

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session - Fifteenth Legislature**  
**43rd Day**

Wednesday, April 6, 1966.

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.  
on the Orders of the Day.

**QUESTION RE PRINTING OF SPEECHES**

**Mr. J. H. Brockelbank** (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I made a motion which was seconded by the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) asking that some further printing be undertaken. Now, the printing that has been done so far, according to information we have been given in the house to date, 8,000 copies of the speech of the Premier in the Address in Reply, and 8,000 copies of the Premier's speech, as Provincial Treasurer, in the Budget Debate, his Budget Speech, but our motion which asked for 6,000 copies of the speech of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) in the Address in Reply, 6,000 copies of the speech of the financial critic, Mr. Blakeney, and 6,000 copies of the speech of the member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) was turned down. I don't think this can be regarded as a very fair kind of a way of dealing with it. I want to register, in this legislature, my objection to that.

**Hon. W. Ross Thatcher** (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, it has been traditional, for I suppose as many years as there has been a legislature, that the speeches of the Premier, in the case of the Throne Speech and in the case of the Budget Speech by the Provincial Treasurer, be printed. We are following no procedure which was not followed by my hon. friends when they were in office. At no time while I was Leader of the Opposition did they ever offer to give us any printing. I think there is quite a difference in the Throne Speech. The government is laying down its plans for the coming session, and in the Budget Speech it is laying down government policy as far as finances are concerned. There is not justification in the other cases they have mentioned.

**Mr. M. P. Pederson** (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to register a protest as well, in spite of what the Premier has just said. I believe that, if we are to adopt the attitude that just because this has not been done in the past it is no good, it is a very regressive type of attitude. Although I readily concede that it is important that the Premier's and Provincial Treasurer's speeches be printed because they do lay down policy. I do believe that if we are to follow the principles of democratic government which calls for two sides to government, government and opposition, that the government could do no less than to accept the proposal that we had placed before the committee this morning.

I believe that it is equally important that the people of this province, the business community and so on, should be apprised of the stand of the opposition as well as of the government. The opposition in our system, contrary to what some of my friends may think, is just as an important part of government as the government think, is just as an important part of government as the government side of the house. If you take a look at the traditional attitude towards government in the British Commonwealth, you will

**April 6, 1966**

find that this is true. The negating of that tradition is not a principle that I believe this government should be following.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they are following a movement here that negates the principle of democratic government in denying the opposition the same or a lesser opportunity than they have inasmuch as we requested a substantial number of fewer copies of speeches mentioned in the motion.

I wanted to register that protest in spite of what the Premier suggests has been precedence in the past. I hope that they will reconsider for next year.

**Mr. R. A. Walker** (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, the Premier seems to resort to the argument that back in 1944 this or that was the situation. Every time he tries to resist a piece of progress, any time he tries to resist any expansion of our democratic climate, he always turns his eyes to the past.

Mr. Speaker, members of this house have to think of the future. If this government, after being in office only two years, can only think in terms of, and judge its policies in reference to, the distant past, then the voters of Saskatchewan are very soon going to get fed up with that kind of backward-looking stance. The members of this house, at least on this side of the house, are thinking of Saskatchewan in terms of the future. We want to improve the democratic climate in this province, and we are having some difficulty because of the resistance of my hon. friends opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I think that, at least, they could be orderly when the proceedings of the house are in session, but the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that in our parliamentary process the opposition's views have a right to just as much currency and just as much publicity as the views of the government. Indeed, I can remember talking to friends of mine in those days, of the newspaper industry, who said that after all the government doesn't really have to have its point of view put forward because the government's point of view is the official policy of the province. Presumably that is well known because people can see what the government is doing. It is the opposition's point of view that is really important in a parliamentary democracy, because the opposition has no mechanism of administration to propagate its point of view. Therefore, the opposition requires more reliance, requires to really more heavily on the media of information, such as the printed word, than what the government does. It seems to me that most people in Saskatchewan view the opposition as an important and integral part of government as the government itself. I can well remember that for years, that I know of, the opposition leader and the financial critic of the opposition did not want their speeches printed or distributed.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Walker:** — . . . and as a matter of fact, to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, they never asked for it.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — That's not right.

**Mr. Walker:** — As a matter of fact, furthermore, any desire to have this service, one of them might have got up in this house and said so.

The plain bald truth is, Mr. Speaker, that they did not want their speeches printed, they never asked for it, either privately or in this ass. The plain truth is that we, on this side of the house, feel that our views are entitled to be published. We are not only prepared to say so privately, but we are prepared to say so publicly. This government is prepared to repudiate our interests in this matter publicly, apparently.

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. E. Kramer** (The Battlefords): — Before the Order of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce one student in the gallery, a young man from Krydor, Saskatchewan. He is eleven years old. It is his first trip to Regina. He came down by himself on the rail liner last night. He is the son of the MLA for Redberry, Mr. Michayluk, junior.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**DECISION BY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE APPEALED (BILL NO. 82  
— AN ACT RESPECTING HOME-OWNER GRANTS)**

**Mr. W. S. Howes** (Deputy Speaker): — Mr. Speaker, in the Communities of the Whole on Bill No. 82, after putting the Q on clause 12, I ruled on a voice vote that the Noes had it. This ruling has been appealed by the Premier.

**Mr. Speaker**— The question before the house is: Shall the ruling be sustained.

The question was negatived on the following recorded division.

**YEAS — 24**

Lloyd	Willis	Broten
Cooper (Mrs.)	Whelan	Larson
Wood	Nicholson	Robbins
Nollet	Kramer	Pepper
Walker	Dewhurst	Brockelbank (Saskatoon City)
Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Berezowsky	Blakeney
Smishek	Pederson	Davies
Link	Thibault	Snyder

**NAYS — 28**

Thatcher	Grant	Radloff
McFarlane	Coderre	Weatherald
Cameron	Bjarnason	MacLennan
Steuart	Trapp	Larochelle
Heald	Cuelenaere	Hooker
Gardiner (Melville)	McIsaac	Coupland
Guy	MacDonald	Gardner (Moosomin)
Merchant (Mrs.)	Gallagher	Mitchell
Loken	Breker	MacDougall
Leith		

April 6, 1966

Then the house again resolved itself into the Committee on the Home-Owner Grants Bill.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### SECOND READINGS

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. D. McFarlane that Bill No. 49, **An Act to provide for the establishment of the South Saskatchewan River Irrigation Project**, be now read a second time, and the amendment thereto by Mr. Walker:

That all the words after the word "that" be deleted and the following words added:

The second reading of the bill be deferred until the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture has inquired into all matters relating to the South Saskatchewan River Project and in particular into its impact on the Broderick area; and that this committee be authorized for the purposes of this inquiry to require the attendance of any person and the production of all relevant papers and documents.

**Mr. J. H. Brockelbank** (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I shall try to be reasonably brief in remarks concerning this bill and the amendment moved by Mr. Walker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in discussing the amendment which asks that the bill be deferred, it will be necessary to discuss the provisions of the bill because these provisions are the reasons for wanting to defer the bill.

First of all I want to say that I realize and I think all members of this house realize that the question of irrigation is an important one to the province of Saskatchewan. We have had sometimes years in succession when there was little need for irrigation. On the other hand we have had years in succession when irrigation would have been a great blessing. We are not getting the South Saskatchewan River Dam nearing completion and it becomes possible to irrigate a substantial acreage in the centre of the province of Saskatchewan. So this cannot be regarded other than as a very important project, but I think we must look at this situation and be careful in making decisions as to how we are going to proceed with it.

First of all I would like to remind the house that the agreement which was signed by a CCF government in Saskatchewan and a Conservative government in Ottawa does not require land to be irrigated at any time. That agreement did not picture the idea of compelling people to put in irrigation. What the agreement required was that at a certain time the ditches and works must be established which would make the water available for irrigating 50,000 acres. This is all that the agreement requires. The act which is before us, asks for something different altogether.

