

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session – Twelfth Legislature
6th Day

Thursday, February 16, 1956

The House met at 2.30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day:

AGREEMENT FOR PRODUCTION OF MAGNESIUM

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural & Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I think members of the House would be interested in learning that an agreement has been entered into with the Potash Company of America for the production of magnesium from 100,000 acres in the Quill Lake area. It is the first agreement of this type to be made in the history of the province and, as far as that is concerned, I think it is the first attempt that has ever been made to do this type of mining for magnesium.

The agreement is for a period of 10 years and during this time the Company will carry on a study of the various aspects of the mining and sale of magnesium, and will conduct any other work that may be necessary to determine the feasibility of establishing a magnesium industry in the province.

Magnesium salts were discovered when Potash Company of America was prospecting for potash in this area. After passing through a thin section of potash and some common salt, the drill encountered a substantial thickness of Carmelite; this is a compound of potassium chloride (commonly called potash) and magnesium chloride. Analysis has also indicated that this mixture contains about two pounds of bromine per ton of ore. A great deal of investigation is necessary before such an operation can be undertaken. Many of the problems are of a technical nature such as mining, methods of recovery and processing. More immediate is the problem of markets for magnesium in quantities large enough to make the venture a complete success.

Canadian production of metallic magnesium has been estimated at 6,000 tons annually, all of which is recovered from a magnesium-bearing limestone. World production is about 140,000 tons of which about 53 per cent is for civilian use and the remainder for defence purposes. Much of it is presently recovered from sea water. Magnesium is the lightest of all metals available in quantities large enough for structural use. It is only two-thirds the weight of aluminium and because of its good strength-to-weight ratio it finds many such uses. The major portion is used in the aircraft industry; the automotive industry is using increasing amounts each year. Volkswagen alone, the largest single civilian user of magnesium metal, used over 7, 000 tons for automotive parts in 1954. Because of their exceptional properties at elevated temperatures, alloys of magnesium are used in jet engines. Additions of as little as one-tenth of one per cent magnesium will change cast iron to the equivalent of malleable iron. Over one million pounds of magnesium

are used for this purpose each year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, magnesium is really the wonder metal of this age. It is very strong and exceptionally light, and this is an exceptionally interesting piece of work that the company has undertaken.

RADIO TIME

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the House the suggested arrangements for the division of radio time of the debates on the Speech from the Throne.

From the suggestion that has been made to us, Mr. Speaker, if we follow the same pattern as other years, I find that, in the first two weeks of the debate, there will be approximately eighteen speakers who will have an opportunity to speak on this debate from the Government side of the House on radio time; there will be the opportunity for approximately four Liberal speakers. I suggest to you, in all fairness, Sir, that it is not a very fair division of time. It seems to me that there are a good number of people in Saskatchewan who listen to the Legislative broadcasts, and I believe that the Opposition should have a far greater share of the radio time. This is the only opportunity we have to criticize some Government legislation and policies and to put our thoughts before the public.

I note that, this year, the broadcasts will cost somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$10,000, and that is paid by all the taxpayers of this province. And I note from election returns of the past that there is a good percentage of these people who are in opposition to the present Government, and I believe they should have the opportunity of listening to the arguments that are presented, from this side of the House, over the radio, just as well as they should have the opportunity of listening to the arguments that are presented by Government members. I would suggest to you, Sir, that if we are going to run this debate into airtime at this moment, it should be delayed and we should have an opportunity to discuss it in this House at some later date.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that if we want to discuss it, the Committee of which Your Honour is the Chairman could bring its report back into the House, and then we would have the opportunity of discussing the report.

I want to point out that it is not a fair comparison to talk about the number of speakers who will be permitted. It is the amount of time which they will use. One of my hon. friends may want to take the entire hour and a quarter; whereas we put on three speakers in an hour and a quarter some days. You cannot compare speakers. You have to compare the total amount of time. I am informed by those who are on the Committee that the division of time is, roughly, on the basis of three to one. Usually in most matters concerning the Legislative Assembly or Parliament, the basis of division is the representation in the House, which, in this case, would be, roughly, four to one. But we have agreed on three to one. Actually, on the minutes, I

understand there are 185 minutes for the Opposition and 550 minutes for the Government side, which is giving the Opposition a little better than three to one.

I quite agreed with my hon. friend that if there should be a discussion on it, the time to discuss it is to have the Committee bring its report to the House and we can discuss it then.

Mr. A. Loptson (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention something that has been drawn to my attention and that is the arrangement in the division of the time. They are allotting the Opposition the first 35 minutes of the house and a quarter, and the speaker is going to be shut off right there, whereas if he does not avail himself of that time, then he is out. I think you will notice that the Opposition has the latter part of the air time in one instance —

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think the suggestion of the Premier is correct. If you want to discuss this matter it will have to take place when the Committee report comes in.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Wednesday, February 15, 1956, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Brown (Last Mountain) for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. J. Walter Erb (Milestone): — I should like first of all, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. R. Brown) the mover of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, and the seconder, the hon. member for Kinistino (Mr. Begrand) on the excellent contributions that marked the opening of this debate.

Their speeches, born out of long experience and keen observation, marked a degree of maturity which has made them valued members of this Legislature, and, I am sure, highly esteemed representatives of their respective constituency which they so ably serve. I am confident too, that they will continue to serve the people of their constituencies in this Legislature for many years to come.

The Speech from the Throne again, as in the past, has ably pointed out the objectives which we shall pursue. That these objectives will be achieved is eminently demonstrated by the ever-expanding economy of Saskatchewan as a result of sound and judicious planning which has characterized the C.C.F. Government during its tenure of office.

The Speech from the Throne each year, as long as this administration has been in office, has invariably met with disfavour by the Opposition and 'The Leader-Post', but the people of this province know, Mr. Speaker, that every Speech from the Throne has been accurate documentation of those policies followed by the C.C.F. Government which have bettered, and will continue to enrich, the social and economic life of the citizens of Saskatchewan.

February 16, 1956

The year that has just recently ended will enter history as a memorable one indeed; the year of Saskatchewan's Golden Jubilee. It is my belief that no people anywhere have ever entered into the spirit that such an occasion presents as did the people of Saskatchewan. I also believe that such was the case was not a matter of accident, or a sort of mass psychology, but rather the characteristics of the people of Saskatchewan – that binding moral and spiritual quality of our pioneers that has become our inherent heritage. And it is that quality that finds its expression in the friendliness and hospitality and good neighbourliness of our people – and their co-operation. So, throughout the summer of our Golden Jubilee, wherever one went, one would see people of a community of different races, religions and political persuasions, all united in a common effort to pay tribute to our pioneers and to celebrate the momentous occasion of Saskatchewan's 50th Anniversary.

The colourful and ingenious parades of vehicles, implements and machines that were the pride and joy of yesteryear; the costumes worn in pioneer days, preserved throughout the years with infinite care; the establishment of temporarily created museums that displayed innumerable items that were part of the lives of our early pioneers; the sparkling pageantry of it all, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, will remain a treasured memory of those golden days.

It was also an occasion for thanksgiving to Almighty God for all his loving kindness bestowed upon this province through the years, and also an occasion to be thankful for one of the most bountiful harvest that we had experienced in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, no other province in Canada is as dependent upon agriculture as is Saskatchewan. It is therefore, unfortunate and regrettable that the label of 'surplus' should be applied to our bountiful harvest, when all authorities of the world are agreed that two-thirds of the world's peoples are without sufficient food. And in view of the fact that Saskatchewan, which produces the finest wheat in the world – a wheat that is required to raise the milling standards of other wheat of other lands – should lie in storage and in many cases be allowed to deteriorate is, I say, an indictment against the Federal Government, which is responsible for the marketing of this commodity.

I am certain that if the average western farmer were in a relatively good cash position, the wheat surplus would not have become the major concern that it is. Indeed, the farmers would have had a cash reserve had they been receiving their fair share of the national income during these past few years. The reason they have no cash reserve after having produced five of the largest crops in history, and having marketed more wheat in that five-year period, is an indication that they have been producing vast quantities of wheat below the cost of production. The unassailable fact is that western farmers, although their bins are full of wheat, are short of cash. The Prime Minister of Canada, the Rt. Hon. Mr. C.D. Howe, Mr. Gardiner, and all their western political stooges from Roy C. Merler down, can talk all they like about how well off the farmers are; the facts remain unchanged.

Much has been said in the controversy between bank loans on wheat stored on the farm and cash advances by the Wheat Board, and I assure

you, Mr. Speaker, that a great deal more will be said. I have spoken to hundreds of farmers throughout Milestone constituency and elsewhere, and I have yet to meet one, regardless of his political persuasion, who is in favour of bank loans, and I am confident that every member in this Legislature finds the same sentiment in his constituency. I want to tell the hon. Leader of the Opposition that he is going to require more than his stirrup pump to put out the fire of indignation aroused in the farmers as a result of the bank loan legislation; legislation which, incidentally, he, the Liberal Party and 'The Leader-Post' so slavishly support.

The farmers, of the three prairie provinces, and the three governments thereof, with one voice insist on a system of cash advances by the Wheat Board. The C.C.F. Government, the C.C.F. Members of Parliament, and members of this Legislature have constantly pressed the Federal Government for legislation empowering the Wheat Board to make cash advances as the only real, practical and just method of easing the farmers' financial position when surpluses accumulate.

