going to have to recognize that not only 325 million bushels are going to be thrown onto the market annually, but probably a figure as high as 400 million bushels in the very near future. They are going to have to be prepared to take that from these vast grain-growing areas to the areas where they can be distributed more properly, and this is at the seaboard.

In this province, as I understand it, there is one prairie terminal located in the city of Saskatoon. Possibly more such terminals are the answer, and the Federal authorities must take that into consideration shortly. If such terminals were built in reasonable numbers, holding a reasonable amount of grain in the grain-producing areas, the grain could be delivered quickly by trucks, probably over a radius of 50 miles, which would give them 7,500 square miles of grain-producing area to deliver to these terminals. The railways would then know that there is always need to ship extra boxcars, as they develop, during the year, to these terminals, and to be sure that they would be filled.

We want to be very careful that we do not require the railways to build as many boxcars over and above the amounts which they now have that they will be in a good position to ask for an increase in the freight rate. Naturally, if we ask them to build and make available more boxcars, there will be the serious danger in the very near future that the railway people (and with some reason) should be entitled to more money for the extra rolling stock which they have.

As far as the second portion of the motion is concerned, it is my opinion that all people, producers of all types of produce, including the grain producers, should have the right to deliver this grain to the elevator of their choice. Unfortunately, this is not a problem which can be solved immediately; but very definitely the authorities should insure that the elevators who have the largest delivery should receive more and more of the share of the available boxcars. Very definitely, and obviously one of the elevator companies in the province of Saskatchewan enjoys a greater amount of business than do some others. That should certainly be taken into consideration when making the delivery of boxcars and allocation to the various delivery points.

Finally I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I can wholeheartedly support the third portion of the motion. It is my opinion that if the Transport Controller is in charge of the allocation of boxcars in any degree, that he has not been doing a good job in Saskatchewan. He has been doing what is obviously a poor job. He may be doing a poor job from the administrative end, or it may be a poor job from the principle from which he must work. In any event – and here I believe I must disagree with the mover – in my constituency it is not the C.P.R. who are discriminated against, but the C.N.R. For some reason or other they have not been able to persuade the Transport Controller to make boxcars available on the C.N.R. line. There is a bad situation existing on that line, and definitely, in my opinion, it is his responsibility. For that purpose I travelled to Winnipeg, last summer, at the request of a series of producers who had two or three delivery points on the C.N.R., and I was perfectly satisfied by the Wheat Board authorities that it was not their fault that the 1954 crop had not been delivered in that area. They had consistently, weekly, advised the Transport Controller's office in Winnipeg that boxcars should be allocated to certain delivery points on the C.N.R. They had kept it up over a long period of time, month after month, but these deliveries of boxcars were not made on that C.N.R. line, and, and as a matter of fact, they have not been made to this date, and that concerns the 1954 crop.

I feel that, on behalf of those producers, a good long, hard look be taken of this Transport Controller and his principle, and his administration, and insure that these people who have the same rights in the province of Saskatchewan, get the same rights to deliver a fair and equitable share of their grain.

It is my opinion as well that the Transport Controller should issue instructions to the train crews, so that when they drop these boxcars, they don't drop them merely at the one big town in the grain-producing area, and then drive along three or four towns before dropping another one. They seem to have a propensity to concentrate their boxcars in the grain-producing area at the largest centre in that immediate area, and then neglect the three of four little towns before they get to the next centre along that line. I

March 2, 1956

have found that to happen over and over again, and it is again discrimination against producers who do not happen to have moved into the larger centres, and have access to the boxcars which are dropped there, I think, as a matter of convenience.

As a whole, I would like very much, on behalf of the wheat producers in my constituency, to support each and every part of this motion. I hope that what we have to say from both sides of the House finally finds its way down to these people who are responsible for this boxcar allocation and the movement of grain in Saskatchewan, in a fair and equitable manner.

Mr. Speaker: — May I say that I have never been in favour of these multiple Resolutions. When I looked over this motion first, there is some difference of opinion maybe on the different portions of it, but I considered that it was all pretty well germane to the one question, so I did not make any effort to separate it. But, if the members of the Opposition wish to have it separated, and the House is willing, I am perfectly willing to separate the motion into its parts.

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I would say on the motion that parts 2 and 3 of the motion be deleted. Our understanding was that maybe there would be some of the members who would be wholeheartedly in favour of parts 1 and 3, and perhaps not part 2, or some of the others, and to give these people the right to vote on the ones of their choice, that we would move that they would bring in sections 2 and 3 as separate motions, so as to get an expression of opinion on each of those. If not, we are prepared to go along with the motion as it is; but to get a better clarification of the thinking of the members, and the fact that the motion is constituted at the present time would appear to be out of order, we are merely asking that sections 2 and 3 deleted, and resubmitted as separate motions, if that is agreeable.

Mr. Speaker: — In answer to the hon. member from Maple Creek, I certainly can't accept a motion that we delete it because if you delete it, then you can't express your opinion on those other two sections. I would much rather, and I think it would be much more effective, if it was separated into three different parts; but to delete it and leave it at that, would simply mean that you are only voting on one portion of the motion, and I cannot agree that the motion is entirely out of order.

Many motions come in with one, two and three sections, and as long as they are more or less correlated, they have been accepted as in order. I previously signified that I don't like them, and I think the members themselves should recognize the situation that there is. But, as I say, I am perfectly willing to let it remain as the one thing, with the one thought behind it. If the House wishes separate motions, we can separate it.

Mr. Cameron: — Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, it is a question as to how we are going to proceed to get a vote on these separate motions. It is not a matter of deleting them, as I explained, but how we will proceed to get three separate votes instead of the one vote.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, may I say first, that as far as I am concerned, I would prefer to vote on the motion as it stands; but if there are members who feel that it would be better to vote on the three proposals

in the motion ad seriatim, would someone in the Opposition move the adjournment and later bring in a motion when they have had the time to study this and to consult with one another as to what steps they want to take?

Mr. A. H. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the debate it adjourned, I would just like to say that in reference to part 2 of the motion, the part that I cannot agree with it “to confine the producer to deliver all his grain to an elevator that he has picked. . .”.

Mr. R. Walker (Hanley): — That is not what it says.

Mr. McDonald: — Well, it could easily imply that, and I would like to have the motion definitely state that it was not necessary for an individual to have to deliver to that particular elevator that he picked as a choice. I think that probably what the Premier has said is very true — that if we were to adjourn this debate on this motion we could have an amendment brought in at a later date. Therefore, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

Equal Rights for Treaty Indians

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate, from Thursday, February 23, 1956, on the proposed motion of Mr. Berezowsky:

“That this Assembly:

- (1) recommend that the Government consider the advisability of preparing and submitting legislation
 - (a) extending the provincial franchise to Treaty Indians unconditionally, and
 - (b) removing from existing provincial laws any restrictive legislation which denies to Treaty Indians certain of the rights, privileges and responsibilities enjoyed by citizens of Saskatchewan generally; and
- (2) request the Government to make representations to the Government of Canada with a view to the establishment of a Federal Provincial Board or Commission to plan policies and programmes to ensure that the actual needs of Treaty Indians in the fields of health, welfare, education and local self-government may be provided for, at the earliest possible date, on a basis of equality with the services in those fields now provided for Saskatchewan citizens generally, and without abrogation or loss of their hereditary or treaty rights.”

Mr. H.C. Dunfield (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, I shall not take much time. Along about this time of the Session, I begin to think that that chap really had something, who said that if all political

speakers were laid end to end, it would be an extremely good thing.