I would point out that if this requirement in the agreement, that the water be made available to 50,000 acres at a certain tie, is too onerous, there is nothing to prevent the present

government from negotiating with the government at Ottawa. They should be able to negotiate with that government to get it changed. But I don't think it is too onerous. I think that Saskatchewan can meet the requirements, but I would like to see the bill deferred because it is too harsh and too dictatorial.

I want to refer to some of the extreme powers which the bill gives and how it gives them. First of all the bill provides that there shall be irrigation districts or at least a district, that there shall be a board. This board will be composed of, not a majority of farmers in the district, but a majority of people appointed by this government. I think the very least that can be done is to make sure that these boards which are going to deal with matters which affect the farmers in the district have a majority of farmers on those boards, elected by the farmers, not appointed by somebody else.

Now, I agree, Mr. Speaker, that in a program like this where the government will be required to make substantial investments that the government should have representation on these boards, but I don't think it is necessary for them to have a majority on these boards. The government will control, insofar as any grants or assistance from the government is concerned, the purse strings, and this is a pretty important part of control. That is the first point, that these boards should have a majority of their members at least democratically elected. The power is given to the board to enforce, to enter into, to determine, or otherwise deal with agreements for the supply of water, to enter upon any land, to construct and maintain, and reconstruct irrigation work, to operate any irrigation system, to manage, to add improvements, to cultivate and carry on any farming operations on any and all land vested in it. These are all included in powers of the board.

The board may also make regulations and bylaws in respect to matters not specifically provided by this act. This give it very wide powers, concerning the distribution of water, concerning the cutting off and stopping of the supply of water to a parcel of land. The board has the power to employ officers and employees; the board is given the responsibility for establishing water rates, or tariffs; the acreage to be classified as irrigable land shall be determined by the board; the board has powers in regard to a tariff for domestic water rates so that there is no question about it. The board has very extreme powers in this act.

I admit, Mr. Speaker, that the board in this case has to have quite substantial powers. I think probably the powers that are given in this act are much stricter than necessary. But they must have certain important powers, and those can be discussed in committee; but I think the bill should be modified to a very considerable extent.

Now, I think what we should be adopting as a policy, first of all that the government of Saskatchewan construct the main works, including reservoirs, canals and laterals, to the farm turnout. The government should provide for the operation and maintenance cost of these reservoirs and other main works, such as pumps, canals, laterals to the farm turnout without cost to the farmer. This is a part that I think the province has to put in. Then I think that if we want to get irrigation developing, developing well, we have to sweeten up the picture to some extent and give some incentive, give some help. I would suggest and my colleagues agree with this: to relieve farmers of the full cost of operation and maintenance of the other works, not the main

**April 6, 1966**

works but the other works, during the initial development period by making grants available on a sliding scale over a five year period, starting within the first year, 100 per cent of the cost of operating and maintenance of these other works, and at the end of five years, eliminating this assistance.

But this is going to be the difficult period, when farmers are trying to make the conversion from dry land farming to irrigation. They will have undertaken a lot of expense; they will be learning the new methods of farming; they will have invested capital in other ways; and they will be waiting for returns. So this first five years is the time when they will need very substantial assistance.

The next point directs financial and other assistance for construction of field ditches and land levelling up to at least 75 per cent of the cost on the first 80 acres to be irrigated by each farmer. The cost of land levelling can run to pretty high figures. I don't think we are going to get this program started very fast unless there is very substantial help to get farmers with a good acreage to start this. Eighty acres of irrigated land is well worthwhile. Whether it is going to be used for the production of cereal crops or fodder crops, or for the production of specialized crops, that 80 acres is a good start.

I think we should say to the farmers in this area that for any of them who use water for irrigation in the first ten years after the water is made available to them, after these main ditches and laterals are in, after the water is at the farm gate, any water they use in the first ten years would be without charge. We do this kind of thing for other industry. We even had cases where the government gives assistance free from taxes for a period of time, where it gives at least a partial freedom, a very substantial partial freedom from payment of royalties and dues in the starting up of a new industry, so it is not unreasonable to ask that there be no water charge for the first ten years after the water is available. This means that the farmers who are willing to co-operate and hurry up and get into business using the water will get many years without charge.

The next thing that we need to do is to provide technical assistance such as engineering service, practical irrigation specialists, farm management help, an extension service free of charge. If irrigation is undertaken it is going to mean a revolution in farming methods. I know that our Saskatchewan farmers are adaptable. I know that they can tackle new problems. But the more help they can get in adapting to these new problems the quicker will they be able to take full advantage of the irrigation and the sooner will Saskatchewan begin to feel the benefits of irrigation.

The capital investment will be very heavy. If we are going to see irrigation go ahead there should be long term low interest loans, with an initial interest free period of five years to farmers for all matters relating to irrigation development. The reason we say five years without interest is that this is the period when it is quite likely that most farmers who convert to irrigation farming will not make any more than their expenses. When they will be investing new capital, when they will be learning new methods, this is the time when they will need some assistance.

Any land purchased by the government should be by voluntary arrangement between the farmer and the government at an agreed price. I don't think in a situation like this it is necessary to

compel farmers to sell, or to compel them to take any particular price, but certainly farmers in the area who want to see out and could arrive at a satisfactory price for their land, should have the opportunity to sell out. This would put the government in the position where they would have some land available which could be sold, by preference, to other Saskatchewan residents for development as irrigated land.

Everything should be done that is possible to get further financial assistance from the federal government through the ARDA program for irrigation development. Our own organization here, SEDCO in Saskatchewan, could give credit and assistance for the establishment of storage and processing facilities, particularly in regard to special crops.

That, briefly, Mr. Speaker, is a program which the CCF party believes should be tried in regard to irrigation. The argument that we have got to use some compulsion on the people in this area, so as to make use of the water immediately is, I don't think, a good one. Canada and Saskatchewan are investing a couple of hundred million in the whole project. I don't think that we should expect that immediately farmers in this area will convert overnight, and I don't think we should do anything to force them. actually what will be the difference in the long run whether we get 50,000 acres irrigated in three years, or five years, or whether it takes 10 years, but I do think it is important that these farmers, that are on this land and want to stay on it should have the chance to adopt irrigation methods without any compulsion. I don't like many of the terms in the bill. I would like to see it deferred. I would like to see a group of practical farmers have a chance to make suggestions in regard to it. In any case, I think this committee, if we consider it, should endeavour to improve the bill, to remove some of the very arduous and dictatorial provisions of the bill, to make it as democratic as is possible.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. I. C. Nollet** (Cutknife): — Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member speaking to the amendment or is he closing the debate?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, I presumed he was speaking to the amendments that is before the house. You can't close a debate on the amendments.

**Mr. Nollet:** — I just want to say a few words in connection with the amendments which requests that this matter be referred to the Select Standing Communities on Agriculture. The government should have prepared for this long ago. But no, they keep this legislation on the Order Paper until the dying moments of this legislature. I feel very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the drastic departure in irrigation policy, not only as it affects the farmers in the Broderick area, as they have been led to believe that a more constructive policy would be pursued, this is a complete and drastic change, the like to which has never been previously experienced in the history of this province, if in Canada. There has never been any more arbitrary legislation brought in. It is because of this that the amendments suggested that the matter be referred to the Select Standing Committee. Even this right is being denied not only to the members in this house to properly examine this drastic legislation, but the right

**April 6, 1966**

is denied to the farmers concerned, the right is denied to municipalities concerned which will certainly be affected and to the farm organizations, especially the Farmers' Union which did a tremendous lot of work in connection with promoting irrigation and the acceptability of irrigation in the area. All of this is rudely brushed aside.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that there is no big rush for this legislation and here I am answering the hon. member for Shellbrook (Mr. Cuelenaere) who also spoke after the amendment was presented in the house. He suggested that this drastic legislation was necessary to speed up this project. Speed up for what purposes? There is only one area where speed is required and that is the construction of the physical works which is the responsibility of the government under the terms of the agreement in Ottawa. They have this obligation to fulfil but nowhere in that agreement is there any provision or any reference made whatever as to how the irrigation will be applied at the farm level or as to how quickly the acreage will be brought under irrigation. Therefore there is no urgency at all for the arbitrary compulsory features in this legislation affecting farmers. All the minister has to do is to build the works and then you can determine what the policy shall be with regard to farmers, especially whether they will have a right to accept or reject irrigation as citizens in a democracy.