Even as far back as 1942 the hon. Premier of this province, as P.M. for the constituency of Weyburn, moved a motion in the House of Commons asking for just such legislation. But the Rt. Hon. C.D. Howe, with the power of a Nikita Krushchev, has constantly opposed and berated a system of cash advances. He has tried to put forth many arguments why cash advances are not practical. At one time Mr. Howe argued that he would not want to place the grain-buyer in the position of a banker. The grain-buyer, incidentally, is an agent of the Wheat Board. He did not want to put him in this difficult position. But, Mr. Speaker, he has made the grain-buyer now a collector of the bank instead and, I am sure, Mr. Howe's solicitude for the grain-buyer will forever disqualify him from honourable mention by these gentlemen.

In another instance, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Howe said this: "One danger in making wheat advances was that after the farmers received cash advances from the Wheat Board, they would sell their wheat to other farmers, as is permitted by the marketing legislation, and then the Wheat Board would have no way of getting its money back. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what experience has the Rt. Hon. C.D. Howe had with farmers that he presumes to call into question the integrity even of the few farmers to whom he refers. I would say that Mr. Howe's opinion of the integrity of the farmer is a pretty crusty and presumptuous one, indeed.

At another point, Mr. Howe put forth the argument that cash advances would destroy the Wheat Board. As a matter of fact, he charged the Winnipeg 'Free Press' and 'The National Post' with leading the drive for advances in order to do just that. And we all know, Mr. Gardiner echoing Mr. Howe at a public meeting at Dysart in Saskatchewan last fall, warned the farmers that they should not pass resolutions because that might destroy the Wheat Board. Mr. Speaker, if the so-called antics of Bulganin and Krushchev, on their tour of India, as related by the press, were supposed to make these two Russians look like a couple of clowns, the people here weren't too impressed, having such a classic example right here in Canada.

I ask, Mr. Speaker: how could a system of cash advances destroy the Wheat Board? That is a question Mr. Howe and Mr. Gardiner have

February 16, 1956

never explained. I am sure western farmers would like to have an explanation of the various theoretical disintegrating processes that would take place towards the destruction of the Wheat Board as a result of cash advances. Well, what is the explanation? Surely it is not the inability of the grain-buyer to administer a system of cash advances upon authorization to do so! I personally, have always found the grain-buyers quite capable of conducting the business operations of their elevators. Surely it is not that the farmers are dishonest, as Mr. Howe fears! I believe farmers as a group are among our finest and most honourable citizens.

Apparently, Mr. Howe did not convince himself by these arguments, because he put forth another recently in the House of Commons, and that one, Mr. Speaker, was really a gem! Mr. Howe warned the Commons that if the Government introduced a system of cash advances through the Wheat Board, the members of the Wheat Board would resign – they would be out of office in a matter of a few days. We have been subjected to a lot of nonsensical excuses and evasions by the Liberal Federal Government at Ottawa, but this last statement by the Rt. Hon. C.D. Howe would win on Oscar for sheer and utter humbug!

Since when do public officials engaged by the Federal Government determine legislation? Since when do these public officials by their alleged threats of resignation, deter and apparently supersede the authority of a responsible Minister of the Crown, and finally Parliament itself? The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, they don't; and that is why the statement by the Rt. Hon. C.D. Howe, Minister of Trade and Commerce, is not only irresponsible but downright stupid.

The foremost proponent of a system of orderly marketing of our wheat and, tied to it a system of cash advances through the Wheat Board, has been the C.C.F. Party. It was only after a long struggle that we achieved the Wheat Board from a reluctant Federal Government. So therefore, in commenting upon the charges by the Liberals that the C.C.F. are out to destroy the Wheat Board, one can only conclude that such fantasies arise out of a complete disregard for the truth of the situation. The Liberal Government has rarely gone along on their own steam, Mr. Speaker. They have had to be pushed more frequently than not, and it is for that reason that they have such an aversion for responsibility.

I think that accounts to a great degree, for the rejection of a system of cash advances through the Wheat Board by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The implications of cash advances are quite obvious to Mr. Howe. It would mean a drastic re-appraisal of the present Federal Wheat Marketing policy, which, of necessity, would imply the acceptance by the Government of a policy whereby payment for Canadian wheat would not be limited to Canadian or American dollars as it is at the present time.

The Federal Government is not disposed to change its marketing policy by accepting soft currencies or barter in payment for Canadian wheat, or making direct gifts thereof to areas where the situation warrants. They have again, as in the demand for cash advances, put forth their nebulous arguments why it can't be done.

I think that Mr. Howe's review of the Canadian economy last fall, as reported in the press, was quite revealing as to the place of importance prairie agriculture holds in his thinking. He spoke in glowing terms of Canada's industrial expansion of export markets for raw and finished materials. He noted that the national product of Canada had increased to \$26,400,000,000 from \$24 billion. He envisaged even a more prosperous 1956 for industry in Canada.

Now I want to say here, Mr. Speaker, that we are all very gratified that such is the case. But Mr. Howe's remarks on prairie agriculture were limited to a line or two. He said that we "had experienced a little difficulty in marketing wheat". Not a word of concern about what the inability to market wheat has meant to the Saskatchewan economy. Not a word to indicate that the Federal Government would give serious consideration to the problems that have beset agriculture in these last few years. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Howe had taken a panoramic view of the Canadian economy through his industrial knothole, and what he beheld was an industrial boom, and that was sufficient for his dissertation on the welfare of the economy of this country.

It would appear that the Federal Government, in view of the expanding industrial economy, the expanding markets, the high level of employment and the steady increase in the national product, is not too concerned about the problems of agriculture; that agriculture no longer constitutes that significant fundamental part of our national economy.

In contrast to such an attitude I was interested in what President Eisenhower had to say about the agricultural problems in the United States which compare much more favourably than ours. Mr. Eisenhower says this: "President Eisenhower said, Thursday, he will open a stepped-up attack on the deep-seated problems plaguing United States agriculture. He urged Congress to place the farmers' plight above and beyond politics. 'Too much is at stake', he said, adding that: 'No group is more fundamental to our national life than our farmers'".

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the problems besetting agriculture go beyond the demand for cash advances and storage payments. These are measures for the immediate emergency of the farmers' plight, and ought to be given immediate and effective attention. The option by the Federal Government whereby they will assume the storage costs on 212 million bushels of wheat is a step in the right direction, but that is only a fragmentary part of the solution to the real problem. The indisputable fact is that agriculture is in a crisis, not only here in the west, but all across the Dominion. It has been caught in a price-cost squeeze with all the implications of economic disaster. This has been a trend since the removal of price controls by the Federal Government in 1946, so that, as a result of ever-increasing costs of production, coupled with the steadily declining prices and markets for agricultural commodities, farmers find themselves in an economic position comparable to that of the late 1930's and even worse.

According to the 'Economic Annalist', an official publication by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, taking the base period 1935 to 1939, prices of agricultural commodities are indicated to be equal to 100. For the

February 16, 1956

same period, farmers' costs of production were also equal to 100. What is the picture today? Again, according to the 'Economic Annalist', the latest index for prices of agricultural commodities is 225; but the index for farmers' costs of production has increased to where it now stands at 241.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, these statistics unmistakably point out that the farmer is receiving less money for his products than it costs to produce them. It bears out the fact, too, that while the agricultural population makes up 20 per cent of the total population of this country, they receive less than six per cent of the national income. That is the situation with agriculture. Loss of markets, piling up of surpluses, falling prices of farm products, rising costs of production with steadily declining farm income – a cost-price squeeze that has relegated the farmers to an economic position comparable to the late 1930's and even worse.

Mr. Loptson: — And now, what are you going to do about it?

Mr. Erb: — And yet, Mr. Speaker, our friends in the Opposition complain bitterly and cry that we raise federal issues in and out of this House.

Mr. Danielson: — But what are you going to do about it?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Erb: — I contend that agriculture is a matter of the first magnitude, and I want to assure my friends in the Opposition that this Government and all members on this side of the House shall continue to keep the problems besetting agriculture before the Federal Government. We shall continue to support the orderly marketing of grain through the Wheat Board. We shall resist any attempt, brazen or subtle, by those who would seek to destroy it.

Mr. McDonald: — A change in your attitude?

Mr. Erb: — We shall continue to press the Federal Government for legislation making cash advances a permanent feature of the Wheat Board. We shall continue to fight for an aggressive and realistic wheat marketing policy that would take into account the acceptance of foreign currency for wheat, direct gifts thereof, and where the situation warrants, barter. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the barter arrangement should not present any difficulties to the Federal Government, Mr. Gardiner having brilliantly worked out the mechanics thereof. What a boon for a lonely-heart bachelor-farmer, Mr. Speaker, upon whom Cupid has failed to smile! His may now be unlimited, happy contemplation – 1,000 bushels of wheat for a wife! Or 2,000 bushels of wheat for two wives!

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we shall continue to fight for a new deal for the agricultural industry of Canada. We shall not rest nor be deterred by temporary palliatives until we have realized for the farmers an agricultural policy that will provide them with a fair return for their products and labour, and a continuing measure of social and economic security.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it ought to be the duty of every member of this Legislature, in the interests of his constituency and Saskatchewan as a whole, to speak forthrightly on those matters of federal jurisdiction which involve the social and economic welfare of Saskatchewan.

One need only consider the 'Green Book' proposals of the Federal Government arising out of the Dominion-Provincial Conference of 1945 to have ample scope, without being arbitrary, to remind the Federal Government of those matters for which they have accepted responsibility, and about which they have done so very little, indeed.

Mr. Danielson: — What about the 'Regina Manifesto'? It's a green book!

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Erb: — Whenever the hon. member from Arm River is at a loss as to what to say, he drags in the 'Regina Manifesto'.