This motion has been on the Order paper for some time, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to it for a short time. When I first heard the motion read I felt that there was nothing in it that I could not agree with fully, though I do agree with it in principle; but I think there are some points that should be clarified.

It is easy enough to say that the Government will give to the Indians of this province, the right to vote in provincial affairs, but nothing has been said of the responsibility that might accrue to the Indians through such action. I would like to know just what their status will be, Mr. Speaker, if they are given the vote; what privileges and responsibilities would accrue to the native population, the Indian population. Would it improve the cultural life of the Indians if they had permission to frequent our beer parlours and to buy liquor? Would it improve their economic position if they were to pay education tax which they do not have to pay at present? And, by right of the provincial franchise, would they have to comply with all of the regulations of The Game Act, some of which they do not have to comply with at the present time? These are some of the many questions which might be asked concerning what the Indians might get out of the franchise. Just the privilege of voting for one of the political parties, I do not think would compensate for many of the responsibilities which might devolve upon the Indians.

Just to give us an idea of what the present status of the Indian population of Saskatchewan is in the question of, say, education. The education of the Indian, today, is being carried forward on a rather extensive scale, increasing from year to year. The Department of Indian Affairs of Canada spent, last year in Saskatchewan, \$1,244,000 on various forms of education for the Indians, and that works out to about \$34 per head, man, woman and child. If the Provincial Government spent that much money it would run to something like \$30 million, Mr. Speaker. The Indian does not pay five cents for his education. Day schools are built for him; the denominational schools are paid a rental; the teachers are paid; everything is paid for, and in the residential schools they have. . .

Mr. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Dunfield: — Yes, when I am finished, I will be glad to.

Mr. Speaker: — Might I point out to the hon. member from Cumberland that, as mover of the motion, he will have the privilege of closing the debate.

Mr. Dunfield: — In the reserves when the Indians are more or less concentrated, they today, at their own request, have day schools built. In the areas farther north where the population is widely scattered, it has been the general policy, and will be for some time to come, to gather the children together in residential schools, where all expenses are paid, even the transportation, and where medical care, clothing, books, everything is paid for by the Federal Government. The Indian himself does not have to pay five cents.

I have seen some of the work done in some of the residential schools in the north, and would like to tell you of one instance in particular that I thought was very striking. Some years ago I was at the Beauval Indian School with the Indian agent, who also is the instructor of the Indian Schools -

(not the instructor, but the superintendent). Grade V was the highest they taught there, and the Indian agent wished to put on an arithmetic test for the Grade V class. The teacher handed him the Grade V arithmetic book of the Saskatchewan curriculum. He picked out a very difficult question. It was one about a farmer coming to town with a number of cattle that weighed so much, and bought so many goods. There were a lot of fractions and various other things in the problem. I saw the most remarkable display of arithmetic that I have seen in any school. Those children went up and down the columns of figures exceedingly quickly. When I came back to Meadow Lake I offered to be the principal of our school a new hat that he didn't have five children in any grade up to Grade XII who could equal that; and when I showed him what had been done, he admitted that he felt he would lose the bet. So I know that the Indian Department is doing a much for the education of the Indian children today.

And may I say, Mr. Speaker, that in 1948 the Indian Affairs Branch of their own accord looked into the whole Indian question in Saskatchewan. Unquestionably, they found some shocking things; but strange to say, up to that time, when the estimates were being brought down each year in Ottawa, there had been from year to year a sum of about \$3 million set aside for the Indian Affairs Branch; but in the year of 1948 the Indian Department, after having made an exhaustive study of the situation, recommended a great many changes. When the real situation came to the attention of the members of the House then everybody got into the act — Conservative, C.C.F., Social Credit; and “my, these conditions were astounding.” They hadn't paid any attention before. The regular amounts in the estimates had gone by year by year and the Indians were a forgotten people, but when the real situation was brought to light. . .

Premier Douglas: — That is not correct.

Mr. Dunfield: — . . .my! Then, everybody got into the act. It certainly brought to light a rather bad state of affairs, and since then the appropriations in Federal estimates have risen each year. I just got some figures from the Indian Department a little while ago, and in the report for 1954-55 the expenditures, today, run in the neighbourhood of \$17 million per year for Indian affairs and are increasing each year.

In the field of health, so far as I know, as my experience has been confined to the northwest part of the province, there I find, too, a very great change. The Indians there pay nothing whatever for medical care. They are brought, quite often, long distances by air or by such means of transportation as are available to hospital, and are there given every care possible. There used to be a resident Indian doctor in Ile a la Crosse, now, I believe he services the province as well; but so far as I have seen over the years, they have never lacked medical attention.

When it comes to improving the Indian situation with a vote, I wonder if the Government has thought, or will think, of asking the Indians if they would like to have the vote, because, in 1948, the Indians were polled by the Indian Department insofar as voting was concerned in Federal elections, and because of certain misunderstandings in connection with taxation, the Indians turned it down flatly. However, those misunderstandings were cleared up and the Indians who can vote today are Indians and wives of Indians, of veterans who have served overseas. Indians who are prepared to waive their tax

March 2, 1956

exemptions insofar as income tax is concerned, they have the right to vote. In connection with taxes Indians who do not wish to vote – for earnings made outside the Reserve, these earnings are taxable for income purposes; but no matter how much their earnings may be, if they are made entirely within the Reserve, that income is not taxable.

Some of our Reserves are not very good, not very productive, and on them the Indians still live much the life that they have led for a hundred years or more. But on some of the better reserves, such as in Meadow Lake that I have in mind, some of the finest land, they are making rapid progress in agriculture. I know, within the last five years, there have been five very good home built there, full concrete basements and story-and-a-half houses, and almost all of it done by Indian labour. They are increasing their grain holdings, and it is surprising the manner in which some of them are becoming agriculturists and businessmen. There are always those who still cling to the traditions of the Indian way of life, but it is only through the slow process of education that we are going to be able to assimilate them into our way of life.

On these Reserves, Mr. Speaker, we must remember this: the Indian has something that many of us, today, rather envy. They have absolute security of tenure. I know that many farmers around Meadow Lake look very longingly at that beautiful Reserve. They have absolute security of tenure; they have no taxes whatever to pay; their entire medical and hospitalization is taken care of by the Federal Government; their entire educational costs are taken care of. I think, Mr. Speaker, that if the giving of the franchise to these people, in a provincial way, would in any way affect any of these privileges it would not be particularly in their interest.

I want to bring some of the actual facts before you, because I have heard in this House some very irresponsible statements made by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Wahl) – of course these statements have always been readily discredited. We had a long letter read the day, written by the principal of the Indian school, which thoroughly discredited the hon. member's remarks, and I just ran across another one last night, from a citizen in his own constituency. I thought it rather pointed up the remarks of the hon. member. This is from the Regina 'Leader-Post' of February 28th, and the letter is addressed to the Editor:

“Re the outburst of Mr. Wahl in connection with the health of Indians. We in his constituency. . .”

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — You are out of order. The hon. member is speaking on a previous debate, isn't he?

Mr. Dunfield: — I think the hon. member was speaking on this motion, wasn't he?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — No, the hon. member was speaking in the Throne Speech debate.

Mr. Dunfield: — Oh, I was under the impression, Mr. Speaker, that he was speaking on this motion.

Mr. McCarthy: — He let you away with it yesterday; you are doing it all the time.