Under this legislation we are ramming this down their throat and I say, Mr. Speaker, this is a completely medieval concept. It's out of date with all factors relating to irrigation in the 20th century. These are intelligent people. Under our previous policy we told them, in fact I gave my assurance to them, that irrigation would not be forced down their throats. They would be given full information in connection with irrigation so that you could make a reasoned and fair judgment. I further informed them of this. The Premier likes to talk now but he is very silent on the other legislation. That was his day of silence and I would suggest to him that he remain silent. This is more of your arbitrary legislation that you are bringing in affecting farmers.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You're better than Bob Hope.

**Mr. Nollet:** — The Minister of Agriculture was a great sponsor of the rights and the freedoms of the farmers in this house. I am almost ashamed of him that he would introduce such legislation that is absolutely unnecessary. Mr. Speaker, you can call it 12:30. I have a few more things to say.

The assembly recessed until 2:30 o'clock p.m.

**Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, when the house recessed for dinner, I was talking about the drastic nature of the policy in regard to irrigation farming and presented this as one very good reason why this matter should have been referred to the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture at which time the farmers affected, farm organizations and others could make representation regarding this type of legislation. I must reply to some of the statement made by the hon. member for Shellbrook (Mr. Cuelenaere) in justification of this drastic policy when he said, quoting from the Star Phoenix, April 2nd:

Natural Resources Minister, Hon. J. M. Cuelenaere said the 50,000 acres involved must be irrigated under the



terms of the agreement signed by the former CCF government and Conservative government.

This is true and it doesn't say that exactly. It says works must be constructed to serve 50,000 acres, that is, to provide enough works and water to provide eventually full irrigation to 50,000 acres. There is no timetable contained. There is no objective as to how quick this goal should be obtained at all. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, again that there is nothing in the agreement with the government of Canada that says anything about irrigation policy as applied to farmers or that makes it necessary for this government to make haste by a compulsory measure to impose irrigation on farmers. The hon. member for Shellbrook (Mr. Cuelenaere) went on and he said this:

The situation the farmers now find themselves in is the result of the agreement and the action of the former CCF government.

He endeavoured to justify this drastic legislation because of the fact that we had pressed for this project for years, that we had finally signed an agreement for the project. His words almost indicated that he was sorry that we had signed that agreement. If this is the case I wish he would say so in a forthright manner. Certainly the signing of that agreement did not make it necessary for the government to bring in the drastic compulsory legislation that you have brought into this chamber. He went on:

If the opposition knows the location of 50,000 acres outside the Broderick area where the residents would be satisfied, they should tell us where it is.

It isn't a question as to whether the residents will be satisfied or not in finding 50,000 acres. I say to the government before you bring in this compulsory drastic legislation, you had better look for additional acreage to round out 50,000 acres. I'll give you a suggestion. You can go down into the Qu'Appelle Valley and find where farmers are irrigating today and continuing to develop there in addition to Broderick. We know the Broderick area does not contain 50,000 acres of land to fulfil the agreement with Ottawa. It can be found in the Qu'Appelle Valley and elsewhere as well. If you are going to look some place else for additional acreage to make it up to 50,000 acres, I would like to know from the government where you are going to look, and the farmers all over the province will be looking whether or not they are going to be included in a project under this drastic kind of legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me make it very clear. We have pushed for irrigation for years to get the agreement signed. We have pushed ever since by stages to bring this project into full development. All the surveys are done. The detail surveys on the farmer's land are done. We got authority from the legislature to do this, which was objected to. This was done so that the farmer would have information as to the number of acres he could irrigate and the cost of bringing that land under irrigation development. All of this was presented to him on this basis. We will give you the information as to the number of acres he could irrigate and the cost of bringing that land under irrigation development. All of this was presented to him on this basis. We will give you the information. We will give you the policy setting out the assistance that we are prepared to give to you. We will construct the works. We will bring the water to your land and you can determine whether you are going to accept water or not. I said then and I repeat that if irrigation isn't going to improve your income position then I am not interested in irrigation either. The house should bear in mind this . . .

**April 6, 1966**

**Mr. Thatcher:** — What did you sign the document for?

**Mr. Nollet:** — Come on! Listen to my friend. I hope he unplugs his ears to this and listens for a moment.

Irrigation costs can be justified in terms of long-term benefits. The same cannot be said of the farmer who irrigates. This farmer doesn't live a span of years over generations, he will not obtain the benefits that society generally gets. This farmer wants to know if it's going to be economically beneficial to him. Once that's proven you will have no difficulty in having farmers irrigate. This has been our experience on all previous irrigation projects in Saskatchewan. As a matter of fact, PFRA has been developing irrigation projects and operating projects for years and it has no legislation at all to do so; still it has been doing it.

One of the first lessons, Mr. Speaker, that we learned when we spoke to the farmers in the Broderick area, when we took them on innumerable tours to irrigation projects in Alberta, was the fact that wherever compulsion was attempted in other areas, resistance was encountered and irrigation set back. I quote from a press clipping that I have had in my files from July 5, 1958. This was the same year we signed the agreement and the Minister of Agriculture for the province of Alberta at that time said we were in for a lot of headaches. So I discovered why the headaches. It was because of the compulsory nature of some irrigation legislation, even though in Alberta it is not the government that is doing it, but it is the fully autonomous local districts that are doing it. Here is what they had to say. They had a commission set up in the province of Alberta to inquire into irrigation. Farmers made representations. Here is what they had to say:

The farmers on the eastern section of the St. Mary's River project told the committee that the province was to force irrigation development on to them in a matter of three or four years, rather than in 20 or 30 years, which they pointed out repeatedly, was the way the project was originally designed.

Now, let's not fall into these mistakes. Then it goes on:

Income by water rates from 60,000 to 70,000 acres is a lot less than it would have been from the 170,000 acres which the province felt it would be getting.

Another quotation:

Farmers couldn't fathom how the Alberta government could ask them to make a development pay its way in three or four years under present farming conditions when the original intention was that the project could not pay its way very completely for another 20 to 30 years.

It takes time. Another one:

The western section of BRD . . .

I think that's the Bow River District.

. . . is about half completed at present and the majority of the farmers on the project said they would rather see

the project dropped altogether than to be led into exorbitant water rates which would lead them into ruin in short order.

And it goes on . . .

Again, I say to the government that if you in fact require legislation to give you authority to have access to land for the construction, for the operation of a project and the acquisition of the land for irrigation works, I am all for it. Those sections of this bill I am in full agreement with, but I am not in agreement with the compulsory nature of this bill insofar as it imposed irrigation on farmers against their will by a trusteeship that denies them the right forever to ever have local autonomy in regard to irrigation matters. These are the factors I object to. I would strongly urge the minister to withdraw this legislation. It is not going to delay development at all. You will have to use your best endeavours to get the works constructed; to bring water to these acres over the next three or four years and at that time you can decide as to policy. In the interval farmers and others will have an opportunity of expressing a viewpoint on irrigation policy and irrigation law for them. I would ask the minister therefore to withdraw this legislation. Come in with a simple act merely giving you authority of access to land for the purpose of construction of works, land acquisition, and all the authority that you need to construct the physical works.

**Hon. J. M. Cuelenaere** (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on the amendment but in view of the fact that some of the speakers . . .