Premier Douglas: — It's the only thing he remembers!

Mr. Erb: — If it serves only one purpose, it serves as a wonderful medium behind which the member for Arm River hides. For example, I will list a few of those things for which they have accepted responsibility:

1. A public works programme which would envisage the building of the South Saskatchewan dam in co-operation with the province, of which you heard the Premier speak yesterday.
2. Unemployment insurance.
3. Proposals for stabilizing the agricultural industry by preventing violent fluctuations in prices and providing a greater degree of stability in farm income, and so on, Mr. Speaker.

Again and again the Liberal Opposition and their political organ, 'The Leader-Post', have come to the defence of the Federal Government's indefensible position by saying that, in order to distract attention from the failures of the C.C.F. Government, we raise Federal issues. That may be good shadow-boxing, but it is definitely poor politics!

Mr. Danielson: — What are you reading from?

Mr. Erb: — At least I can read! There is an old proverb, Mr. Speaker, which says: "Not failure, but low aim is crime." I would suggest to my hon. friends of the Opposition that they begin to raise their sights.

But alas! Mr. Speaker, our friends of the Opposition and the editor of 'The Leader-Post' got lost among the ruins of the shoe factory and tannery many years ago and they are still lost there, groping about.

Mr. Danielson: — The ruins are still there, too!

Mr. Erb: — And with their vision obscured by their political twilight, they have failed to see the dawn of the new day in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Cameron: — Still beyond the hill.

Mr. Erb: — Mr. Speaker, far from distracting attention, we have caught the imagination of people everywhere. For, indeed, the eyes of the world are upon Saskatchewan – not upon any failures that might have been, but upon the outstanding and remarkable achievements of the first Democratic-Socialist Government on the North American continent.

And it is with unending amazement that, here in the northwest part of this continent, a frontier province formed only 39 years before this Government took office in 1944, a province not rich in the accepted standards of wealth, with only one economy, agriculture; a province the hardest hit of any by the grinding depression; a province handicapped by inept Liberal administration – debt-ridden, barren and broke; yet in a few short years under a C.C.F. administration, should write into North American history a new social and economic order, is a monumental achievement of the 20th century.

To mention just a few of the progressive acts of the C.C.F. Government:

1. The first and finest Hospital Services Plan on the continent.
2. The first free Cancer treatment and control programme, ranking in clinical staff and equipment with the finest in the world.
3. A free mental hygiene programme and, according to the world's most eminent psychiatrist, "the finest programme anywhere and the envy of the entire civilized world."
4. The first air ambulance on the continent, having since its inauguration on February 3, 1946 to January 31, 1956, flown 2,351,783 miles with 17,729 hours of flying time, and having carried 7,444 patients, and whose exploits have become almost legendary throughout the continent.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is highly noteworthy to mention that in the 10 years of air ambulance operations, flying under hazardous conditions, not one major accident has occurred, and all patients have been carried safely, and without the slightest injury. This admirable record is, I am sure, a great tribute to the ability, the great consciousness for public safety and the devotion to duty of Mr. Donald Campbell, Supervisor of the Air Ambulance, to his excellent staff of nurses, pilots and flight engineers; and it is to them, Mr. Speaker, that we express our gratitude.

5. The Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office owned by and operated for the people of Saskatchewan, saving themselves millions of dollars through low-cost insurance premiums.
6. A social welfare programme that provides, among other things, nursing homes for the aged; complete free hospital, medical, optical and dental care for old-age pensioners; Mothers' Allowances, and child welfare.
7. A Bill of Rights.
8. The Farm Security Act.
9. Vastly expanded agricultural services.
10. The Saskatchewan Power Corporation with a capitalization of \$95 million, that has undertaken a rural electrification programme which, by the end of 1956, will have brought power to 40,000 farms and all towns and villages.
11. A new deal for the rural municipalities since 1944, cancelling over \$70 million in relief and seed grain debts; a new system of equalized grants; the assuming by the Government of what amounts to about 80 per cent of the social aid in the municipality; return to the municipality of the 2 per cent Public Revenue Tax, amounting to \$1,600,000; a \$50 million – 12,000 mile main market road grid with the Government assuming half the cost.

As I stated earlier, Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of the outstanding and progressive acts by the C.C.F. Government. There are many more equally important, but to have made all these services available to the people of Saskatchewan, with a budget that is much less than one-half that of Alberta or British Columbia, Ontario or Quebec, and at the same time to have reduced our debt from \$177 million in 1944 to \$79 million in 1954, with further reductions in 1955, is a shining tribute to the integrity, resourcefulness and ability of the C.C.F. administration.

Already, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan are enjoying more social and economic benefits than the people of our neighbouring provinces. But this is only the beginning. Until recently, Saskatchewan was considered only an agricultural province, but the picture is changing very, very rapidly today, as a result of the unfolding of Saskatchewan's vast timber, mineral, oil and gas resources; and wealth that is already being reflected in the welfare of the people of Saskatchewan. Timber stands in such proportions that will support at least four pulp mills. Uranium deposits greater than any on this continent, and rivalling those of the Belgian Congo, with several uranium mines already in production – mineral whose vast potentialities will bring about a second industrial revolution of the world, and a new concept of living. Base metals, zinc, copper, iron, lead and gold on the pre-Cambrian

February 16, 1956

shield, spread over an area of 82 million acres, with seven mines in operation and 12 new ones being developed, foreshadows one of the greatest mining industries on the earth. The large potash deposits on the North American continent, taking in an area that extends from the Alberta border to the Manitoba line. Already it is estimated that the initial production potential of our potash is valued at \$20 million annually – the source of fertilizer, potash, that will have unlimited markets the world over. A crude oil production that has grown from a mere trickle in 1945 to 12 million barrels in 1955, with 1700 wells capable of production. Natural gas from 131 wells in such quantities that already this premium fuel is being carried to the people of Saskatchewan, in homes and industries.

Mr. Speaker, I have indicated here very briefly, the immense production potential of our resources. They are being developed rapidly, and they will continue to be developed under a C.C.F. Government in the years that lie ahead. The various industries that have located in Saskatchewan have spent hundreds of millions of dollars. They are going to invest millions upon millions more, because the industries in Saskatchewan are here to stay. Just how credulous and naïve do the Opposition and their political press, ‘The Leader-Post’, think the industrialists are, to be frightened away by their concoctions of prejudice and fear?

In spite of all the whining and whimpering, and crocodile tears of the Opposition and ‘The Leader-Post’ to the effect that industry will not come to Saskatchewan as long as we have a C.C.F. administration here; in spite of all the trips that the hon. Leader of the Opposition wishes to make to the east, crying about the imaginary armada of boats that Saskatchewan has missed – in short, in spite of everything the Opposition and ‘The Leader-Post’ try to do to the contrary, industries will continue to come into Saskatchewan in ever-increasing numbers to build, to develop and to expand with complete confidence and trust in the integrity of the C.C.F. administration.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that no other province in Canada can look to such a brilliant future as Saskatchewan. On these fertile prairie plains we produce 60 per cent of all the wheat in Canada, and, which is more, the finest wheat in the world. We are capable of carrying on a livestock and diversified agricultural economy greater than any other province in Canada. In short, our agricultural assets and potentials are tremendous. Our vast oil, gas and mineral resources, awakened from their long, prehistoric sleep, are surging from the bosom of the earth to mark the drawn of a great industrial era in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it would be presumptuous pride to predict that during the course of the last half of this century, Saskatchewan will have become one of the wealthiest, if not the wealthiest, provinces in this Dominion. And that this will be the case is not a matter of chance. No, Mr. Speaker. Progress does not just ‘happen’; it comes rather as a result of dedication to an ideal, faith and courage to venture, the ability to plan, and a great capacity for work. That characterized our pioneers; it characterizes this Government!

When the C.C.F. Government took office 12 years ago they faced a tremendous challenge. That challenge constituted, in a way, St. Paul’s summing

up of faith: "The substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things unseen."

I say, Mr. Speaker, the faith which the people of Saskatchewan have reposed in this Government has made evident the substance of things hoped for – a new economic and social order of humanitarian programmes, promised on the divine injunction that the rich should help the poor and that the strong ought to help the weak.

The people of Saskatchewan know, by the performance of this Government during the past 12 years, that the affairs of this province are in good and capable hands, and that under this administration they have, indeed, become heirs of a prospering province, and shareholders in the great destiny of Saskatchewan.

I am persuaded that the people of this province, when called upon to do so, will again, overwhelmingly, give a mandate to the C.C.F. Government in whom they have learned to have such abiding faith and trust. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the motion.

Mr. W.H. Wahl (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — I would like to congratulate the previous speakers and say I enjoyed listening to their opinions. As you know, I represent the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, and it is my responsibility to present their problems to this Assembly.

Qu'Appelle-Wolseley is a strictly agricultural constituency, and many of the oldest farming districts in Saskatchewan are situated within its borders. The towns, villages and hamlets are there because they are necessary to serve the farmer who lives within the borders of this constituency. The few exceptions to this rule are the tourist business justly enjoyed by the town of Fort Qu'Appelle; the Dominion Experimental and Forestry Farm situated in Indian Head, and the homes for the infirm at Wolseley, where they serve over 100 guests. The other exception is the \$5 million Inter-Provincial pumping station situated at Glenavon, and this is on the Inter-Provincial Pipeline that pumps oil from Edmonton to Sarnia, and also picks up oil in Saskatchewan and Manitoba. Now this installation at Glenavon, the taxes that come from this station and the pipeline, certainly supplement the budgets of the municipalities concerned and the Regina East School Unit, and the personnel at that station are a welcome addition to that community.