Mr. Dunfield: — However, I don't object to it; I don't like to read these things; they aren't very nice, anyway. But, Mr. Speaker, this is just a quotation I saw in the paper referring to remarks that the hon. member had made in connection with the Indians.

Some Hon. Member: — Go ahead, read it.

Mr. Dunfield: — And it says:

“Re the outburst of Mr. Wahl in connection with the health of Indians, we in his constituency do not even have a medical doctor to call when we are dying. . .”

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think the hon. member is in order because this deals with the field of health.

Mr. Wahl: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. . .

Mr. Dunfield: — Yes, but anyway, this is just a comment. . .

Mr. Wahl: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I have no objections to him. . .

Mr. Dunfield: — I will your questions after.

“ . . . we, his constituents, do not even have a medical doctor to call upon when we are dying in Fort Qu'Appelle; and we have not had the services of a medical doctor here for several years. We pay Saskatchewan Government compulsory hospital taxes and we have to wait weeks before we can be admitted to any Regina hospital for operations. So he alone needs hitting on the head with something bigger than a neckyoke to bring his attention to what happens to the people whom he represents. The people he does not represent. . .”

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Dunfield: — “. . . are being care for by three medical doctors located here in. . .”

Mr. Speaker: — Order! That does not apply to this resolution. You are making reference to an episode that is already passed; that doesn't apply to this motion.

Mr. Dunfield: — Well, I will abide by your decision. That is the end of the quotation, anyway, Mr. Speaker.

This Indian problem is a very difficult one as we all know, and as I said, when I looked at this motion first, I was fully in sympathy with it, and I am, with the context. I certainly approve of anything that will make for the betterment of the Indian population; but so many times I have found that my first impressions concerning resolutions by this Government have been very faulty; that in the context there was some other motive, and I am quite sure that the whole intent and purpose of this act is political rather than for the betterment of the Indians. But even so, I will take a chance on that and support it, Mr. Speaker, because, as I was going to say, the problem of the Indian is very similar to the problem of the Métis.

March 2, 1956

Mr. Speaker: — I might point out to the hon. member that you have ascribed unworthy motives.

Mr. Dunfield: — I will withdraw that, Mr. Speaker. I was going to say that the two problems are very similar — that of the Indian in Saskatchewan, and that of the Métis; and, Mr. Speaker, the record of this Government in dealing with the Métis question in this province has not been such that we would have a very great deal of confidence in having them dabble in Indian affairs.

This motion calls for joint discussion between the Federal and the Provincial Governments. That is quite in order and quite all right. I think both could learn from it; but I think probably the Provincial Government could learn a great deal more than the Indian Affairs Branch would learn. Nevertheless, I am certainly going to support the motion.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, may I just say a word about some of the remarks that have been made by the member for Meadow Lake regarding this motion.

First of all, may I point out that he is apparently under some misapprehension when he refers to this motion constantly, as a Government motion. This is not a motion from the Government; this is a motion from a member who sits on this side of the House. Private members are always entitled to introduce resolutions at any time, setting forth their views, and for my hon. friend to think that somewhere in this resolution is some sinister motive on the part of the Government is quite beside the point. As a matter of fact, there are a number of questions which he has raised which I would also raise with reference to this particular motion; and I want to raise some of them in just a few minutes.

May I point out that my hon. friend, who just took his seat, is quite incorrect when he said that the appropriations of the Department of Indian Affairs were raised very materially after the parliamentary investigation, but that prior to that time no one had paid any attention to the Indians, and that is was only after the parliamentary investigation began that everybody wanted to get in on the act. As a matter of fact, during the years when I sat in the House, there was a small group of members, particularly the member for Yorkton and the member for Selkirk, Manitoba, who had made a specialty of studying the Indian problem; who had visited scores of reserves across Canada, and who, each year, raised this question by resolution on the estimates of the Department of Indian Affairs. I think that those two members probably more than any other members in the House, were responsible for finally getting a parliamentary committee set up to look into this question.

I do not want to detract in any way from the credit which is coming to the Federal Government and to some of its officials, who, as a result of that investigation, made a very careful study of the situation and have brought about some very commendable reforms. I remember that Dr. Keenleyside, who at that time was Deputy Minister (just a newly-appointed Deputy Ministers and who is now with the Technical Assistance Branch of the United Nations), made a trip across Canada and he came here to see us. We gave him all the assistance which we could by way of transportation and by way of information which we might have, and I know that, as a result of his visit and the visit

of other officials, a great many things were done to improve the situation with reference to the Indians. My friend is quite wrong when he suggest that it was not until 1948 that anything was done, or that anyone took any interest in the question of the Indians. Some of us took a great interest in the welfare of the Indians, and I think the results of that interest was the setting up of the parliamentary committee and the improvement that has taken place since then; not that a great deal of improvement is not possible yes, but certainly some improvement has been made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may turn to the motion itself. In some respects, I am like the member who just took his seat. There are many questions that I ask myself when I read the motion. There are a great many things which will have to be thought of, and in view of the fact that this resolution asks the Government to consider the advisability of submitting legislation, I would just like, very briefly, to put forth my views and, I think, the views of the Government respecting this matter.

I think we all agree in principle with the resolution. That is, the resolution is anything, in essence, this: that in Canada and in Saskatchewan there ought to be second-degree citizenship. I am not going to blame anyone, but the fact remains that there has grown up in Canada a situation in which our aborigines have a different status in the community from the rest of the people of our province and of our nation. I say I blame no one, because I think that, fifty or sixty years ago, many whit people thought that the Indians were a dying race. Certainly no one thought that they were going to be a very important factor in the future. They were relegated to Reserves which couldn't possibly have foreseen any great increase in population; the treaties were inelastic, and the provisions made for health and education fairly primitive, with not opportunity for democratic participation by the Indians themselves; with a complete paternalism by a Federal government and none of the essence of democratic self-government toward which these people lean.

History has shown us that the expectations of fifty or sixty years ago have not materialized. As the Indian has built up immunity to white man's diseases, instead of being a dying race, he is now beginning to come back; the Indian population is increasing. I know one Indian Reserve very well. My family and I have a little summer shack on an Indian Reserve at Carlyle – the member for Cannington knows this very well. There you have several hundred Indian families trying to live on a few acres of sand and bush that would not support twenty white families.

Mr. Ripley (Athabaska): — Would the speaker permit a question, please? You have seen how those people live, and you are speaking on this motion, and as far as the privileges are concerned, do you think that they are prepared to accept the responsibilities of having full use of liquor and other things that go with the privileges in this resolution?

Premier Douglas: — If my friend will let me discuss the resolution I will be very glad to answer his question. I am simply pointing out to my hon. friends the historic background to what has happened – that these people were put on these Reserves; many of these Reserves are now over-populated, and they will not support the populations. There are other Reserves, as my

March 2, 1956

friend for Meadow Lake has mentioned, in which that may not be the case. But undoubtedly there are Reserves which are over-populated; there are Reserves in which the health and educational facilities are primitive and inadequate; but the most serious thing is that these people are continuing to grow up in a society in which they are segregated, in which they are inferior citizens, in which there is not opportunity for them being assimilated into our society and becoming a part of the Canadian people.

It is not a simple problem. Every country has had its problems with aborigines. Some nations have managed the situation well; others have done it poorly. The best example of handling the situation with some degree of statesmanship has been New Zealand with the Maoris, whom the Speaker, you will remember, described as having “beautiful voices”; but the Maoris are the best example of aborigines who have been absorbed into the population and who have taken their rightful place in the community. The United States has made a great many changes in the last quarter of a century with the result that the status of their Indians has improved very materially. I think that we in Canada, in recent years, have become more concerned with this problem, and I, for one, am not standing up here to criticize anyone for the handling of Indian affairs. I expressed my opinion when I was in Ottawa about it, made my protests about conditions which I thought could be remedied. I think some of those conditions have been remedied; but I think there is still much more to be done.