**Mr. Nollet**: — the member has already spoken on the amendment.

**Mr. Cuelenaere**: — No, I haven't.

**Mr. Nollet**: — Yes you did.

**Mr. Cuelenaere**: — Just on the main motion.

**Mr. Speaker**: — I think the member spoke on the motion unless I'm incorrectly informed.

**Mr. Cuelenaere**: — I only spoke on the motion.

**Mr. Speaker**: — If I remember correctly the debate continued on the amendment.

**Mr. Cuelenaere**: — I just spoke on the motion.

**Mr. Nollet**: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it's evident that the amendment was before the house before the hon. member from Shellbrook spoke. Now, you can only speak once, in my understanding, on the amendment or the original motion and the amendment together but you can't speak twice.

**Mr. Speaker**: — It's proper for a member to speak on an amendment after it has been moved. A member can speak on a motion. Then after an

**April 6, 1966**

amendment has been moved he can subsequently speak on the amendment. I can't tell you just when the hon. member spoke. He spoke somewhere.

**Mr. Nollet:** — He spoke after the amendment was before the house.

**Hon. D. McFarlane** (Minister of Agriculture): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the hon. member from Shellbrook spoke. Then the hon. member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) got up and made the amendment, then the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) adjourned the debate, then followed the member for Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) and now Mr. Cuelenaere.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, the records show and if the house wishes I'll send for the records.

**Mr. Nollet:** — I won't take the time of the house at all to go and consult the records but I made a note of it and I believe . . . I'm not questioning the issue, Mr. Speaker. Let him speak.

**Hon. D. V. Heald** (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I think the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) has conceded that the situation is that the member for Shellbrook (Mr. Cuelenaere) spoke before him and he is the member who moved the amendment. So, obviously the member for Shellbrook was speaking on the original motion.

**Mr. Nollet:** — It may well be.

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe that the hon. member for Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) was wrong on several points, on several counts, when he spoke to the house this afternoon. He stated that when I spoke I said that this legislation was necessary in order to speed irrigation. I wish to point out that I did not make that statement. What I said was that this legislation was necessary in order to meet the terms of the agreement. The hon. member said that there was no time table as to when irrigation was to be put in and secondly, he pointed out that all that the agreement required was that there be some facilities or some projects to be put in.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think at this time it's important that we should do two things very briefly. Firstly, that we know exactly what the agreement says and secondly, that we just look, very briefly, at the history of this South Saskatchewan Irrigation project.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the language of the agreement that was ratified by chapter 100 of the Statutes of 1959 is very clear. the agreement section 13 says:

That Saskatchewan will assume responsibility for the undertake the construction, operation and maintenance as part of the project, of all main canals, secondary reservoirs, distributories, pumping stations, and equipment and all other works required for the conveyance and the distribution of water to all land to be irrigated by the reservoir hereinafter referred to as the irrigation works, and further agrees to proceed as rapidly as practical with the construction of the said works . . .

**Mr. Nollet:** — . . . construction of the works.

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — With the construction of the works, that's exactly what it says and then subsection two clearly says:

That upon the transfer of the reservoir to Saskatchewan under sub clause one, Saskatchewan will indeed before the expiration of one year from the day on which the reservoir is filled to minimum irrigation level as determined by the minister or after three years from the date of transfer of the reservoir to Saskatchewan under the sub clause one of clause seven, whichever is the earlier, complete construction of the irrigation works to the extent necessary to provide full irrigation to not less than 50,000 acres of land.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this agreement was confirmed by Statute in 1959; but the year before in 1958, the government of the day came to the legislature of Saskatchewan, and, as was pointed out by the then Premier, Mr. Douglas, he said we are on the horns of a dilemma. We have negotiated a contract which we haven't signed yet. He asked the legislature at that time to confirm or to authorize the execution of this agreement at a subsequent date. Now, this is what the act says:

Agreement authorized.

The Lieutenant Governor in Council on behalf of the government of Saskatchewan on such terms and conditions as may be approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council an agreement between the government of Canada and the government of Saskatchewan.

Then it goes on to say that it can provide for certain works. Section four clearly says:

The said agreement will provide for the government of Saskatchewan undertaking to construct and operate all or part of the irrigation works necessary to make full use of the water available for irrigation to the extent that such use may be economically feasible or may provide for the construction and operation of such works being divided between the two governments with either government undertaking to pay a percentage of the cost of the works constructed by the other government or of the total cost of all such works as may provide for either government undertaking to pay the cost of part of such works.

In other words, section four clearly provides and this is what it says, as on the marginal note, "Agreement may provide for irrigation works".

**Mr. Nollet:** What are you going to do about that?

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — I'm going to deal with that and I may as well deal with it right now, because I have already pointed out to the house and I think it has been pointed out several times by both the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) that this agreement, that is before us, referred only to works and there are no

**April 6, 1966**

rights of appropriation for anything but for the land required for the works. In other words, all the act that is before the legislature does now is to provide necessary legislation in order to carry out the terms of the agreement which were set out in the contract and which was authorized by the Statute of 1958.

Now, in order to substantiate that I want to refer the hon. members to both section 11 and to section 15 of the act before the house. Both of them only refer to the works of the project. It's interesting to go back and read the words that were spoken in the legislature at the time this act was introduced. In 1958, the then Premier of Saskatchewan, the hon. T. C. Douglas, made this statement. He said:

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important piece of legislation and I, therefore, would like to take a few moments to discuss it.

Then he goes on to point out how they are on the horns of a dilemma and must ask the legislature to authorize them to sign a contract although the contract hadn't been full negotiated. Then he goes on a little further:

The idea of irrigation and water development on the prairies was first recognized as far back as 1890.

Then he goes on in the history, how this project developed and then a little further on page 37, and I'm reading from volume 32 of the reports of the 1958 legislature, it goes on:

That is in terms of the investment, it won't generate enough power to warrant the investment — we pour much less money and generate much more power from the Saskatchewan River at Fort a la Corne or at Nipawin. For irrigation alone it would not justify the expense. Or as a source of water for industrial purposes and to meet the needs of some of the growing urban communities it would not justify the expenses. However, when they are all taken together, then it does become, in our opinion, socially and economically feasible.

And then, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier spoke on a little further, it is most interesting to say the least. He says:

The three main aspects to the dam are that it is a multi-purpose dam. First of all there is irrigation . . .

Then he points out what the agreement provides with respect to irrigation. Then he says:

The soils and topography for the most part are found to be favourable, but there are some drainage problems which will have to be carefully investigated and handled. It is estimated that the number of farm units should be much more than doubled once irrigation can be put in. the major use of the irrigable land in the initial stage will be for livestock, forage, cereal crops, which will be tied in with the surrounding non-irrigated land. But on the long-range program we hope and anticipate that it will lead to the development of specialized crops such as vegetables, sugar beets and other things of that sort.

Now, he goes on, and says:

With specialized crops it is anticipated that it could rise to a figure of \$50,000,000. This, of course, would mean a greater amount of income coming into this area and a larger number of people there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it was on this representation, on that type of representation that this was a multi-purpose project, a project that would be used for irrigation, for power and for the supply of water, that the opposition of the day and the hon. Mr. McDonald, the Leader of the Opposition then, spoke in favour of it and spoke to it as something that was of some great benefit. It is important to note that when he referred a little later on to the electricity this is what the words of Mr. Douglas were:

The second aspect, next to irrigation, of course, is the power aspect of the program.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is very clear that in 1958 that the leader of the government at that time, the leader of the party who now sit opposite, gave as a value of this project, irrigation as a number one value of this project. He stated that the second aspect next to irrigation, of course, is the power aspect of the program. It was a most important aspect of this program, namely irrigation. It is very interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that in the 1959 act when this was ratified that there were some very extraordinary powers given to the then government. The defining section of the project, and I am referring to chapter 100 of the Statutes of 1959, says:

Project means the South Saskatchewan River project, the works of which are described in the agreement.