I said that I wished to present some pressing problems of the people of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, and the first is that the average farmer has not had a decent pay cheque in over two years, and 85 per cent of the farmers owe money they cannot pay. Considerable amounts of this money are owed to the local businessmen and the co-ops and they cannot afford to carry this credit on their books. That places these people in a financial position from which they have no defence.

Now why does the farmer owe this money, Mr. Speaker? Well, I am going to say this: because optimistic statements by Federal Government

February 16, 1956

Ministers in the last seven years have lead them to believe that they could continue to spend and borrow money for things they needed without getting into financial trouble. So the people who have given them this advice are to blame.

What is the solution? The solution is not the \$1,500 bank loan. In speaking to many Bank managers, they tell me the farmers should be paying his bills and not borrowing more money.

I am going to tell you a story to illustrate what the farmer must do if he is going to get the attention of the Federal Government, and this story concerns a farmer who bought a mule to pull his plow. This was a very kind-hearted farmer, and when he got the mule home he discovered that the mule would not work. No matter how he tried to persuade this mule he still stood still, and paid no attention to the farmer. So the neighbour, noticing his neighbour's plight, came over and suggested that he get a mule trainer to teach this mule to work. So the farmer procured the services of a mule trainer, and the mule trainer came and he tried to persuade the mule to go to work; but the mule paid no attention to him. So he grabbed a neck yoke that was lying there and hit the mule over the head and knocked him down. The farmer rushed over and said, "Surely that's not how you train a mule?" And the mule trainer said, "No, that's not how you train a mule; I am merely trying to get the mule's attention."

Now before the farmer can present his plight to the Federal Government, he must have Mr. Gardiner's attention, and he can't get it by hitting him over the head with a neck yoke. He has got to use other methods, and I am going to suggest a method. We are told that there is going to be a provincial election this summer. By every farmer and every businessman and everyone else that is connected with the farmer getting out and voting C.C.F., Mr. Gardiner will understand that language, and you will get his attention; you'll get some action.

Mr. Danielson: — Where did you get that information?

Mr. Wahl: — Before I leave this subject of a decent pay cheque for the farmer, I am going to suggest the kind of money I am talking about, and it is not 10 cent wheat payment, but at least \$1,000 immediately to the smallest farmer and from there on up.

The other night on 'Citizen's Forum' which is conducted by the Canadian Association for Adult Education and is a television programme, they were discussing "Are we a Christian Country?" I was particularly interested in a part of their discussion which had to do with our responsibility as citizens to Christ's injunction to 'Love Your Neighbour'. Now, the group decided that the average Canadian is now more conscious of the troubles of the unfortunate people than ever before and is willing to try to do something about it. In fact, the simple explanation is they are concerned about social justice. I am going to present some evidence this afternoon to show that this is true in some parts of the country.

Jim Hayes, who is the staff reporter for the 'Daily Tribune' a Winnipeg paper, wrote a series of articles which were printed on the front pages of that paper, and I am going to read from the first article. This is

about Grand Marais, Manitoba. This is what he says:

“They call this place ‘Paradise’ in summer and ‘Purgatory’ in winter. Fifty miles northeast of Winnipeg the woodlands echo with the happy laughter of holiday-makers all summer long. In the winter, the woods are quiet hiding the desperate economic plight of the Metis families.”

I am going to continue with the next article, which was January 14, 1956, and the title of it is, “Where Race Bias Rules”, and this is what it says:

“Invisible but solid, a wall of indifference and contempt divides the community of Grand Marais socially, just as the CNR track splits it geographically.

“On the west side of the track are the homes of the white permanent residents, mostly retired couples from Winnipeg, and the summer cottages of economically-secure city-dwellers.

“On the east side lies ‘the settlement’ – a group of small, poor homes occupied by about 100 Metis families.”

And this is how the white person sees it:

“The white residents largely view the people of the ‘settlement’ as shiftless, irresponsible and alcoholic.”

Very fortunately for the Metis people in this community, the Catholic priest has a different view, and this is what he says, and I agree with him:

“Lazy? Would you call a man lazy when he goes out on the lake as these men do for long hours pulling in nets to make a living? Would you say a man is lazy when he works in the bush as hard as many of these men do?

“No, they’re not lazy – most of them. They don’t get a chance to live proper lives. There is no work. Their average income is probably only \$50 a month and no one can support a family on that.

“Hardly a family has enough comfort. They have been exploited for years. They have been paid terrible wages. When they are no longer needed as workers, they are thrown aside and forgotten.

“Excessive drinking, he agreed, is one of the major problems. ‘They do drink too much, but what else have they to do? They drink to escape the conditions in which they find themselves.’”

February 16, 1956

“He also blamed depressed living standards for what he called a ‘lack of basic morality’ among the Metis people of Grand Marais.

“Common-law relationships were almost the practice rather than the exception, he said. Many of the children were illegitimate. The young people had frequent scrapes with the law. Few of any denomination attended church.

“It’s not that they’re evil,’ he said. ‘They’re ignorant. Nothing is done to raise their standards. No one cares about them.’”

I would like to congratulate this staff writer and the ‘Daily Tribune’ for printing this on the front page of their paper, because they have got some action. The Welfare Council of Greater Winnipeg is investigating the conditions of that particular Metis settlement and all the settlements in Manitoba, and evidently there are many of them according to this article. And they have brought this to the attention of the Social Welfare Department of the Manitoba Provincial Government, and they have promised some action.

Now, further evidence that people are being more conscious of social justice is an article that appeared in the ‘Calgary Herald’. This was a series of articles, on September 17, 19, 20 and 21, 1955 and they were by their staff writer Jack Deakin. These concerned Indian reserves in Northern Alberta, and before I go on to read these photostatic copies of the ‘Calgary Herald’ editorials, I am going to say that the Indians are ‘wards’ of the Federal Government. And, this is what they say:

“POVERTY, FILTH THEIR LOT”

“NORTHERN INDIAN WELCOMES DEATH”

“Chronic poverty, virtual starvation, disease and squalor, these are the lot of the northern Alberta Indian. For many, death is merciful release from the misery of life.

The Indians have the choice of remaining on unproductive reservations of the district or wandering thousands of square miles of territory, once rich hunting grounds and now made virtually barren by the advance of civilization.”

I am just going to read briefly from the description of the picture on the next page, and that says:

“Shocking plight of North Indians is indicated by this mother of nine children, with her young baby, beside the mud-chinked log hut.”

The next one, and I will read the description under the picture:

“One of the many victims of privation on the reserves, this 12-year-old boy is riddled with tuberculosis. He was brought into hospital at Fort Vermillion a few days before the picture was taken. He will spend from six months to a year in hospital and then what? Back to the reserve and later to hospital again. That’s the life of Indian children.”

As I said before, these are the responsibility of the Federal Government, and the only comment on this was a denial that I read in the ‘Winnipeg Tribune’ when the Department of Indian Affairs claims “this is not true”; but I think this is the evidence.

Now, something hopeful came out of these articles. The fourth one says “INDIANS ENVIOUS OF GOVERNMENT-HELPED METIS NEIGHBOURS”, and according to this article evidently the Alberta Government are trying to do something for the Metis people in Alberta, and they are to be commended for this.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to take you back to a town that you are familiar with, and that is the beautiful summer-resort town of Fort Qu’Appelle. I have a copy of a disgraceful thing that happened there last year, and this has to do with, on June 19, 1955 a girl aged six years of age on the Piapot reserve who was sick and was diagnosed as a diphtheria case and was treated in the Isolation Ward of the Regina General Hospital. Later on two cases of diphtheria were reported to the Region on August 8, when Dorothy and Margaret Desjournlais, aged 9 and 10, of Sintaluta, contracted the disease, following attendance of many families at a summer school. Thirty-nine families were quarantined, 82 throat and nose swabs taken, 37 cases referred to family doctors for antitoxin administration. At special immunization clinics in Indian Head and Sintaluta booster doses for diphtheria were given to 301 persons, and I want to commend the Regina East Rural Health Region for the work that they did in administering this antitoxin to these people so that they would not be subject to catching diphtheria. The reason they claim that they weren’t inoculated before was because the parents had failed to bring them in to the Health Clinics.

But, in the case of the Department of Indian Affairs, it is a different story, because in December, three fatal cases of diphtheria were reported from the Piapot Indian Reserve; two of these died in Fort Qu’Appelle Indian Hospital, and the third in a snowmobile during transportation to the Hospital from the Reserve. The fatalities were Margaret, aged 4, Allan, aged 5, and Ellen Theresa, 23 months; and I am going to spell the name because I don’t speak the Indian language, Kaistwtum, all members of one family. And, the reason I want this inscribed on the records is because Indians are known to the Department of Indian Affairs by numbers, and when they die, they merely stroke the number off.

Now if, when this first case of diphtheria was brought to the attention of the Department of Indian Affairs on June 19th, they had taken the proper precautions, these three children would not have died. When I say what I am going to say, I am rather ashamed to say that, unlike the ‘Calgary Herald’ and the ‘Winnipeg Tribune’, the ‘Leader-Post’ failed to

February 16, 1956

report this, so people would be aware of this disgraceful situation. Now whether it was on account of their political affiliations, or whether it was because they cater to special interest rather than public welfare, I don't know; but there is no doubt about it, that if this had originally been reported, public indignation would have caused these three children to be inoculated and they would not have died. I am told by doctors that diphtheria breeds very rapidly in overcrowded living conditions that exist on all Indian Reserves.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, in the time allotted to me, I have presented two problems that have to do with Qu'Appelle-Wolseley constituency, but nevertheless the first problem is the same problem that exists in all three of the prairie provinces, namely the farmer has no money, and the other problem is more widespread. It not only exists in Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan, but in British Columbia and Ontario also; and I say that in this age we can no longer ignore these conditions. Something must be done about them.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the Government on the Throne Speech vote.