I think every member of this House is concerned about the long-term picture for the Indians. Do we envisage that when we reach our 100th Anniversary, and when we reach our 200th Anniversary are the Indians still going to be a separate group of people, second-rate Canadians, without either the responsibilities or the privileges of citizenship? Are they going to be segregated in little compounds, in little Reserves, or are they gradually going to be absorbed into the community? We don't settle all the Chinese people out in some corner of Canada or some corner of the province. We don't separate other groups of people. Yet here we have segregated the Indians in this manner; and, as I say, it is a historical sequence. I am not blaming anyone for it; it has grown up out of our history. Are we prepared to accept it as a permanent feature of our history?

I think that the member who moved this resolution has put up to us a real problem: how do we start to do something about making the Indian a first-rate citizen, equal with the rest of us, giving him the same rights and privileges and opportunities as the rest of us have? I agree with the member for Meadow Lake that I don't think we can just hand it to them unless they want it.

In 1946 – I may be wrong about the year, it may have been 1947, but if my memory serves me right it was 1946 – I took the initiative in calling a conference here in Regina of the Indian Chiefs and their Councils to discuss this very question with them, to discuss whether or not they would like to have the franchise in Saskatchewan. At that time they said ‘no’. They said no, because the term “franchise” in their minds was associated with losing their treaty rights; that they has always understood the term “to be enfranchised” meant to lose the rights and privileges which they had under their treaty. Despite the fact that we tried to explain to them what was involved, most of

them (even those who understood it and were in favour) said, "I don't think most of our people would want it."

Since that time there has been quite a change, and I have received from a number of the Indian leaders in the province, particularly from some who are in the constituency of the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Wahl) communications saying that they think, in view of what has happened in British Columbia where the Indians are now voting and where they have a sitting member in the Legislature, that they would like now to have the franchise extended to them. I think someone made the suggestion in the course of this debate that we might consider having them vote separately. Personally, I am open to argument on that point. My first reaction is against it. I think if you are over going to eventually assimilate these people into the general population. We don't have a member for all the Scotsmen in the province, or all the Ukrainians in the province. You vote by constituencies, and I think they ought to vote in the community where they live, like any other citizen, although there might be some argument for an interim period in which they send their own members. That is open to argument; but I do think that we ought to give some consideration to extending the franchise to the Indians only if the Indians themselves, in conference assembled, say that they want it. I don't think you can force democracy down people's throats, and if they then I think that whatever Legislature is here ought to consider very seriously extending that privilege to them.

I think the first step toward ultimate emancipation is to begin to assume some of the responsibilities of citizenship. That raises the whole question which the member for Meadow Lake raised: are they also, then, going to have to assume certain tax burdens and so on? That type of thing you would have to work out with them in a conference, and see to what extent they ought to continue to have certain privileges and to what extent they ought to surrender those privileges, and assume other responsibilities.

Now we come to part (b) of the resolution which suggest – and that is the question the member for Athabaska (Mr. Ripley) has raised - "the removing from existing provincial laws any restrictive legislation which denies to Treaty Indians certain of the rights and privileges and responsibilities enjoyed by citizens of Saskatchewan generally."

That raises the whole question of the right to purchase liquor, the right to enter beer parlours and so on. And again I come back to the discussions which we have had with the Indians. Most of the Indian leaders with whom I have discussed this question, most of the people who work closely with them, have told me that, in their opinion, it might be disastrous to remove those restrictions. Certainly it might be disastrous to remove them all at once; and again, I would think the same policy ought to be followed by the Government with respect to removing these restrictions as should be followed with respect to the granting of the franchise. I think those restrictions ought only to be removed if the Indians themselves feel that they are ready to assume these responsibilities, and if they feel that it would be in the best interests of their people.

You cannot take people and suddenly put them under pressure to which they are not accustomed. In the Anglo-Saxon countries we have taken

centuries to move from a state of feudalism to a state of self-governing citizens. You have to grow up to those responsibilities. Special powers mean carried responsibilities and you cannot assume them overnight. On the other hand, to use that as a n excuse for never doing anything is to postpone the day of reckoning, and continuing this very fortunate condition of segregation which we have at the present time. I would agree with the member for Cumberland that the time has probably come to sit down and discuss with the Indian people and their representatives just which of these restrictions ought to be continued during an experimental period while they are evolving to a state of full citizenship, and which of those restrictions could be removed at the present time.

The second part of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, is the suggestion that the Government make representation to the Government of Canada with a view to the establishment of a Federal-Provincial Board or Commission to plan policies and programmes to ensure that the actual needs of Treaty Indians in the fields of health, welfare, education and local self-government, etc. are met. I can assure the gentlemen opposite that the Government of Saskatchewan has not got some 'gimmick' in making a suggestion like that. At the present time, under the constitution of Canada the entire responsibility for health, welfare and education of the Indians is with the Government of Canada, and not provincial government is going to rush in and ask for the privilege of spending money. But again, if we look toward the ultimate assimilation of the Indian into the population of Canada, then surely some day we must look toward the elimination of Indians being treated under a separate department of government on a paternalistic basis.

I think there is a good deal to be said for the proposal that the Federal Government and the Provincial Government ought to get together to plan the health, welfare and education of the Indian people with a view to gradually assimilating them into the general municipal and provincial economy of the province. I don't mean by that that the Saskatchewan Government is now asking for the privilege of taking over the responsibility for the Indian – that is a federal responsibility which the Federal Government undertook when it signed the Treaty; but I do think that a good deal of the administrative work could be done by a provincial government. I think if we are going to bring these people into the provincial economy that gradually the separate administration of the Department of Indian Affairs ought to disappear, wither away, and these people be assimilated into the municipalities and the towns and the villages and come under the same jurisdiction as do the other people of the province. When I say that I am thinking of a long-term programme of ten or twenty years; and in my opinion it would take that long to do it; but if we never start in to plan a programme, then nothing is ever done, and surely no member of this House could look with equanimity and say that 50 years from now, or even 25 years from now, we will still be treating out Indians under the Department of Indian Affairs, treating them as though they were children, looking after them, giving them neither tolerance or responsibility. Surely we would hope that in a quarter of a century or more, they will have become full-fledged citizens, carrying their share of the burdens, having their voice in the government of the country and of the province and of the municipalities, just as every other person does.

Mr. W.H. Wahl (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I would first like to state that I became interested in the Indian question many years ago – in fact when I was a boy, and listening to my grandfather talk. He used to proudly say that his grandfather and grandmother had travelled by boat and walked with another group of United Empire Loyalists to what is now known as Nova Scotia to live and enjoy the rights that go with living under the British flag. And, at that time, he stated that no one had a better right to call themselves Canadians than the United Empire Loyalists, except the Indians. I always remembered that, because as I grew older I came to realize that these privileges that my ancestors had been willing to make sacrifices for, had been denied the Indians, and it is about that I am going to speak.