And it is important to note that the agreement that I referred to a moment ago refers to the irrigation as part of the project. Then what does it go on to say a little later on under section 12? Just listen to this:

Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council the commission may, without the consent of the owner thereof or any person interested therein, enter upon and take possession of any lands or mines or minerals that in the opinion of the commission are necessary for the construction, maintenance and operation or protection of the project.

This is what was put into the act at that time. Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take up any more time of the house. All I am going to refer to is that when the second act came up before the house in 1959 — I am going to again quote the words of the then Premier — this is what he said on page 16. This is volume 26. He said:

This is a big undertaking particularly in view of the fact that it is a progressive program and under the agreement hon. members will notice that we are supposed to have a certain amount of land ready for irrigation, and supposed to have . . .

And listen to this:

. . . certain secondary reservoirs built and certain canals constructed, timed exactly with when the main reservoir will be completed.

And this is what he says:

**April 6, 1966**

There will be a good deal of timing with reference to the power installation.

There was no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that when he persuaded the people of Saskatchewan to accept this agreement, and the house to accept this agreement that he did so on the representation that the government would have land ready for irrigation within the time specified by the agreement. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the attitude taken by the opposition right now is most hypocritical. They are attempting now to confuse the people of Saskatchewan. They are trying to pretend that this is the side that is taking arbitrary measures when they laid the foundation for it. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that there is any doubt as to what was said in 1958 and what was again repeated in 1959. All we are doing here by the terms of this bill is to put into effect what was agreed upon between the government of Canada and the province of Saskatchewan. If you read section 11 and section 15, there is just no doubt about it. There is no effort in this bill to take away land from people. All it does is to take away that portion of the land that is required for the work, not for irrigation. This act does not necessarily have to go to the Broderick area, you must bear in mind, but with this particular act we could go to any area where the farmers will agree that, because of what has been said, this particular area has been recommended. So, Mr. Speaker, all this particular area has been recommended. So Mr. Speaker, all I want to say in conclusion is that anything that is being done by the government of the day is only being done to carry out in good faith that which was agreed upon by the opposition in the then government of Canada.

**Mr. Nollet:** Will the hon. member permit a question?

**Mr. Cuenaere:** — Provided it's a question and not a speech.

**Mr. Nollet:** I want him to read an excerpt from the agreement itself that says that the province must have a satisfactory irrigation policy to apply to the farmers and that they must have a certain acreage under irrigation by a given period of time.

**Mr. Cuenaere:** — First of all, Mr. Speaker, and secondly I have already read it. The section clearly indicates without any shadow of a doubt, just plain ordinary English, that within one year there must be 50,000 acres ready for irrigation . . .

**Mr. Nollet:** Read it. Read it. You're afraid to read it again. Must have works constructed for 50,000 acres.

**Mr. Cuenaere:** — It doesn't say that at all. It says, and I think it is very clear. It says:

Upon the transfer of the reservoir Saskatchewan will before the expiration of one year from the date on which the reservoir is filled to minimum irrigation level . . .

Now this is what it says:

. . . complete construction of the irrigation works to the extent necessary to provide full irrigation to not less than 50,000 acres of land.



It is plain, ordinary English and all this legislation does is to provide for this. And, furthermore, I want to tell the hon. member for Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) that when the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) replies to him in a few moments to close the debate, he will read some of the statements he made back in 1959 and he will look even sillier than the then Premier did.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I would draw the attention of the house to Hansard of April 1st, 1966, the member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) was speaking and moved an amendment. And on the next page, according to the records of *Hansard* — and I have no reason to consider that they are incorrect — apparently the member from Shellbrook (Mr. Cuelenaere) spoke and the debate was subsequently adjourned by the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) on that same day.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Ask the jury.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I don't know just what one does under the circumstances.

**Mr. Walker:** — Your Honour, the house does not give any consideration whatever to what the member says. This is of no interest at all.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, let me say that I don't think that would be the best thing in the world to do, but I draw this matter to the attention of the house in the interests of the correctness of the records. I leave it to the house as to what action they should take about it.

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — May I just say this, as I said before, I am just going to speak to the point, and I want to apologize. I spoke very briefly just before 5:30 and I was under the impression — and I say this with all sincerity — that I had spoken on the main motion, I made inquiries and I was verified that I had. If there is any error I certainly wish to apologize to the house. I did not wish to deliberately — I could have passed this material on to someone else.

**Mr. Nollet:** — I will certainly accept that. I was the only one that raised the objection. I stated at the time that I thought I was right but let him go ahead anyway. He did not do any good for his cause.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think the house is prepared to accept the explanation of the member.

Amendment negatived.

**Mr. Cuelenaere:** — If I had spoken before on the amendment, I would not be entitled to speak on the motion. I, now, repeat on the motion what I said the second time on the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I must draw the attention of the members to the fact that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate. If anybody wishes to speak he must do so now.

**April 6, 1966**

**Hon. D. McFarlane** (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I note in the comments which have been made the general agreement is, or there is general agreement that the South Saskatchewan River project should be proceeded with. The main questions which have arisen are concerned with which of the several alternative policies should be followed in implementing the program. I appreciate the concern which members have expressed in a number of areas. One of these concerns the extension powers conferred on the minister under this act, and I can assure the members that I feel that this is necessary during certain stages of the development of the project. There is general agreement that the government should build the main works and this is certainly what we are doing in this act. The minister needs the authority not only for this phase but also the flexibility in the powers to operate and maintain the works and to co-ordinate development activities in the early period to ensure a successful project. There does not seem to be any reasonable alternative to this. It is the intention of the government, however, to appoint a project manager and establish a district board as provided for in the act at an early date. You will note that the powers of the board closely parallel those of the minister except for the expropriation and the minister is empowered to make agreements with the board and to delegate most functions to it. This will be done progressively and as rapidly as circumstances permit it.

It is the intention also to set up a fully elected board when the project development reaches the stage stipulated in the act. I think this takes care of some of the objections raised by the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank).

Those who have suggested that the project should be developed in a similar fashion to the smaller projects built previously do not recognize the essential differences in the two situations. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it would not be practical to set up this project under those conditions. The small group projects built to date have a maximum of 5,000 acres; most of this acreage, of course, is on Crown land in the province. In contrast this is by far the largest project in the province and will necessitate an outlay of some \$8,000,000. The privately owned acreage in this project will greatly exceed the Crown land holdings.

Reference was made to the irrigation policy which still is in effect for the smaller group projects whereby the department provides operation and maintenance grants to the water users on a declining scale over a five-year period. The October 1964 interim irrigation policy on this project recognized the need for special assistance to the farmers converting to irrigation. Details of implementing the policy have been worked out using a ten-year development period as foreseen. I appreciate the comments of the opposition alternative methods of to go slow and of the rapid development policy. This is a matter which the government has considered very carefully, but I must point out, Mr. Speaker, that every economist who has looked into the matter has concluded that the more rapidly the farmer makes the adjustment to irrigation farming and develops his unit, the faster he reaches a viable income position. Further, for a number of people on the small units it opens up new possibilities for increasing the size of the farm business which is the basis to reaching adequate income levels. I am surprised at the change of attitude by the member for Cutknife (Mr. Nollet). When he was minister in charge of the policies to develop this irrigation, he only issued one policy statement. Now he is condemning us. He says we should go slow. When

he was Minister of Agriculture he issued the government policy statement of March 23rd, 1959, and what did he say? Under the section dealing with the need for rapid development of all irrigable land this is what he and his government had to say:

All the irrigable land in each block must be irrigated as soon as possible after the works are completed. Large and expensive main and secondary canals, pumping stations, extensive field distribution systems should not be built unless full use is made of them. The government believes that the development policy for this project must involve measures that will encourage the full irrigation of all irrigable lands within a relatively short period of time.

This was his policy in those days. Now he says we should abandon that and conduct a go-slow policy.