Mrs. J.E. Cooper (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the previous speakers in congratulating the mover and seconder of the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne for their very excellent addresses. I would also like to add to what the Premier said, and to what the previous speaker said, in congratulating the Jubilee Committee and the Government and the people of the province, for the magnificent success they made of our Jubilee year.

It certainly is a year that will long be remembered by the people of this province for a great many reasons. But to me, the best thing about the Jubilee year was the many things of permanent value that were left in its wake: community halls, community rinks, picnic grounds, homes that were built for older people, the senior citizens and the pioneers. That was an excellent Jubilee project. And the, Mr. Speaker, the cultural life of this province was greatly and permanently enriched. Historic sites were marked that lend colour and interest and that feeling that all past is prologue, and we are all part of a very great tradition.

And then, almost every community has written its own history, and they have that preserved and in fact we have a very fine new provincial history, and Earl Drake of Regina has written a very colourful history of the city of Regina. The history of this province now, Mr. Speaker, is more thoroughly recorded than the history of any province in Canada.

Then when it comes to literature, we have Dr. King's anthology "Saskatchewan Harvest" which has collected for us the very best in Saskatchewan prose and poetry.

Then we have songs and a film about Saskatchewan, plays written by Saskatchewan people, and in the process, Mr. Speaker, we found out and discovered a great deal of very real talent in this province that we didn't even know existed. And we have the Saskatchewan Arts Board, a creation of the

C.C.F. Government, to thank for the wonderful job they did in searching out and bringing out Saskatchewan talent. I think that it was a very splendid thing. Man cannot live by bread alone, and it is this sort of thing that enriches the spirit and makes this province grow in stature and in vision.

Now, Mr. Speaker, not the least of these Jubilee projects was the Provincial Museum, built as a tribute to our pioneers and opened in May by His Excellency the Governor General of Canada. Since this Museum was opened in May, there have been over 150,000 people visit the museum; there have been over 5,000 children taken through the galleries on lecture tours, and they have seen very many educational and interesting natural history films – and not only city children, but rural school children have been brought in; and this is all a very valuable thing. Right now, by the way, there is a very interesting handicraft exhibit of representative Saskatchewan handicrafts, which you should see if you possibly can. Many cultural organizations are using the auditorium. It is filling a very great need, and is used almost every day for some cultural organization.

I think that what the Museum means to this province of ours was put so very beautifully and with such sympathetic understanding, by His Excellency the Governor General when he visited here, that I would like to quote just a little bit from what he said, and I quote:

“This afternoon it is our special privilege, and pride, to think of the founders of this free community. We remember with thoughtfulness and respect the founders who knew little of freedom in the material sense, but subjected themselves to the hard discipline of privation and labour. They did this in faith that they could lay the foundations of a great and a prosperous, and a free society, which would summon men and women from older parts of Canada and from other lands to come and call it their home.

“They built well, and today I am happy to join those who salute them in gratitude for their vision and their courage and their toil.

“I was greatly impressed when I heard that Saskatchewan, with all the celebrations, and parties and plays, and picnics, had seen fit to build a Museum in this Jubilee year. I do not believe that there is any better way to mark a Jubilee in an enduring manner. The anniversary year will pass, but the Museum will remain as a tangible and abiding memorial of the achievements marked by this season of rejoicing.”

The Governor General said he had the hardest admiration for museums, and again I quote:

“In a new country, museums are more important than in an old one. As a young people we need these retreats which invite us to study the meditations from which emerge clearer ideas for action, with purposes more matured and better designed.”

February 16, 1956

A very wonderful expression of opinion about our Museum.

And then, also, Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter from a resident of Vancouver, Dr. Daniel McKellan. I want to read just a little bit of what he said:

“While in Regina on a recent visit, it was my very good fortune to visit your museum, an experience long to be remembered.

“Regina and the province of Saskatchewan are to be congratulated on such a marvellous collection. You have not aped nor copied anyone else. It is typically Saskatchewan.

“I was particularly impressed with the work of the taxidermist. The animals and the birds are so life-like that you almost expect them to go into action. The whooping crane has been much in the news of late, but how many have actually seen one, unless they have visited the museum in Regina. These animals and birds are placed as nearly as possible in their natural habitats which must have required a tremendous amount of thought and work. The work of the artists have painted the background so skilfully that it is difficult to tell where the foreground and the background meet. The descriptions alongside each cage add much to the enjoyment and the education.

“A most interesting collection and you are only getting started. Your museum is a tourist attraction of the first order. Tell them about it, and keeping on telling them about it.”

And this, Mr. Speaker, is what I think we should be doing. I think we should tell in our constituency, “When you come to Regina, do not miss seeing the museum.” Now, I say, I think this is what we all should be doing; but unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I have been reading press reports by the Leader of the Opposition and other Opposition speakers, deriding remarks, sarcastic, derogatory remarks, saying we should have spent the money on roads, calling it a place for ‘stuffed jack-rabbits’ – things like this that show absolutely no understanding, no appreciation of the purpose and value of a museum.

Unfortunately this is the kind of criticism we have to put up with from our opponents, sometimes, on the other side of the House. In so many ways the Liberals have been selling this province short. While the Premier of this province and the members of this Government have been travelling the length and breadth of this country, and the Premier far beyond the breath of this country, trying to build up faith in Saskatchewan and encourage industry to come into this province, these calamity howlers, these prophets of gloom over here in the Opposition, what have they been doing? Going around crying, “No industries coming into the province.” In fact, trying to suggest to industries that they must not come into this province while we have a C.C.F. Government in power. Mr. Speaker, if we had to wait until there was a Liberal Government in power before industry came into this province, it would be a pretty poor outlook for our province.

And by the way, when we start talking about the business and industry that we have, I hear mumblings and grumblings from across the way there, that these things that we are saying are just propaganda, or we wrote the articles ourselves. Well, I have something here, Mr. Speaker, which I don't think either the Leader of the Opposition or any of the other members will say is our propaganda. It is written by an organization that has never been noted as being a 'fan' of this Government, or praising it too often, and it is headed "THE ECONOMY BULGING AT THE SEAMS."

"The economy of Regina and southern Saskatchewan is bulging at the seams", Alex Aitken, Manager of the Chamber of Commerce, told the members at an annual banquet at the Legion Auditorium on Saturday.

"Regina in particular has been enjoying a high level of prosperity", he said, "and business has stayed very active."

He gave these reasons:

"Money has been pouring into the province from oil and natural gas developments, and outside investment in new manufacturing. This has done much to relieve the employment situation in the province, where opportunities for farm employment have almost disappeared."

And this comes from Mr. Alex Aitken, head of the Chamber of Commerce.

We do get some rather amazing statements sometimes from Liberal speakers, and I have another example here that I would like to point out to you. This is from a press report of the opening session of the annual meeting of the Liberal Provincial Council, from 'The Leader-Post' of Wednesday, November 9, 1955:

"Walter Tucker charged the C.C.F. with manipulating the thinking of the people so as to undermine faith in Opposition leadership."

He said:

"They sought expert advice on the psychology of this insidious method and gave great attention to this matter in Saskatchewan."

"The C.C.F. had done this against him when he was Leader, and he warned the delegates to be on your guard against these tactics, and Mr. McDonald not to expose himself to these tactics."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that was news to me, and I think it was news to the hon. Premier; but you know it is an idea that I think the Liberals could well think about. One thing I am sure, no one would ever accuse either Mr. Walter Tucker or the Liberal Party in this province of having any psychologists on their staff, and if they did, I am quite sure that you would find that they would have been well warned not even to give a hint that they

were going to do away with our Automobile Insurance. Also, they would be told that they consistently under-estimate the intelligence of the people of this province. The people are not blind. They know what is going on around about them and when the Liberals go up and down making promises that would cost this province many thousands of dollars, people are apt to get out a pencil and paper and do a little bit of adding, and immediately start speculating on what new taxes the Liberals are going to impose. They tried this before, and I can assure them I don't think it will work again, this time.

Coming now to the Speech from the Throne, I was very delighted to find that we are to get a Women's gaol. It is something that I have been advocating for a long time, and it is something the women's organizations have been asking for. It will not only make the situation better for the women prisoners, but it will give much-needed space for the men prisoners in the Prince Albert gaol, and I would like to thank the Government for including that in this year's projects.

I am also most enthusiastic, Mr. Speaker, about the fact that we are to have a new Provincial Technical Institute. This province is becoming very rapidly industrialized, and we do need skilled technicians of all kinds, master carpenters, skilled electricians, people who can take supervisory jobs, and so on. Up to now there has been no school in Saskatchewan where this kind of advanced training could be obtained, and very often people for these top supervisory positions have had to be imported into Saskatchewan from other provinces, and Saskatchewan young people have lost out.

We have very excellent facilities at the University for students who graduate from our high schools and collegiates and wish to enter professions, and we also have a loan fund if they need financial help. But the facilities have been very limited for students who wish to enter the various skilled trades. After a student finishes technical school, he either had to enter a long apprenticeship or he has to go to other provinces to continue his education. The number of students under any circumstances who can complete a university course is very limited, and it is a very small percentage of the number of students who graduate from grade twelve. I think it is only fair that technical students should have an even a break as we can give them in the matter of higher education. And so I do welcome very much the new Technical Institute as forecast in the Speech from the Throne, and there is no doubt, of course, that Regina is the logical place for the Technical Institute. We have the largest population here from which to recruit students and the employment opportunities are certainly much greater in Regina than any other centre.