The hon. member from Meadow Lake was talking about the Treaty rights, and I am going to tell a story that will illustrate what these Treaty rights mean, and I think the hon. member from Melfort will probably be interested in this. It has to do with a couple who were celebrating their 25th wedding anniversary, and as usual the man was speaking. He was telling his well-wishers what a time he had had persuading his wife to marry him. He said he had had considerable rivalry, and he had had to make some very extravagant promises. In fact, he said that he had had to promise her that no matter what she asked, whether it was a diamond ring or a fur coat or a new dress, she would never have to ask him the second time, and he said, “I am going to say I have kept that promise; she has never had to ask me the second time for anything – I have always said ‘no’ the first time.” That means that he had given her exactly nothing – and these Treaty rights, I would say, amount to almost exactly nothing. Admittedly the Indians receive \$4 or \$5 a year Treaty money; but this exemption from taxation on the lands they live on – that’s quite a story, and it sounds very good. You would think, Mr. Speaker, if you were told that your farm lands were going to be exempted from taxation and other taxes that it would be a fine thing; but these taxations are wrapped up in services, and by services I mean services such as roads and health, and fire protection, and schools, and things of that nature. So when you find out that the Federal Government has included through the Provincial Government – and I have never been able to find out how this was accomplished; has included in the boundaries of the municipalities the Indian Reserves, and the municipalities are expected to furnish the services such as roads and maintenance of roads and other services to the Indian Reserves for exactly nothing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you can’t blame the municipalities if they do exactly nothing. It is the Federal Government or the Canadian people that wanted to keep their promises to the Indians, and they should be paying taxes on Indian Reserves to the municipalities and the provinces in which they live.

Now, for the education of the hon. member from Meadow Lake – he was talking about the health services and the social welfare services that go with being an Indian on Indian Reserves. In this Federal health plan that is supposed to come into effect, one of the stipulations is that the provinces will accept the health and welfare problems of the Indian people. Now, is the Department of Indian Affairs of the Federal Government going to pay the tax to the municipalities and the province so that they can fulfil that promise so that the Indians will have these services? That is a very important question.

March 2, 1956

I have mentioned that that is one of the deterrents. There is another deterrent in Indian reservations and that is the Indian agent. I do not want anybody to be mistaken and think that I have anything against Indian agents, or that I think they are not trying to do a good job. In fact, when I answered that letter to the Reverend gentlemen at Punnichy, I stated that I had read the letter by the Rev. Albert Southhard in 'The Leader-Post' with interest, and I want to point out I recognize the good work done by the many fine people for the Indians in the field of health and welfare. I recognize that the Rev. Albert Southhard had expressed concern for the feelings of the Department of Indian Affairs, and that is exactly what he expressed in the letter – nothing else; but I said, "I am expressing concern for the people who receive the brunt of their policy, namely, the Indians."

Mr. Speaker: — I think the hon. member is more or less repeating something that has already been taken up in the House.

Mr. Wahl: — Well, he condemned me, and I am just repeating what I have replied to this gentleman for the hon. gentleman's benefit, in case he doesn't read it in 'The Leader-Post'. And I went on to say, "Their lot is one of poverty, disease and suppression."

Dan Kennedy, who is an old and respected Indian gentleman on the Reserve north of Montmartre, has this to say about Reserves in the United States had a suggested remedy for Canada. He said:

"I had occasion to pay brief visit to the Fort Peck Indian Reserve in Montana, this fall. I could hardly believe my eyes at what I saw. Every Indian home had modern facilities – electric lights, frigidaire, washing machines and other electrical appliances. Most of the Indians lived comfortably and operated their own farms. With the exception of the superintendent, the head office of the Reservation is staffed by Indians."

Now, who has a better right to look after their own affairs than the Indians themselves? I think that would help to correct the ills of the Indians – to give them self-government and to allow them the right to vote not only municipally, but provincially and federally.

Speaking of these Indian agents (and I see nothing against them) I noticed in the Reserve north of Montmartre, there is only one decent house on the reserve and that is the Indian agent's; and recently they have put electric lights in there. They have an extension from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation's line, and they have given him these lights. I am not arguing that he should not have the lights, but he is the only man on the Reserve who has these privileges, and the Indians are paying the bill. Part of that \$17 million that the hon. gentleman is talking about goes to pay his wages, and as one Indian suggested to me, "I wouldn't want to have these men put on unemployment insurance, or unemployed, but I am going to suggest a good place for them. That would either be in the P.F.R.A. or the P.F.A.A. There is lots of room for them there and they would get a very decent salary." And he went on to say that if any of them thought that the salary wasn't quite what it should be and they wanted to supplement it a little, they could do like

some other P.F.A.A. employees do – they could sell some of the P.F.A.A. dynamite to the farmers.

I feel certain that, if the Department of Indian Affairs was reorganized and they allowed the Indians to look after their own affairs, they would soon raise their standard of living, and in that way they would probably become farmers on quite a large scale, because an Indian reservation would be a fine place to start a co-operative farm.

This resolution, in my opinion, does not suggest any new principles, because an Ontario Committee, on March 29, 1954 urged that the Indian get the right to vote, and they also urged that they have other rights, because it says here that the bootleggers on this particular Reserve in Ontario, get \$18 a quart for the cheapest whiskey.

I just want to answer another suggestion by the member for Meadow Lake, and he had noted the letter from Fort Qu'Appelle in the 'Leader-Post'. I want to tell him that that man, Mr. Eddes, is the chairman of the Liberal executive in Fort Qu'Appelle.

Mr. MacNutt (Nipawin): — Hear! Hear! He's a good man.

Mr. Wahl: — And I have answered him and pointed out to him that he had political rights, but the Indians around Fort Qu'Appelle have none, and that letter will appear in 'The Leader-Post'.

Premier Douglas: — You hope!

Mr. Wahl: — I have hopes, yes. In closing, I just want to draw your attention to an editorial in 'The Star-Phoenix', and this is dated Tuesday, February 28, 1956. It was written after the hon. member for Cumberland moved this motion, and this is what they say about Indian Reserves:

“Reserve life is scarcely conducive to mental and psychological maturity, and it is becoming increasingly less tenable economically.”

That is the opinion of 'The Star-Phoenix' and this editorial is well worth reading, because in my opinion, there are some very constructive thoughts in there. One thought that they bring out is one that I have expressed, and that is the fact that without municipal taxation and without provincial taxation, no group of people can make any progress. History has proved that. As our taxes have gone up our standards of living have increased and so the only way that I can see that the Indians are going to improve their standard of living is by us giving them full rights as Canadian citizens, the same as you and I enjoy, Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the motion.

Mr. James Ripley (Athabaska): — Mr. Speaker, I will give some support to this motion, as far as the privilege of voting. I am entirely in favour of that. But it is very apparent to me that we are talking about two entirely different classes of Indians. You are speaking of Indians, or natives on reservations which are becoming surrounded by farm land, and you have to take into consideration, when you speak of a Treaty Indian that they are scattered over this county, as far as Saskatchewan is concerned, right up to the 60th Parallel of north latitude.

Since the end of the last war I have lived up in that country beyond the 55th parallel, and there will never be any farms in there; not for 10,000 years, I don't suppose, anyway, because there is not soil. When you think of the rights that you are going to give these people, they will be included in the class of Treaty Indians, and I think Mr. Dunfield's problem is similar to mine. He is up in the north, too, so that, as the Premier has said, we have to take a great deal of study.

I think probably the resolution isn't worded too well to conform with the problems of the Treaty Indian. I think it should be divided, or pointed out strongly that you have a division where you have reservations in farming areas and also reservations farther north, which do not have similar problems at all, and never will have those problems. So I am going to talk about the people who live farther north. An Indian, under the Indian regulations is classified as any person who lives the life of an Indian, regardless of whether he is a half-breed, a white man, or Polish, or Irish.