**Mr. Nollet:** — Nothing about compulsion.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Similarly, from the standpoint of the province there are important benefits in a rapid type of development. The earlier the benefits can be brought forward, the better their present value will compare with the significant financial outlays which have to be made initially. Industry is booming, not only in Saskatchewan, but in the Prairie Provinces as a whole. Expanding food production is once more an acceptable and desirable objective. There is growing opportunity and need for the area to meet its own specialized food production needs. Saskatchewan needs to take the initiative with positive programs to capture its share of the markets and not be satisfied to follow present production patterns alone. In some respects, Mr. Speaker, it may be already later than we think. Even with a fairly rapid development policy we will be well into the 1970s before we can attain significant levels for our production and markets in this specialized area.

Reference has been made previously to the establishment of a sugar factory when sufficient acreage develops. Industry may require it before we would have normally expected to be in a position to support a factory. The government recognizes that it will be necessary to provide a large influx of capital so that farmers may maintain adequate living standards in the transition period. The proposed act provides the legal framework for this. It will apply through an amplification of the irrigation policies. This envisages among other things, project operation and maintenance grants to the districts, the waiving of interest on certain types of loans especially for the development period, and other items are provided for in the legislation. The needs are recognized and the needs will be met.

The government feels that much has been accomplished in getting farmer support for the policy proposed, and is acquainting farmers in a preliminary way with the factors which need to be considered in making the transition to irrigation farming. The current extension program dates back to January of this past year. This past year, in spite of some of the statements made by the member for Cutknife (Mr. Nollet), during the past winter we had a series of ten meetings among different farm groups in the area. Their interest has been sustained and the attendance total for these series of meetings was about 300 persons. Note that these meetings were organized by the farmers concerned, with the department supplying the information on the request of making necessary arrangements with the farmer.

**April 6, 1966**

Industry, for example, covered the sprinkler irrigation representation. Even the industry was represented at these meetings. A broad range of subjects included soils, climate of the area, irrigated crop production, irrigation methods, and the farm management aspects of irrigation farming. The discussions have been increasingly free and fruitful as good faith in the department has increased. The farmers have expressed their appreciation for the program and a keen interest in repeating and intensifying this program during the coming winter. The success of the program, together with current changes which appear to be taking place in the area, auger well for increased local participation during next winter and, of course, this summer.

The summer extension program, Mr. Speaker, will be intensified with a full-time man being assigned to the farm management aspect. Some farmers in the south end plan to begin land levelling this year anticipating somewhat use in 1968. Instruction and development experience gained by the staff from provincial departments and from keeping in touch with Alberta and the United States developments will be valuable and utilized fully in the South Saskatchewan River Irrigation Development. I am confident that this together with the appropriate policies we are proposing will make the project a worthwhile undertaking both for the farms concerned and for the province.

One other reason, in some ways a compelling reason, a reason for applying the operation and maintenance charge on the schedule to irrigable lands is that in this act there are no measures for so-called speculation controls. These are controls to prevent people buying land and simply holding it against price increases in the future. This could be met presumably by not permitting sales unless they were approved by the minister or by the board. However we prefer to leave as much freedom as possible in the area and we think it is better to require some development than to undertake restrictive administrative requirements. Without these it would be possible for land companies or speculators to simply buy land and hold it, waiting for development of the rest of the project to enhance the prices in the area. In this connection I would re-emphasize the development period foreseen is a ten-year period. The interim policy statement envisages a schedule that would apply water rates on ten per cent of the irrigable land of 20 acres per year whichever, the ten per cent of the irrigable land acreage or 20 acres a year, is the greater.

A good deal has been said regarding the selection of the Broderick-Outlook area as the initial development area. All our studies, Mr. Speaker, point out that this area has a logical first choice for development. It is the largest single block of irrigable land in the whole project except of course for the Asquith area. It includes 37,500 acres irrigable not including the spring flood potential of an additional 2,000 acres in the Broderick marsh. Compared to this the Conquest area, another logical starting place, only comprises about 28,000 acres. To develop the Conquest area, Mr. Speaker, a pumping plant would also be necessary and the reservoir would have to be constructed in the Anerley Lake area at approximately \$4,500,000 in costs. The per acre cost of the Conquest area for the main works, we estimate is about \$100 an acre higher than in the Outlook-Broderick area. Finally, the decisive factor is the Saskatoon southeast water supply project. The pumping plant and the main canal to Broderick and the Broderick reservoir are common works which are required to serve either the Broderick-Outlook irrigation development or the SSEWS.

With very little modification they can serve both; on all

counts the Broderick-Outlook area is the logical place to start. I would just like to close, Mr. Speaker, in saying the legislation was introduced some three weeks ago. During that period of time we have invited the farmers in the Broderick area to come and meet with the cabinet to review the legislation. This they have done. On two other occasions they have come to the Department of Agriculture, met with the minister and the deputy minister and the officials in the department to discuss this project. This they have done as I said on two occasions. By virtue of the fact that we have given these people three weeks after the original act was brought in to present their case to us we feel that they have been dealt fairly with and I am sure they have respected this opportunity.

I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers in that area are not forced to sell their land. By virtue of the prices that the government is paying these farmers who wish to sell, they are in a position now to make the choice of selling out at a good price, or staying and irrigating. Mr. Speaker, all our policies are directed towards having the farmers stay in the area and irrigate and accept the benefits of irrigation. This I am sure most of them are going to be willing to do. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that many of the arguments put forth by the opposition during the course of this debate would simply be an about-face to the type of policy they were trying to put forth when they were in office.

I say, Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity, that the first policy statement came down in 1959. From 1959 to 1964 there was nothing done. This government has gone ahead, accepted its responsibility, and in a short period of two years has gone out and met with the farmers, discussed the irrigation phase with them, held meetings in their towns; and my predecessor, Senator McDonald, went and visited the farmers personally on their own land, and explained our project to them.

Mr. Speaker, I feel sure by virtue of the co-operation we are having from the farmers in that area, by virtue of the fact that we are setting up policies that will help them, that this will be a most successful project.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the assembly to move second reading of this bill.

**Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, would the minister tell us how many acres will be irrigated in the Broderick area for which works are going to be constructed?

**Mr. McFarlane:** — About 37,500 irrigable acres.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

### THIRD READINGS

**Hon. D. G. Steuart** (Minister of Public Health) moved third reading of Bill No. 96, **An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.**

**Mr. A. Thibault** (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, I must say at this time that I am very disappointed that on second reading the government would not meet the request of the people of St. Benedict. I received a telegram this morning from the overseer of St. Benedict regarding their relocation in the Watrous constituency.

**April 6, 1966**

The member for Humboldt should at least have had the courtesy to speak to his people first, but instead he chose to rudely eject them from his constituency, against their will.

It is quite understandable that the people of St. Benedict would sooner belong to Humboldt or Kinistino. I want to point out, as I said on second reading, that Humboldt is 38 miles from St. Benedict while Watrous is about 70 miles distant. If St. Benedict were placed in Kinistino their member would be only a few miles away. Should there be a change at the next election, seeing that the Liberal candidate is from Wakaw their member would then be only about 20 miles away. This would have added many Liberal votes to my constituency which would have worried me a bit, but I believe in meeting the wishes of the people.

The amendment would have been a minor one, just a movement of two miles. Taking in a few sections would have given good service to these people. Furthermore, they are along no. 20 highway. They have good connections with Humboldt and they have been thrown into Watrous. It's not a very polite way of doing things. They now have to travel about 70 miles and it's right out of their area of communication.

The thing that is very difficult to understand is that the member for Humboldt (Mr. Breker) did not even consult the people of St. Benedict about it. He chose to rudely eject them from his constituency without even consulting them. The first time they heard about it was when this bill appeared before the house. I hope that these people are not too disappointed. As a matter of fact I would have been very happy to have St. Benedict in the constituency of Kinistino, but be it as it may, we can't do anything about it. We'll accept your decision, but I am sure that when the election comes around, the people of St. Benedict will certainly let you know how they feel.