Speaking of higher educations brings me to a matter which has interested the people of Regina very greatly, and that is the question of a degree course in Arts for Regina College. The Leader of the Opposition criticized the Government, in his speech, because we don't have a degree course in Regina College Art, and recently, one or two very vocal individuals belonging to the Liberal Party – Regina citizens – have made some criticisms of the three Regina M.L.A.s because we haven't said much on this subject, and they say we should be put on the spot and that sort of thing.

Speaking for myself, Mr. Speaker, I have purposely refrained from making any public statements on this matter for this reason; and I think, Mr. Speaker, it is a good and a logical reason.

I feel that the matter of an Arts degree course for Regina College is primarily a matter for discussion between the Senate and the Board of Governors and the groups that are sponsoring the degree course for Regina College.

What the Government has been asked to do is, in effect, to over-rule a decision of the governing body of the University. The University Act was set up many years ago so that the conduct and the policy of the University is vested in the Senate and the Board of Governors. This was done for the express purpose of keeping university affairs completely free from politics, and I think every member of this Legislature will agree that that is a very wise provision.

We pride ourselves in Canada that we do keep our universities completely free from political control, and I feel that it would be a very great tragedy if this matter of Regina College becomes a political football. It will be a disservice to Regina College, a disservice to the University of Saskatchewan, and a disservice to the cause of education in this province.

But, Mr. Speaker, that I have made no public statements on this matter is no sign that I haven't taken an active interest in it. All of my life I have been tied up in one way or another with education, and naturally, I would like to see the courses at Regina College extended as much as is economically and physically possible; and I have thought in my own mind sometimes, that the Board of Governors might consider trying out at least a second year in Arts, to see how it works out. But, I have been interested; I have followed the matter, and I have attended every meeting where this matter was discussed. I have studied every brief that has been presented with the greatest of care. I have interviewed the principals and the vice-principals of every Regina Collegiate to find their opinions and also to get an idea of how many young people they felt would be available if there was an Arts Course. I talked to the Dean of Regina College; I went to the University of Saskatchewan and talked to the Dean of Arts and Sciences. I have compiled information from other provinces to find out how many of their universities, which are not provincial universities, and not on the main campus, receive aid from the provinces and the extent of that aid. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have compiled a very sizable file on this matter of an Arts Course for Regina College, and I have always been willing, and I still am willing, and would be very glad to discuss this matter with the Citizens' Committee, or any other group that is interested in the matter.

There is just one more thing that I would like to say before I leave this subject, and it is that Regina is well represented on the governing bodies of the University. It is represented by men with ability, men with integrity, and men who are seriously concerned and have shown over the years that they are seriously interested in education, and no thinking person would ever deny this fact. Certainly there are men who are vitally interested in the welfare of Regina you people. Now, of course, it is always possible that they could be wrong, but I would like to point out that the Senate is an elected body, or at least the majority of the Senate is an elected body, or else

February 16, 1956

the representatives are appointed by interested provincial organizations, and it seems to me that if any citizen or any group of citizens feels that they are wrong in their decisions, then the remedy lies in changing the personnel of the governing body of the University. This, to my way of thinking, is a much more intelligent, much better approach, than asking the Government to interfere in the conduct and the management of our University.

Coming back to the Speech from the Throne, I was very pleased to see that the Government is going to continue what it has already started, and do a major job of remodelling and modernizing the Mental Hospital at Weyburn. This problem of caring for the mentally ill is a very difficult problem, and it presents a lot of difficulties in many ways., These large institutions which we have for the mentally ill, when they were built, their purpose was mainly custodial, and there was very little understanding that mental illness could be cured. Since that time there has been a revolution in the care of the mentally ill. We have new drugs, and new methods of treatment, and a great many of these mentally ill people are being returned to live a normal life. But, unfortunately, the type of buildings which we inherited were not meant to take care of these modern concepts, and we find ourselves with a good deal of difficulty; but there is too much money tied up in these institutions to discard them, so we have to make them just as comfortable and as suitable as we possibly can.

Overcrowding is still the number one problem in our mental hospitals, not only in Saskatchewan. This is true all over the Dominion of Canada, but our Government has been steadily trying to reduce this in a variety of ways. The new Training School in Moose Jaw was a major step; the new T.B. unit was another excellent step. We now have a new nurses' residence which has made things much better for the nurses, as well as giving them some additional space, and the trend in nursing homes is going to help a great deal by being able to take some of the older people who are not really mental patients. We now have a very excellent 45-bed psychiatric ward at the University Hospital, which has increased our facilities for acute care of the mentally ill, and which provides a very good opportunity for doctors and nurses to study mental illness, and gives a chance for post-graduate work for psychiatrists. The increase in provincial spending for our mentally ill, since 1950 alone, has been 46.4 per cent and Saskatchewan, of course, provides free care for the mentally ill, and we have what is recognized all over Canada as the best staff training programme in the Dominion. I think, Mr. Speaker, we can honestly say that our programme for the mentally ill is second to none in this Dominion of Canada. But, Mr. Speaker, while there is reason for a great deal of pride in what has been accomplished, there is still no reason for complacency until we can completely deal with this matter of overcrowding.

The Canadian Mental Health Association should be commended for the excellent job they are doing in keeping the needs of the mentally ill before the people of this province, and they point out that, in spite of all we have done, there is still 75 per cent overcrowding in our mental hospitals, and if we are to do the kind of job that modern concepts of the care of the mentally ill call for, we will have to deal with this matter as quickly as we can.

They suggest that we should have three or four smaller mental institutions, about 300-bed institutions, at places like Prince Albert, Saskatoon, Yorkton or Swift Current, near the communities where the people live, so their relatives can come and visit them. I don't know whether this is the best answer, but to me it sounds very reasonable, and I think it should get a good deal of consideration. As long as we have overcrowding, of course, it makes the situation difficult for the staff, it makes it difficult to keep good staff, and, of course, it works a hardship on the patients. I do earnestly hope that when the Government finds itself financially able to construct any new buildings, the first one to be announced will be a new Mental Hospital.

While I am on this subject, I would like also to pay tribute to the voluntary visitors committee, who visit the hospitals rain or shine every two weeks. They are under the leadership of Mrs. R.J. Davidson, who is a pioneer in the field, and they are doing a wonderful job which is appreciated more than I can say by the patients, and certainly is appreciated by the Government.

I also was very much concerned when I discovered that the Federal Government is planning to exclude mental hospitals, and T.B. sanatoriums from the proposals that it made to the provinces for the hospitalization in the Health Insurance Plan. Now, Mr. Speaker, half the beds in Canada are occupied by people who are mentally ill – and why this discrimination? I can see no difference in the needs of the mentally ill and the physically ill. I thought Dr. McKerracher put it awfully well recently when he said: “The only difference between mental illness and physical illness is purely a matter of geography.” That is, whether the illness strikes the heart, or the limbs or the nerve centres that control the brain, it is just a matter of pure chance; and any Federal Health Insurance Plan that excludes the mentally ill, that is half the hospital beds in this country, is not a comprehensive Health Insurance Plan at all to my way of thinking. I do know what the result will be if the provinces are getting half the cost for their general hospitals and virtually nothing for their mental hospitals – the mental hospitals are going to have a pretty poor show, and I feel very badly about it and I was very pleased to see that our own Minister of Health took a strong stand in trying to persuade the Federal Government to include the mental hospitals in the hospitalization plan.

There is one more aspect in the field of social welfare that I would like to call to the attention of this Legislature, and that is the problem that is caused by a rapidly aging population, and it is a problem that Canadians have been slow at facing. We look on Canada as a young country, populated by young people, but this is no longer altogether true. At the turn of the century one out of 13 of our population was 65 years of age or over, and life expectancy was 49 years. Today one out of eight is 65 years of age or over, and life expectancy has risen to 65, and by 1971 (15 years from now) it is anticipated that one out of six will be 65 years of age or over, and life expectancy will continue to rise. Medical science, less strenuous physical labour, and many things have caused this, and these are things we have reason to be proud of and we are grateful for; but this chancing factor in our economy, I believe, needs to be assessed more realistically than it has in the past,

because what is happening is that as the age span lengthens at one end and the years of attendance at school lengthen at the other – that is young people are much older before they enter employment – the burden of the money to care for both groups, the old and the young, is falling on a relatively smaller group, and this will be a much smaller group yet. So it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that in any social security programme for older people, this fact must be borne in mind, and I think it shows that we need a two-fold programme for old age security: First, to meet the immediate physical needs – to prevent suffering and to provide at least a decent minimum adequate standard of living; second, and just as important, a long-term programme to make a more permanent basis for the usefulness and the happiness and the independence of our older people.

Good social welfare practice always aims at making people more self-reliant and more independent, and no social security programme can be a permanent answer to the problem of age unless it bears this fact in mind. Saskatchewan has made considerable strides in the past 10 years in answering the first of these two things, namely, looking after the physical welfare, and a brief review of our programme I think will bear this out. Saskatchewan pays its share, of course, of the old-age assistance pensions to almost 5,000 needy pensioners at a cost to the province alone of \$1,500,000; and in addition, for this group we provide free hospitalization which cost the province, last year, \$273,000, or an average of \$53 a person. Then for the group over 70, we, in this province, have supplementary allowance and, since the increases last year, we expect that to cost us approximately \$1 million a year. But even more important to this group, I believe, is the fact that we provide free health care – hospital, medical, dental, optical and 80 per cent of their drugs. Now the cost of this, last year, for medical care was \$718,000; for hospital care, \$1,747,000, or an average of \$123 a person; so that total care for those over 70, supplementary allowances and health care came to \$2,466,000.