Mr. W.H. Wahl (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Oh now, that's not true.

Mr. Ripley: — But, I would say my wife, myself and my children live more the life of an Indian than your people do down on these reservations you have. We live in log buildings, and we use wood, and live off the bush far more than your people do in your reservations down here. That is why I am saying that you have two very separate problems. You cannot import those people up north down here and make farmers of them, and I doubt very much if you could move the people you have in farming areas here up north and make trappers out of them. So there is a very distinct difference there, and, as far as the north is concerned, the Premier mentioned they have a different status in the community, and actually they do. They are more what you would consider the aristocracy of the north. If other people would have the protection from the cradle to the grave that the Treaty Indian does in the north, they would very gladly accept it, and if this resolution goes through, giving them all the privileges as it states in the resolution, they would have privileges that no one in this province will have for 20 or 50 years, probably. They have protection from the cradle to the grave; they have free education, and I know some Treaty Indians who are proud of the name of an Indian who are in Grade 11 in school, taking commercial courses. There was a young girl up at Sandy Bay last year, and she can type 50 words a minute, and take shorthand. They have that privilege. They can go on to University, and as far as we classify Indians (and they classify themselves up in the north), they don't bother with this Métis business or anything like that. They are all Indians, and they are Treaty or non-Treaty.

They are in a very preferred category at the present time, and I have had many occasions to fly people out of the farther parts of the north. In fact, one particular case which I remember quite well was two sisters who married people up north; one of them married a Treaty Indian and the other married a non-Treaty Indian. I was flying up from Brochet at that time north into Reindeer Lake, and I took one girl into hospital at Flin Flon just before freeze-up to have her baby, and of course, she couldn't get back until after freeze-up; came back at Christmas time and she was under the care of the hospital and the Department of Indian Affairs all that time and her transportation was paid for.

The other girl who was married to a non-Treaty, unfortunately, they were out fishing on an island several miles down the lake and the ice conditions were not suitable for her to come in, but she had her baby all by her self out on this island. It was her first child, and she managed all right and bore a nice-healthy child, but that points out the difference between Treaty and non-Treaty Indians. I know they are very well looked after as far as the Department of Indian Affairs is concerned, and this resolution should take into consideration the fact that you are talking about two different classes of Indians. If it is confined to Treaty, another northern situation will have to be considered; but if it is going to be taken in its entirety, I would be glad to become a Treaty Indian myself, with the protection given my children and my wife for the rest of their lives. They are very well looked after.

Premier Douglas: — Would you give up your franchise to become a Treaty Indian to get that security?

Mr. Ripley: — Well, certainly. Why not? You had that example yourself when they refused to accept the franchise because they thought they were going to give it up. I would be entirely in favour of them having the vote, and as the hon. member from Meadow Lake has pointed out, it is strictly a matter of the province giving them a provincial vote, and of giving up their freedom from taxation in Federal income tax, which I doubt very few would have to pay; but they can vote in the federal election.

Of course, a lot of these things are not explained to them very well, because they are scattered around in districts all over, although I visit a lot of them because I get around the country up there. But to do a job of it, and explain the situation to them would take quite a bit of time. I think if it were explained properly, they would be glad to accept the vote. There's no doubt about that.

I am very much against giving them the privileges of using liquor, because it states in the resolution that they would have the right and responsibility. Now, in the far northern area, they cannot have the responsibility of a citizen as we have down here. Their life is much freer. They are away from all the confinements of society that we have, and I know for a fact that it will work a great deal of hardship on them if they are given full freedom to purchase liquor. They get enough of it as it is.

I would like to point out that as our hon. friend just mentioned bootlegging for \$18 a bottle, or something like that; well, that is practically an impossibility in the north because there would be a policeman at your door by plane, or some way, in very short order. None of that goes on up north, except amongst themselves. There is a certain amount, of course, between those who can purchase liquor and those who cannot. That is a little bit of internal commerce which they work out between Treaty and non-Treaty. But I certainly would not be in favour of them having liquor. It has been brought to my attention at Lac La Ronge, for instance. The women up there had a meeting, which is a very unusual occurrence; very seldom can you have any of these native women talk to you at all; they are very shy, and very seldom will they get up enough nerve to call any kind of a meeting. But they called a meeting of their own and had quite a discussion. One of their very big problems is liquor, beer, and anything else along that line. They are the ones who suffer most from it — women with children; and up there it is not like it is around the

March 2, 1956

city here. Every man is his own boss, and what he says and what he does with his money – well, nobody else can do anything about that.

So they suffer mostly in silence, and I know for a fact that giving them any freedom in that line at all is going to be disastrous. When you are considering that, I want to point out particularly the extent of the problem all the way through the north – not just the farming areas. I know that is something different altogether.

I notice in Manitoba they have a suggestion that they be admitted to beer parlours for a trial period of two year. I don't know whether it has been passed – I just happened to catch a little information on it, and I think if it could be done, it might be advisable but then, when you are admitted to a beer parlour you are admitted to the responsibility of a citizen in society. You are not running free and untrammelled out in the far parts of the north; you are amongst other people and they expect you to behave as those around you behave. So they perhaps will benefit some from that, and be encouraged to raise their standards of behaviour to that of the people they live with. That idea could possibly be worked out, but I am definitely against this entire freedom that this resolution states, and I cannot vote for it on that basis alone. But I am certainly in favour of them having a vote, both provincially and federally throughout the province.

Mr. Wahl: — Mr. Speaker, might I be privileged to ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Speaker: — Will you answer a question?

Mr. Ripley: — Yes, of course.

Mr. Wahl: — Are you in favour of the white man drinking?

Mr. Ripley: — Well, that's quite a problem. That has nothing to do with this, anyway, but I am in favour as long as he fulfils his obligations to society; then it is entirely up to himself.

Hon. J.H. Sturdy (Minister of Social Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, I haven't much to say on this resolution, but the hon. member from Meadow Lake got under my skin on a couple of points. In the first place, he intimated that since the Liberals were in their Ottawa heaven, largely since Confederation, that all is right with the Indian people. Now, I do not think that this is so. I think that the Indian people have had a shabby deal down through the years. I think that we should be fairly ashamed of ourselves in respect to what has happened to the Indian people. I feel that in comparison (as the Premier pointed out) to other aboriginal populations, Ottawa has done an extremely bad job as far as our Indian people are concerned.

The second point was this. The hon. member said that in view of the fact that we are doing such a bad job with the Métis people, we were not in a position to criticize what Ottawa was doing with the Indian people.

May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that there are 17,000 Indians in the province; that there are 50,000 Métis people; that is, there are 50,000 Saskatchewan citizens with Indian blood who can be classified as Métis people. You don't heard of any but an extremely small percentage of the Métis people. All the rest of them are just as we are – they are Saskatchewan citizens. You run across them in the professions; they are farmers, and workers, and there is simply no difference between them and us. So insofar as the Métis people as a whole are concerned, a very good job indeed has been made of their assimilating into the general society of Saskatchewan.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that small areas and communities of Métis people, largely through the neglect and disregard of their rights and opportunities and privileges by previous Liberal Governments, constitute a problem, but we have certainly been doing something about it, during the past few years, and they are making very considerable progress. Although the problem with respect to certain of these Métis settlements may continue for a generation, or until the adults in those communities pass on, with respect to the oncoming children let me tell you that they will be among Saskatchewan's proudest citizens in the matter of relatively few years and during the present generation.