**Mr. H. A. Broten** (Watrous): — In this struggle I'm third choice.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Broten:** — but I must say that I do heartily welcome these people from St. Benedict into the constituency. I am sure that we can with the help of our friend from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) serve them real well. I am sure they will appreciate the effort that we will put forth.

The assembly recessed until 7:30 o'clock p.m.

**Mr. W. A. Walker** (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, prior to the Redistribution Bill of 1965, Hanley constituency had nearly 15,000 voters, about 6,000 more than the provincial average. In 1965, those parts of Saskatoon which had historically been a part of Hanley constituency were entirely removed, leaving only 5,500 eligible voters, which was the smallest constituency in the settled area of the province. It has by this bill been still further reduced in population. The only explanation which I can discover for this butchery is that the Liberals hope to convert a former CCF majority into a Liberal majority. It appears to me that, if everyone votes as they did in the last election in Hanley constituency, the Liberals have a paper majority of 159 votes in Hanley constituency. But Mr. Speaker, it won't help the Liberals. The people of Hanley constituency will not abdicate their right to choose their member for

themselves.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Walker:** — In this debate, Mr. Speaker, the government has crushed with its majority every suggestion and every amendment which has been made to this bill.

I think this bill is very poorly drawn up. It was hastily drawn up, rushed into this house on short notice, and is being pressed with insufficient time for proper consideration and for proper scrutiny.

I urge the government even at this late date to withdraw the bill in order that it be given more consideration and more study. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I will oppose third reading.

**Mr. M. Breker** (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from Kinistino asked me why I had not consulted with the Liberals in St. Benedict. Well, let me say that this might have been the policy of the NDP to discuss and plan their redistribution with their supporters, but this is not the policy of the Liberal government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Breker:** — We did this on a non-political basis, at least as far as my constituency was concerned. I hope for the good of the province. Just imagine the government going into St. Benedict, where three out of four people are Liberal and asking these people to what constituency would you like to belong. Just imagine! What about the people in Warman? They are going into the Watrous constituency. Practically all Liberals. Where would they like to go but to Humboldt?

I would like to comment on the remarks from both the members from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) and Watrous (Mr. Broten).

**Mr. D. G. MacLennan** (Last Mountain): — Hardly worth the time.

**Mr. Breker:** — Oh, they are worth the time all right. There must be four of them. Two couldn't be that stupid.

I will continue to look after their needs for the next two years as I have in the past. It is indeed my honour to have the people of the town of St. Benedict place the Humboldt constituency as they first choice as admitted by the other two members. This is truly my loss, this having St. Benedict in Watrous constituency. St. Benedict from a religious point of view and from a nationality point of view, and from a trading point of view belongs to the Humboldt constituency and to Humboldt alone. You're very right, St. Benedict should be in the Humboldt constituency. The government informs me that this is an attempt to equalize the population of both of the constituency . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Breker:** — I'm not getting as much money as Red Skelton but I'm getting as many laughs.

**April 6, 1966**

Watrous has 6,500; Humboldt has 9,500. Net result: Watrous, 7,000; Humboldt, 9,000. The only way to equalize these two is for Watrous to come right down and take the whole of Humboldt.

**Mr. F. A. Dewhurst** (Wadena): — How about Wadena?

**Mr. Breker:** — Wadena? The Humboldt constituency without Humboldt would be called the Muenster constituency or the Annaheim constituency. Mr. Speaker, if I were in the village of St. Benedict I would press for paved streets down their main street, water and sewer which they haven't got because everybody has got a price.

**An Hon. Member:** — What kind of member did they have?

**Mr. Breker:** — What kind of member? Well, I don't know. Not bad. Not bad. I'm biased, of course. I would suggest that the people in that area are in the driver's seat. Now, the hon. member from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) states that people from St. Benedict should be asked. Just imagine! I wonder if they went out and asked the people when they did snips, and cuts, and joggled. I wonder if they went out and asked. Pardon?

**An Hon. Member:** — And jiggled.

**Mr. Breker:** — Oh, and they jiggled. They jiggled the whole works.

Mr. Speaker, in the next two years I will continue to serve the people in the town of St. Benedict as I have in the past, as I said before. And I can assure them that no. 20 will be built in 1968. Incidentally, even the Liberals back in 1944 were going to build a road into St. Brieux and then for 20 years the CCF were going to do it, and now we have it. We are going to take in that grid road right through Kinistino constituency. Something you have never been able to do. And who knows, if the oil keeps coming out of the ground we might find enough to oil that road. These people will never be written off as far as I am concerned. Who knows that when we do a snip and a cut and a haggle job we may get them back into the Humboldt constituency — two, three, four years, I don't know.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A. Thibault** (Kinistino): — Would the member permit a question?

**Mr. Breker:** — We will have a question and answer period on Easter Monday, Art.

**Mr. Thibault:** — Well, the people I was referring to — I want to correct a statement — were from the town of St. Benedict. It is the overseer that the telegram came from and not the Liberals from St. Benedict. It was not the Liberals I was referring to. I want to correct a statement but in fact, Mr. Speaker, four out of five on the St. Benedict Town Council are Liberals.

**An Hon. Member:** — They were but they got their eyes opened. They are like the kittens.



Motion agreed to and bill read the third time.

## RESOLUTIONS

### MOTION RE RE-ARRANGEMENT OF HOURS

**Hon. D. G. Steuart**, (Minister of Public Health) moved, seconded by Mr. B. H. Bjarnason (Kelvington):

That the adjournment of the assembly do not take place this day at 10:00 o'clock p.m. as fixed by the Order of the assembly, dated March 29th, 1966; and that, notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 2, and the Order of the Assembly, dated March 29th, 1966, the assembly shall on April 7th, 1966, meet at 9:00 o'clock a.m. and there shall be a recess from 12:30 o'clock p.m. until 2:00 o'clock p.m.

Motion agreed to.

## SECOND READINGS

### ADJOURNED DEBATES

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Davies that Bill No. 102, **An Act to amend The City Act** be now read a second time.

**Mr. H. H. Baker** (Regina East): — Mr. Speaker, I didn't know it was coming up tonight. I thought it was being left for tomorrow. But I am sorry that I had to leave the house yesterday when it came up for discussion. I assure the minister in charge I didn't run away from it. The Minister of Highways (Mr. Grant) and I had the privilege of turning the sod for a fine project in the city of Regina at 3:00 o'clock. It was something that we had set to do and as I say I had to take leave for a while from the house.

I appreciate being given the opportunity to be able to say a few words on it. They will be very few. From the remarks of the minister I guess there is every indication that the bill will be not passed. I want to say in regard to the project — I believe he also said it was my pet project — I want to assure him that it was passed by city council in Regina unanimously. I am associated with the project and am very proud to be associated with it. It wasn't mine. It was a sort of joint discussion we have had. We passed it and took it to SUMA. SUMA passed it with the direction that it should be discussed with the government and this legislature this year in the hopes that it would be put through. It is permissive legislation. It is not mandatory in any council. The city councils can put it through if they want to or not, and I had hoped that the government would accept this in good faith. It is not mine. It's brought in by one of the aldermen who couldn't go to Moose Jaw to discuss it. He is quite ill at the present time. We are thinking of other people on council. We have a man that has served something like 20 years in the city of Regina who was honoured at the Urban Municipal Convention, Alderman Wilkie, who is up in his senior years. I think in view of the services rendered it would certainly be nice if a man like that could get \$60 or \$75 a month. As far as I am personally concerned it doesn't affect me one bit because I have a deferred pension plan paid up. I have a private one I carry and I am doing this because I think it is right. The MLAs have a pension plan which was brought in

**April 6, 1966**

some years ago and I certainly agree with it. I certainly agree that all men in public life should have the same opposition.