In connection with this last group, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out two things. The Federal Government agreed to accept the responsibility for pensions for this group and we are paying 2 per cent of our taxable income, up to a maximum of \$60, to the Federal Government to look after this, and the responsibility for adequate pensions for people over 70 certainly rests with Ottawa. But seeing they have not assumed it, Saskatchewan has stepped into the breach with supplementary allowances. I would also like to say to our Liberal friends, who are sometimes critical and say we are not doing enough for older people, that no Liberal Government in Canada provides any supplementary allowances for their old-age pensioners!

This, of course, is not the total of our financial assistance. The Government has a very substantial housing programme. We have four nursing homes financed and operated entirely by the Government; and when the new nursing home is finished in Regina, we will have accommodation for 570 people. Even then, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, we find we are still going to have a long waiting list and eventually we will have to build more of these homes. Nursing home care, last year, cost \$733,000 and that is without the capital cost of constructing homes. While nursing homes are expensive, they are less expensive than hospitals and, of course, they are very necessary.

But this, Mr. Speaker, is just the nursing homes. We also have our programme of assistance in capital grants and operational grants to churches and charitable organizations and municipalities who will build homes for older people, and I have been simply delighted at the enthusiastic response that this programme has been receiving. Homes are actually springing up all over this province. Regina is to have a "pioneer village" (we are going to call it), where we will have 100 housing units for married couples and a hostel that will accommodate 60 people. The province will be spending, on Regina's project alone, \$100,000 on capital grants and \$6,400 yearly on maintenance grants. Saskatoon has its "Jubilee Heights" project, which is going to provide for 100 married couples and 100 in the hostel. Moose Jaw is considering some such project. I think it is interesting to notice that homes are being operated, or are in the process of construction, or negotiations are proceeding, for homes at Radville, Kindersley, Prince Albert, Carnduff, Kamsack, Ponteix, Swift Current, Shaunavon, Yorkton, Estevan, Balcarres, Kenaston, Meadow Lake, Tisdale, Lloydminster, Craik, Eston, Middle Lake, Neilburg, Wolseley, Assiniboia, and there may be others that I have not heard of yet. I think that is pretty wonderful. We have 21 of these homes now receiving grants and we expect that our capital expenditures on grants will be \$300,000 with a yearly operational grant of something over \$70,000.

When you add these all up, Mr. Speaker, old-age assistance, supplementary allowance, hospital and medical care, nursing homes and so on, you find a total of well over \$6 million being spent on the older people of this province. This, of course, is exclusive of the capital cost of building nursing homes, and some additional cost of social aid on a share basis with the municipalities.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we will all agree that this is a very sizable programme. It is a programme we can be proud of. I think we will agree that it does not meet entirely the needs of some of our older people, but we have gone a long step in that direction.

But what about the second half of the programme that I was talking about – some permanent, long-range programme? This is something I am most anxious to bring to your attention. Time was, Mr. Speaker, and I think you will well remember, when in almost every family home you would find a grandmother or a grandfather or an aged aunt or uncle; but this is not so true today. There are many reasons for this: The change from a rural to an urban community making it a little more expensive to look after an extra person in urban areas; houses are smaller, today, there isn't enough room to keep an extra person. I am afraid, also that there is too much tendency on the part of some younger people to shift the care and the responsibility for their parents on to outside institutions.

I think also, Mr. Speaker, what we really need is a very great change in our attitude towards older people. People in some of the older countries, countries like China, have something that they could show us. When a person grows older there they gain prestige; they become the most important person in the family group; their opinions are sought and they feel wanted and they feel one of the group. We could do with a lot more of that kind of spirit here. Old people here are far too often excluded and made to feel that their usefulness is finished; and this, Mr. Speaker, is certainly a contributing factor in illness, both physical and mental illness, that occurs

among older people. Any doctor or psychiatrist will tell you that if we could achieve a changed attitude towards our older people, we would not find so many of them in our hospitals and in our mental institutions.

I am not trying to say that all older people should live with relatives. I fully realize the difficulties of three generations living under one roof. I know there are problems, but there are also some compensation. I believe that it is very good for young people to develop tolerance and understanding and a little bit of self-sacrifice and respect for older people. I think it is something that will stand them in good stead all the rest of their lives, and build up a sense of responsibility. But, Mr. Speaker, aside from living with relatives, I think there are a great many more things that we could do to keep people in their own homes for a longer period of time. There have been many older people who have had to go to live in institutions because they can no longer cope with all the household chores, but with a little help they could manage. There have been some very successful and interesting experiments tried out, with housekeeping and marketing services for older people. It is a service such as the Victorian Order of Nurses give – you know the Victoria Order of Nurses visit homes and give bedside nursing care to people who would otherwise have to be hospitalized. This housekeeper service is much the same. They come in on a regular basis, and they take over some of the heavier chores that the older people cannot do; they also do the marketing when it is very cold and the streets are slippery. I think that is something worth considering. It has worked well in other places.

Then, too, I think more attention should be given by builders to more suitable housing for older people. And again, I have read of most interesting experiments in this type of housing, with good firm railings, and ramps instead of steps, and things of that nature. It is something we could think about.

There is one more aspect which I consider important, and that is the question of employment for older people, and I do think we need to thoroughly re-examine our employment policy. Employment agencies, today, find it increasingly difficult to find a job for a man of 435 or a woman of 40, if for any reason they have to change their job. And, of course, they are right at the very peak of their ability at that time. It is a very short-sighted policy, and it is a very serious problem, and it needs more attention than it is getting.

This raises the question of compulsory retirement. In most places compulsory retirement takes place at 65, in some at 60; sometimes it is 65 for men and 60 for women; why, I don't know. Statistics prove that women live longer than men; men are much nearer dead at 60 than women, or at any time for that matter! However, that is the way it is. Of course, Mr. Speaker, some people do wish to retire and they certainly have the right to if they so wish; but many do not, and they are still able to work and do a good job – and why should they be denied the opportunity? If they are able to work and wish to work, they are certainly healthier and happier, both physically and mentally, if they are allowed to continue in their employment, and, of course, it provides more opportunity to maintain their independence.

We have to remember, Mr. Speaker, that as people live longer they have so many more years to support themselves after their income is cut off; and also remember that a person at 65 is stronger and healthier, today, than they were 50 years ago. There have been some very interesting experiments carried out in the United States in this business of keeping people in production longer, and we find some interesting legislation, too. I am particularly interested in what they are trying to do in the matter of part-time employment. I find that, in eighteen states, there is no compulsory retirement age. In an additional thirteen states, retirement is at a flexible age. In Massachusetts, they have a law which restricts discrimination by private employers against workers from 45 to 65 years of age. They have a very interesting demonstration project in Florida on creating part-time employment; and in different states, Mr. Speaker, they have 'sheltered workshops'. Now a sheltered workshop is to assist elderly people in part-time employment. It is called a sheltered workshop because it is not a profit-making organization and it doesn't rely on mass production; it relies mainly on hand work; and it is quite successful.

I was very interested in the experiment of the Jewish Vocational Service of Greater Boston, and it is helping qualified older people to establish small businesses. Interest-free loans are given to these older people if they show that they have the ability and the capacity to open businesses such as cigar stores and variety stores and novelty shops. Also there was a Bureau set up that was very successful for older businessmen to do a part-time accountancy for small firms, and that is working very well.

These, I think, are very interesting experiments and very worthwhile considering. They are all methods that we could use to keep people in production longer and so retain their contribution to the economy that is now being lost. I believe that such a programme would pay dividends in health and in happiness for older people, and at the same time help to remove a good deal of strain on the economy. I know that in times of unemployment many people feel that a programme like this would aggravate the situation, but I do not believe that the solution to unemployment lies in discrimination against any one group. When unemployment becomes a problem the first attack is always on older people and married women. I think this is a wrong approach; it is a negative approach, and it solves nothing.

In a country such as Canada where there is so much that needs doing and where we have the material and the resources to do it with, full employment should be our aim, and we cannot afford to lose the production of any citizen who is willing to work and who wishes to work. I do think, also that leadership should begin with our governments. Our Federal Government and our Provincial Governments, I believe, should re-examine our employment policies and set an example for private industry. I also think that the Governments, in co-operation with each other, could produce an excellent educational programme to show people the need for what I am trying to say.

There is a good deal more I could say on this subject, but I think I have said enough to point up the problem. Certainly there needs to be more medical research on the diseases that attack elderly people and, of course, that suggests geriatric units in hospitals and medical schools.

We need more study on adequate pension plans, and we do need to try and include more groups in superannuation plans; and some attention should be given to the retirement needs of the self-employed. Certainly I

believe that, from the day a young person draws his first cheque, there should be deductions for old-age security. After all, old people are no different from the rest of us. What they desire most is economic independence and a feeling that they are part of society and making a worthwhile contribution to society. This, Mr. Speaker, is my idea of a comprehensive old-age security plan.