I have been in close association with Indian people I lived in the Qu'Appelle Valley where there are the File Hills Reservation, the Muscupetung Reservation to the south adjoining the village of Fort Qu'Appelle where I lived for a period of 12 years, from the early '20's until the early '30's, and also the Sioux Reservation. I got to know a great number of these Indians. As a matter of fact, I was Manager of the Sioux hockey team for many years until my wife had to sort of discourage it, because our house during the winter time was filled up with our Indian friends, and it did interfere a great deal with our family life. But I was very happy to be manager of that Indian hockey team, and I notice that they are in the semi-finals again this year, so that they are keeping up tradition of being good sports.

I often thought when I lived there, that it was too bad that on that very fine Muscupetung Reservation where there was just as good land as was farmed in that entire community, they didn't have day schools there in exactly the same way as in the adjoining farming community, where they had their rural schools. I often talked with the school board and with the people in Fort Qu'Appelle who were interested in the Indians that it was too bad we didn't have a technical school here, or a composite type of school, so that the Indian boys and girls, when they completed Grade 8, would have the opportunity of coming into that school, missing with our white children, playing in their games and their athletic activities, and becoming a part of that whole Valley community.

I am not deprecating in any way the very fine educational services rendered by the residential school at Lebret. It was a splendid school, and the Indian children received an excellent education there. They were taught, indeed, in some respects probably better than they were in the ordinary public school. They learned to speak excellent English; their manners were excellent; the girls were kept there until about 14 years of age, and the boys the same, and then they went back to the reservations. Unfortunately, there was no means whereby a follow-up of the fine work that was done in the residential school was made on the reservation, with the result that those

March 2, 1956

girls and boys soon deteriorated when they returned to the reservation where they became segregated from the rest of society.

May I point out another experience. I was in Prince Albert Women's Gaol not so long ago and out of the 34 inmates in the gaol 28 of them were Treaty Indian women. I discussed with our staff the tremendously high percentage of Indian Treaty women in our Women's gaol. This was the explanation that was given to me. These Indian girls went to residential schools where they gained some appreciation of the modern amenities of living; became accustomed to electric lights, and to running water, and sewage facilities, and so on. They received a good education, and both the Catholic and the Anglican church, which maintain these residential schools, are entitled to full marks on the quality of education they give them, that is, academic education.

The girls (since I am dealing with the girls) at age 14 or thereabouts, return to the reservations, and there they find a very primitive way of life, and it is not long before they become fed up with it, and so they leave their reservation and go into surrounding communities, towns and cities, where, unfortunately, they get into trouble. Consequently they land up in our gaols and remain there over winter until the birds start to sing, and they want to get out. Then they return to the reservation. It isn't long before they are again fed up with the primitive method of life that exists on those reservations, and they leave the reservation; again get into trouble, go back to our gaol, and so the vicious circle goes on and on.

I am pleased to note that there is some evidence of the adoption of the type of education that prevails in Saskatchewan for the ordinary citizen. The ordinary type of rural schools are being introduced.

Another thing I noticed on the Muscupetung Reserve was that, in spite of the fact that they had just as fine a land as existed in the country, very little of it was under cultivation. Since then, Ottawa has embarked on another policy. They lease this land to white people, and they pay to the Indians on the reservation a quarter of the crop share. It seems to me that that is entirely wrong; that since that land belongs to the Indians, surely under a good policy of administration, of helpfulness, that the Indians by this time, could have been raised to the status of good farmers and that they Indians themselves could have enjoyed the produce of those reservations. In spite of that, the land is largely leased to the white people living, many of them, miles away from the reservation.

Mr. Ripley: — May I ask a question? On this land that is leased out from the reservation, the Indians would have the privilege of reclaiming that at any certain time, would they not?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Yes, the land is usually leased for a period of from five to ten years, usually ten years.

Now, my hon. friend from Meadow Lake inferred that if the province had the responsibility of administering Indian Affairs, they would do a very bad job, indeed. Let me tell you, Sir, that if this Provincial Government had the opportunity of spending \$17 million a year, as you say is expended

by Ottawa. . .

Mr. Dunfield: — All over Canada.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — All over Canada?

Mr. Dunfield: — \$1,240,000 on education in Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Well, surely that isn't very much. But you did state that they expended \$1,240,000 on education in this province, and assuming that they spend \$5 million (the Department of Indian Affairs), I am sure that whatever money is being expended today on Indians that the Provincial Government could do a much better job than the Federal Government is doing today, and has done in the past, with the expenditure of that amount of money. It seems to me (and I think it is very evident) that Ottawa, where policy is determined, is much too far away from the Indians resident in Saskatchewan. Regina is next-door to the Indians living here, and we know them, associate with them from day to day; we know their problems.

There are other things of which I do not approve. The Indians are being encouraged to enfranchise by the Department of Indian Affairs and become citizens of Saskatchewan. Once they leave the reservation, they lose their treaty rights and they become our provincial responsibility. May I also point out that many half-breed or Métis people, who hitherto were classified as Indians because they had resided on Indian reservations for many years, because they had been voted in by the Indian band, are now being challenged as to whether they should enjoy the status of Indians. Only last week I had one family from the Mescapetung Reserve in to see me. There are 20 members of that family now on that reservation, and the grandfather of the family is in the process of being kicked off, and all his family, his sons and daughters and grandchildren. They have been a part of that reservation for 40 years. They have contributed in great measure to the advancement of that particular reservation, and it is a good one in comparison to many I have visited. Because of Ottawa action, they are threatened with being kicked off the reservation.

I think that if we are going to do a job for the Indians, particularly in my Department of Social Welfare, that we must consider the Indians as citizens, with the full rights and privileges and advantages of all the services of my department, and every other department of government, as far as that is concerned. As the Premier has pointed out, under this system which exists, the Indians are considered wards of the Federal Government, second-rate citizens, and that is not good enough. Yet, though we pay pensions (age 65 to 69 to the Indians) we cannot go on the reservation and give to the Indians there the same services we give to Métis people or to the white people who are their neighbours.

I think the time has well arrived (indeed, long past) when the administration of Indian affairs should be scrutinized very closely. In British Columbia, the provincial government there was a very great deal more control and responsibility as far as the Indians are concerned than we have in Saskatchewan. The relationship has been worked out with Ottawa, and I think the Indians are making good advancement in British Columbia, because the administration of Indians there is largely under the provincial government. And why? Because the provincial government knows the problems. They live with them; they are closely associated with them. Don't ever think you are going to

March 2, 1956

solve the problem of the Indian as long as it is administered from as far away as Ottawa is.

There is much more I could say about this resolution. The Indians are supposed to be wards of the Federal Government. This Government has come 2,500 wards in any one year, and I will say this, if we did as badly with our wards as the Federal Government is doing with its wards, I would be very much ashamed indeed.

Now, I have restrained myself in the language I have used. I could be much more forcible, and there are other things I would like to talk about; but I think I have contributed as much as I should to this debate. I will certainly vote for this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. John Wellbelove (Kerrobot-Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, if the intent of this resolution is to improve the condition of the Indians as a people, then I think we are all for it wholeheartedly. But, like the member from Cumberland, I had some misgivings about that first section. If we are to interpret it in a way which it could be interpreted by first reading it, that it is instructions to the Provincial Government to proceed at a fairly early date to extend the franchise and Government to proceed at a fairly early date to extend the franchise and remove all the restrictions, well, then, I could not vote for the motion.