Municipal government is getting to be a heavy responsibility, particularly in cities like Regina and Saskatoon. They get \$2,400 a year. The time isn't very far off when this will have to be much higher. In line with that, I advocated last year that even the sessional indemnity here was particularly much too low for rural members. I had hoped that the government this year would do something thereto.

But I believe that this is fair legislation. It is not forcing anybody. I was just making a rough calculation last night in regard to the Regina City Council. The monies that would be contributed by those there now would take care of any pensions for many years to come without any city contributions. It is not going to affect our budget at this time and I fail to see the reason why it is being held up. I wouldn't have brought this in, in fact I had asked the minister some time ago if he would bring it in when the City Act was under discussion. He suggested to me — "Why don't you move a house amendment?" Well, not too long before that he said it would have to be passed by SUMA before he would consider it. Well, SUMA did pass it and this is why I am pressing for it. If they had not passed it we would certainly have not put the bill before you. I think, I'm sure that a good many on the other side feel as I do, and many on this side feel that this should be passed this session. It takes some time to get something like this into operation. A lot of study goes into it to have it set up properly for years in the future. I am very surprised that the minister spoke against it. I don't know if he is in the house, I don't see him there. I thought that, watching his actions when he first took over, we were going to have a man of action. I had given him quite a good plug in the house here when he took over, I thought the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) made a good choice. I am beginning to wonder now whether he is beginning to get afraid of his own shadow.

But anyway I am not trying to get nasty over this at all. I think it is wrong if the government turns it down. I don't understand the thinking of the minister. When the city manager proposal was turned down by SUMA last year, yet it was brought in this year and passed. Here we have a suggested amendment that was passed by SUMA and I think the government should pass it at this session. I am not going to belabour it any more. I assume it is going to be thrown out. I assure you I will not bring it in next year. If it isn't passed this session, I doubt if it will ever get here again. So I suppose we can say that we will have to wait until the CCF government is in office to put it into force. If an election is called this year, that will be in 1967.

I want to conclude that I would hope that the government would reconsider this matter. If it was mandatory I would certainly go along with them that it should be given further study. Permissive, and if you wanted to add an amendment subject to the approval of the minister in charge, this still gives the authority to the department. I think this could easily be done and hurt no one here. It would be of benefit to men who are elected to public life and entice other good men to come into public life so that they have some little security, because when you get into public life, you and I know that there are many hazards that you are confronted with. You may be here or there, and you may not be. These are some small compensations for this sort of work, some security for people in this house and people who are elected to local governments.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the government on the other side would reconsider and pass this unanimously.

**Hon. D. G. Stuart** (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McIsaac) indicated, we are going to oppose this bill. We are not saying necessarily that we are opposed to a principle of a pension plan for people, elected officials in municipal life but I think this is the very principle the Saskatchewan Urban municipal Association considered this last year. They turned it down. They considered it this year and they accepted it. The municipal conference is very old. It was sort of rushed from the conference in Moose Jaw. Then a piece of legislation was drafted and brought before this house in the last two or three days.

Now, I don't think it's a good principle that we would take an act like this and with this much haste, enact it into legislation. The SUMA organization for which I have a great deal of regard, I was a member of it for many years, passed many resolutions. The government every year sits down with them as they sit down with the SARM and the other organizations, and they discuss the resolutions that they pass. Some are implemented. Some are not implemented. I think that this particular resolution should be discussed with the cabinet. A caucus should have a chance to discuss it just as sure as the caucus opposite would want a chance to discuss it. If SUMA still feels this way when they meet us in the fall, it will be given every consideration. I don't say it will be brought in. I don't say it will be passed but certainly it will be considered. This is the reason we are opposing it. Not because we are necessarily opposed to the principle but because we don't think this is a good way to legislate.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I must draw the attention of the members to the fact that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate. If anybody wishes to speak he must do so now.

**Mr. W. S. Lloyd** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say . . .

**Mr. Stuart:** — On a point of order, I don't want to be technical but I think you have lost your chance to speak.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — All right, Mr. Speaker, you are right.

**Mr. Speaker** — It seemed to me that the member adjourned the debate, didn't he?

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Yes, the member from Prince Albert (Mr. Stuart) is, on this point, correct, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — If the member adjourned the debate and didn't avail himself of the opportunity of speaking when the debate was reopened, or resumed, he still has the opportunity to continue his remarks if he wishes.

**April 6, 1966**

**Mr. Lloyd:** — It may well be that the member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) was still right in spite of the rules of the house, Mr. Speaker.

I wanted to make a very few comments. First of all, there was some suggestion from the words of the minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) that this particular measure was one of which our group was not aware and to which we are not giving it support or which we would need more time to consider it before we gave it our support. I just wanted to assure the government that, if that is the reason for not passing the bill, then we can remove that one because this measure has been discussed by ourselves and it does have the support of those of us in this particular group.

Secondly, I say that it comes passing strange and more, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that a reason for not passing a bill with about three lines in it is that it is introduced late in the session. We have today passed a bill as important as the amendments with respect to constituency boundaries. We were told of the contents of the bill in detail on Tuesday and on Wednesday we have passed it. It seems to me that that cannot be accepted as any argument for not proceeding with the bill, which the minister says is good in principle.

Motion negatived.

## **SECOND READINGS**

**Hon. D. V. Heald,** (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 57, **An Act to amend The Statute Law.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, certain amendments to the Statute law Amendment Act become necessary as a result of the passing of the Time Bill by the legislature. I think the details can best be considered in committee but I would like to say a few words about what we are proposing to do in these amendments. When I get to the references to the Election Act I should tell the house that there will be amendments, house amendments introduced because the amendments with reference to the Election Act as they are presently constituted are not right. Anyway, what this act will do is to repeal a reference in the Interpretation Act to Mountain Standard Time and in its place will be provided that references to time will be to time under the Time Act, 1966.

Now, then Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other enactments of this legislature of this province where there are references to time. What we are doing in this act, in these amendments, is to delete the references to a particular time, whether it be Mountain Standard or Central Standard and saying that time shall be time within the meaning of the Time Act. There is the Land Titles Act; there is the Court Officials Act; there's the City Act; Town Act; Village Act; School Act; Weekly Half Holiday Act; Legal Profession Act; the Factories Act and the Bills and Sale Act.

Now, that leaves two other references. The first reference I would like to mention briefly is the references in the Election Act. As I say we will be introducing amendments in committee to provide that references to elections, that is provincial elections will be Central Standard Time, 9 a.m. to 7 p.m. which won't change anything. That will be the same as it is now. Of course, if an area is on Mountain Standard Time it will be 8 a.m. to 6 p.m.

We also propose that the times for polls in hospitals and sanatoria shall be 8 a.m. until 12 noon; and 2 p.m. to 6 p.m. This is Mountain Standard Time. It will be 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. Central Standard Time; 3 p.m. to 7 p.m. Central Standard Time. The references to advanced polls will be 7 p.m. to 10 p.m. Central Standard Time on Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Monday, and, of course, 3 p.m. to 10 p.m. on the Saturday immediately preceding the polling day. So this isn't any change.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no reference specifically exempt from these changes to municipalities as covered under the Rural Municipalities Act. The R.M. Act is not amended. References to Mountain Standard Time in that act remain effective. Provision is made in the Time Act but nothing in the Time Act applies to references to time in a rural municipality relating to the holding of an election or the taking of a vote, in respect to municipal matters. Mr. Speaker, the reason why it was felt advisable not to make the Time Act apply to rural municipalities and elections in rural municipalities was because the boundaries under the Time Act are school units, and they do not coincide with the boundaries of rural municipalities. So you could have got a situation in a municipal election where you might be operating in two time zones so we deleted any reference under the Time Act. It does not apply to rural municipalities in elections in rural municipalities. This will remain the same and it will still be Mountain Standard Time.

With that short explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would beg leave of the assembly to move second reading. As I say, the details and the application to each particular act can best be dealt with in committee.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

On the motion of the Hon. Mr. Steuart, the assembly adjourned at 11:28 o'clock p.m.