I do believe that the Saskatchewan Government could give a good deal of leadership here. In so many ways our Saskatchewan Government have shown that they have imagination and resourcefulness and a pioneering spirit, and here, Mr. Speaker, is the place to pioneer. It is something we could do without a sizable increase in our budget – which, I am sure, will make the hon. Provincial Treasurer breathe a sigh of relief. And it is something, also, that if, we were successful, would eventually lead to a noticeable decrease in cost. A pilot project in this field would attract interest and attention in every province in Canada as well as making what, I think, would be a very worthwhile contribution to the economy as a whole. I think it is very worthwhile thinking about. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the motion.

Mr. H.C. Dunfield (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 3 – An Act to amend the Mineral Taxation Act

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple Bill. It is to remove the mineral tax on coal on an acreage basis.

The Bill is not retroactive. I think that is the only fair way to introduce a question like this. It will take effect when it comes into force. It says at the present time that the Act shall come into force on the day of assent. I will look into that question and probably it would be wise to have the Act come into force at the beginning of a year, probably the beginning of 1956; but I don't think it would be fair to go back any more than that.

Bill No. 10 – An Act to amend The Vehicles Act

Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, the amendments to The Vehicles Act are many, as usual, and probably some of them are quite important. I think the amendments proposed to this Bill will probably provide a greater measure of security to the members of the Legislature than any other legislation we are going to introduce this year. It will certainly give them a greater feeling of safety than anything that is likely to come up.

First of all may I say that, this year, it is not our intention to set up a committee of the Legislature to make recommendations concerning highway safety. We have done that now for the last two or three years, and I think it has been very effective. During the year, however, we have been able to organize a permanent Highway Safety Committee consisting of representatives of various organizations that are interested in highway traffic within the province. This Committee have made certain recommendations but because of the lateness of the year in which they were appointed, they have not had time to reach any definite conclusions. During this next year, however, they will be studying this question in great detail.

First of all, for many, many years now (I suppose twenty to thirty years) it has been necessary, whenever there has been an accident of over a certain amount of damage under The Vehicles Act - \$100, or where anybody has been injured, that accident must be reported. Now that has created many hardships where people are at some distance; the accident may be away out in the country; so instead of requiring that it be reported in person we are now making it possible that the accident may be reported by telephone and the police may then ask the person to come in or to submit in writing the details. We feel that if it were done in this way it would save many long trips, particularly for our rural people.

Then, too, we have finally given in – and may I say that I do this with some hesitation – to the requests that we make it possible for the vehicles to pass on the right hand side in towns and cities where the vehicles are on streets which are clearly marked off into lanes wide enough to hold three vehicles – that is, where you have three lines of traffic. I have always felt that by doing this we are leaving ourselves in a position where there will be more accidents; however, I have been observing in the two major cities this past year that a great many vehicles are doing it and the police have not been making a serious effort to prevent it; so that if the police force in the cities concerned – they are the ones that have asked for it and if they are not going to enforce the Act as it is we might just as well make the Act the way in which they are enforcing it. And so we are making provision for right-hand passing where a street is clearly marked off into lanes. This does not, of course – and may I emphasize this – this does not give any right to pass on the right on our highways in the country or on the streets in the cities where they are not marked off into lanes.

The third point – in the past we have required two licence plates on all vehicles, including dealers. We have run into a little trouble with some of the dealers in Saskatchewan; they have to change these plates constantly and we find that they take the plate off one vehicle and put it on another. Now of course that is perfectly legal, that is what the intention is; but they are often in a rush and only take the back plate off and put it on the back of the other car; and then they sometimes forget and take the plat off the front and put it on the back of another car, so that one half the total number of licences enabled them to do the job. We are changing that and are only going to provide the dealers with one licence plate – only one plate will be necessary and that is to be put on the back.

There have been a great many complaints in the past about unsafe vehicles. We have given a great deal of study to the question as to whether or not we should require that every vehicle should be examined. In the province of British Columbia – or at least in a portion of it, in the city of Vancouver –

they do require that every six months a vehicle must be taken to the Government inspection agency and be examined. In the province of Alberta they have a system there whereby you must take your car to any garage. Insofar as I am concerned, unless we have our own garages where the vehicles can be taken to I do not think that the other system would work; it is not working where it is being tried at the present time. However, we are amending the Act to provide that no person who is in the business of selling cars may sell a car unless it is in fit mechanical condition before it is sold. Every car, before it is sold, must be free from defects that would cause an accident; in other words, the brakes must be right, the lights must be right, the steering equipment must be right before that vehicle can be put on the highway. It is not usually with the legitimate dealer where the trouble is, but it is many of these people who come in and start up second hand or used car lots, they bring cars in and they go out from there without being put in proper condition; so we think that is the first step to see to it that no cars are sold until they are in safe mechanical condition.

And then, following the recommendations of the Legislative Committee of last year, we are making an amendment, this year, to require that there shall be on all cars manufactured after the 1st of July of 1956 an automatic signalling device. That means that the companies will all be notified that any cars that are brought into Saskatchewan, manufactured after the 1st of July, must have the automatic device. It will be eight or nine months before these cars get into the province and the manufacturers will have plenty of warning that they must have the automatic device on the cars.

And then I come, finally, to a little matter there has been a great deal of publicity given to, and that is the question of the issuing of blue licences. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the members of the House that this legislation has been on the statute books of Saskatchewan now for some twenty years – long before my time, I may say – and this particular section of the Act requires that people who are convicted under certain sections of the Act will automatically receive a blue licence. If they have another conviction within 12 months they will automatically receive a red licence, and if they have a third conviction while they have the red licence, then their licence will be automatically suspended. This is a question that I am sure all members of the House are interested in. It has been urged upon us that we should remove the necessity for getting a blue licence for minor offences. But what is a minor offence? When I took the question to the Legislative Advisory Committee last year, every member on the Committee was unanimous that there was no minor offence for which a blue licence was being given. No recommendation consequently was made to this House to change it. However, we feel that the time has now come when probably we should try something else. We can always revert, if we find it doesn't work out. On the back of the licence that we now use – on the back of the operator's licence – there is a place for two warnings and then a place for a conviction. We are amending the Act, this year, to provide that when a person is convicted for any of these offences where previously he automatically got a blue licence, the presiding magistrate or justice of the peace will mark, on the back of the operator's licence, the conviction; the conviction will be entered on the back of the white licence, and the date of the conviction. That is all that will happen – he will get the conviction entered on the back of his operator's licence. And then, if he gets into more trouble and starts speeding again

after he has had the conviction entered on the back, the next time when he goes before the court he will receive a blue licence. In other words, every person gets . . .

Some Hon. Member: — Gets one warning.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — No, there are no warnings in this; let us get that point clear; there are absolutely no warnings in this. The first time, when a man gets a conviction – not a warning, a conviction – he gets it entered on the back . . .

Some Hon. Member: — Can they convict him without a penalty?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Oh no. He pays his penalty. He pays his \$10 and costs or \$20 and costs or whatever the penalty is; he will get that the same as usual, the same as he has been doing, but he will not get a blue licence for it. But then the second time he gets a conviction he will automatically get a blue licence.

In other words, everybody is going to be allowed one conviction before they get a blue licence, but the second time they are going to get a blue licence; and the, of course, if they get another conviction within a year they will get a red licence.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — They don't get a sandwich in between.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — No. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all hon. members of the House will appreciate the fact that this is going to cut down very considerably – I would estimate 75 to 80 per cent of the blue licences will be eliminated as a result of this move. I hope that the motorists of the province will appreciate that we are rescinding legislation that has been on the statute books for nearly twenty years; that we are giving them a break and that they will not be less careful in this driving habits because of this. Frankly, I don't think they will. I think that this will not cause the people to be any more careless than they have been.

I would like to say at this time that I am very happy about the way the people have driven during the past year. I think during the past two years the people of Saskatchewan have shown a great improvement in their driving habits. The accident rate, as we all know, went down by about 50 per cent of what it was in 1953, and that record was maintained through 1955. Unfortunately, last year, we did have a great many fatalities; we had 125 fatalities last year, compared with 76 the year before and 124 the year before that. Last year was an all-time record insofar as fatalities were concerned, but the total number of accidents was almost the same as it was the year before, and the total property damage was actually less last year than it was in 1954. If you asked me to explain why there were so many more fatalities last year, I couldn't do it. It is just one of those things; in one week, for instance, we had two fatalities where people, in broad daylight on a clear day, drove into the side of a freight train. If you can explain those things, then, of course, you could explain the increase; they are things that are unexplainable; no matter how we try to analyze it we haven't been able to find out why there were so many fatalities, last year, with the same number of accidents as we had in the previous year.

February 16, 1956

Now, Mr. Speaker, there may be questions that will come up. There are many other amendments that I consider more minor. I think these six that I have mentioned are the principal ones. And with this explanation I would move Second Reading.

SECOND READING

Bill No. 20 – An Act to amend The Water Rights Act

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, some municipalities have complained regarding matters in connection with water rights. One complaint is that under Section 8 of The Water Rights Act – or rather I should say that Section of The Water Rights Act has been interpreted, in Court judgments, as holding the municipality liable for flood damage because the municipality had not obtained a water right. In other words, the interpretation seems to be, according to the municipalities, that a municipality is required to obtain a Water Right when a road is built across a natural run. The Water Rights division maintain that they do not need a Water Right, but at any rate to clarify the matter and to give the necessary protection because of the interpretation placed on Section 8 of The Water Rights Act, we are now making it clear that a municipality does not require a Water Right when it constructs a road across a natural runway; but the municipality will definitely still be liable for damages under Section 402 of The Municipalities Act.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would move Second Reading of the Bill.

The Assembly then adjourned at 5:30 o'clock p.m.