But after listening to the Premier's approach to it, and his interpretation of the intent of the resolution, then, if it is to be a conference with those people concerned, with fairly lengthy negotiations and exploring all the possibilities and avenues of the implications of this resolution, I could support it. But I have a certain amount of reservation on account of that clause (b) there.

Mr. Speaker: — It is my duty to inform the Assembly that the mover of the resolution is about to exercise his privilege in closing the debate.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on a question of privilege, if I may. Just so there is no misunderstanding, the member for Kerrobot-Kindersley (Mr. Wellbelove) just said "on the basis of my interpretation of the resolution." I, of course, cannot interpret the resolution — only the mover can interpret the resolution. I was trying to place the position which the Government would take if the resolution passed. We could not (I think I was speaking for my colleagues) take the passing of this motion as arbitrary instructions to immediately remove restrictions if this resolution passed. That is the interpretation we would place on it. I cannot speak for the mover or the seconder of the motion.

Mr. W. J. Berezowsky (Cumberland) (Closing Debate): — Mr. Speaker, having prepared this Resolution, I will admit that it may be inadequate; but it was the best that I, an ordinary person with sentiments such as have been expressed by the Premier (with which I agree), could do. I had no intention at any time to put into this resolution any idea that we should do something to further endanger the living conditions of the native Indians.

I think the member from Athabaska (Mr. Ripley) and the hon. member who just spoke (Mr. Wellbelove) had an idea that it concerned liquor rights. That may be quite true. I will say only this, that in line with the sentiments expressed by the Premier a while back, we must remember that, if we are going to give people all the fine things in life, somewhere there are going to be some thorns also, with which we must be content. I think it is the prerogative of governments at any time that if, by passing certain legislation it is going to hurt a certain group of people, then they should not pass this particular legislation. This should be the attitude towards liquor.

But the Indian problem is much broader than just a matter of liquor, or other such things. It concerns people, their lives, and their destiny. As I said preciously, what is going to happen in the future? How long are we going to wait to assimilate these people?

The hon. member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield) said he wanted some clarification, or rather he said he was going to give some clarification to this resolution. I think that a number of members spoke after, and gave him some answers. The fact is this: notwithstanding what the hon. member from Meadow Lake has said, when he made the comparison between the Treaty Indians and their opportunities in life today in Saskatchewan (and I won't go further afield) and the Métis people down at Green Lake, this fact can be faced and can be seen by everyone, that the Métis people up there, with the training that they could have, can go anywhere in Saskatchewan. They can get a job anywhere, and they are respected everywhere by the people who understand what respect is; whereas the man from the reserve who is a 'Treaty' has not that privilege.

I can give you, Mr. Speaker, as an illustration, a case of two souls I met on the road going down from the National Park to Montreal Lake. I asked them what they had been doing; they had been working down at the National Park at Waskesiu. Were they happy? Yes. Well, why were they going back to this reserve? Well, they were happier on the reserve. Why? Because in the hob these girls had been doing, every so often the ignorant, selfish and un-Christian people branded them as 'dirty Indians', and yet these girls were just as nice looking, just as clean looking as any one you would meet. But they are branded. As long as we have the reservations and the system that has been carried on for the past 100 years or more, we are going to have a branded people, and a second-rate citizen. That is the answer to the hon. member from Meadow Lake.

I recall (if I may mention at this time, too) when the hon. member mentioned in a discussion, I think, similar to this one today, that the only time the Indian people were happy is when they can catch a four-pound fish and eat it up, and so forth; and everything we were doing to try to emancipate these people was of no value. I hope he has changed his opinion since that time.

Mr. Dunfield: — That statement, Mr. Speaker, is not worthy of contradiction, even.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I wish you would tell us exactly the way you said it then. Now the question was asked, what responsibility would they have and what privileges? I cannot tell you all the responsibilities and privileges. That will be worked out by the people who are concerned about the welfare of these natives. But I can say this, that they have a right to self-government and self-government carries along with it a certain amount of responsibility,

March 2, 1956

even the local self-government in whatever unit they may be residing in; call it municipality, call it reserve, if you want; I don't care what. That is a responsibility as well as a privilege. Today it is neither a privilege nor a responsibility, because you have a dictator there (if you wish to call him that, or call him an agent), who tells them and directs them, and they have to abide according to whatever decisions he makes.

I believe they could assume the responsibility of establishing, say, a tribal court, if you want to call it that. They could have their own police, and of course, I could mention other such organizations. As the Premier has said, in 25 years, or 50 years from now, these people will have been assimilated, or become integrated, into our society. We have to start somewhere, and I think now is the time to start. I think they should have the right, as the Minister for Social Welfare has just mentioned, to farm land which has been leased out for five and 10 years. It is true, and it is happening all over Canada. It is happening in Saskatchewan. I think those people should have the right, through their own organization, to either farm that land, or they should have the right to lease it out to whomsoever they desire. It should not be decided by somebody who has been set up as a superior person to look after their affairs.

I think they should have the right to control their farms if they are going to live on a reservation, and I think, most of all, that instead of being forced off the reservation, as they are today to become a public charge in the province of Saskatchewan, they should have the right to go into the fields of industry and opportunity in this province, without being told that, because they are not well behaved on the reservation, they must leave; but only leave of their own account to improve themselves.

Those are some of the answers I wish to give to the hon. member from Meadow Lake. As I say, I do not know all the answers; I am no expert. I understand what prejudice means. If I were a native of Saskatchewan here, speaking for my fellow brothers, I think my language would be much stronger, and probably my interpretation much better.

But I hope, Mr. Speaker, you will forgive me if I have not done as good a job for these people as I would like to do. Do they drink whisky in the north? Are they different people in the north? – the situation there is no different from here. When you get up north (and the hon. member from Athabaska admitted it), you only have two kinds of Indians there. You have the non-Treaty, who could be quite like any of us, and others who drink, if that is their desire; and you have the other kind who are Treaty Indians, and they, too, drink. The only difference is that today, under the vicious system that we have, whether it is at Lac La Ronge or any other place, instead of drinking at a legal institutions, they get their liquor from bootleggers, and they pay ten times the price that they could obtain it at legally. Now, I am not encouraging anybody to drink. I don't believe they should drink; but I am quite certain that if they drank legally, you would not have the drunkenness, and everything else that goes along with it, to the extent you have today, and they must pay for this poison obtained from bootleggers at \$10 and \$15 a bottle.

There is no answer to that. The only answer is an educational programme. Those people are human beings and have the same potentialities to learn as we have; and if they are shown, and get to believe, that liquor is not

good for them, they are going to react to that situation just as we react. Some of us drink moderately; some not at all. Others have no measurement, unfortunately. You will find, Sir, in their group, a similar situation prevails.

In conclusion, I cannot agree with the hon. member from Athabaska that the people in the north, the native Indians, are any different from the native Indians here, or any different from me or anyone else. They lead a different life because the environment there is different. They trap for a living, while I farm for a living. They may be fishing for a living, while my friends here may be in business. You have to adjust yourself, wherever you are in Canada, to the situation and environment in which you live in order to make your living. And to that extent, they are no different. I have seen successful men of the Indian group in business. I have seen them as scholars, and have seen them in the government service, as the hon. Minister of Natural Resources should be able to tell you, and they have done excellent work. They are no different from the rest of us. Therefore, I would say, Mr. Speaker, if you agree with me that they are no different, then why should we continue to class them as second-rate citizens?

These are some of the things I considered when I prepared this resolution for the consideration of this House.

The question being put, it was agreed to unanimously.

The Assembly then adjourned at 5:30 p.m.