

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session – Twelfth Legislature

9th Day

Tuesday, February 21, 1956

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

On the Orders of the Day:

SALE OF OIL AND GAS LEASES

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural & Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I think the members of the House would be interested in the sale of oil and gas leases which was held Thursday, February 16, 1956.

Thirty quarter-sections were offered. Bidding was, at the option of the bidder, either on a cash-bonus basis for a standard lease or a percentage of net returns after payout for a Net Royalty Lease. Nearly 400 bids were received. On one parcel there were net royalty bids only. On all other parcels both types of bids were received. The great number of bids on one parcel was 34; the smallest number of bids on one parcel was seven. All bids on five parcels were rejected.

Net royalty bids on nine parcels were accepted. Highest percentage was 86.35 per cent; lowest accepted, 65 per cent.

Cash-bonus bids on 16 parcels were accepted for a total cash amount of \$1,444,443.77.

ON THE ORDERS OF THE DAY:

VISIT OF MISS FRANCES HYLAND

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with the Orders of the Day I would like to move, by leave of the Assembly, a motion to adjourn the House for a short period of time in order that the members of this Legislature may do honour to a young lady who has brought credit both to herself and to this province by her distinguished career in the field of drama. I refer to Miss Frances Hyland, who is back in the city with The Canadian Players, and who will be appearing, this evening, in a performance of Macbeth; and tomorrow evening in Shaw's St. Joan. We are delighted to have Miss Hyland here.

I would like, therefore, to move, seconded by Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition):

February 21, 1956

“That proceedings of the Assembly be now suspended in order that the Assembly may pay tribute, on behalf of the people of the province, to Miss Frances Hyland who, by winning international fame and distinction through her chosen medium, the stage, has brought great honour to her native province of Saskatchewan.

(Miss Hyland enters the Chamber)

Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): — On behalf of the members of this Legislature and the people of Saskatchewan I would like to welcome Miss Frances Hyland back to our province of Saskatchewan, and I want to congratulate you on the success that you have had to date, and I sincerely hope that in the very near future, you will have the opportunity to again coming back to the province of Saskatchewan to display to the people of this province the talent that you have. I know that all our people are very proud of you, and we feel that we would like to have the opportunity again of playing host to you here in this, your native province.

I want, also, to extend a very hearty welcome to the group that you are playing with, to the province of Saskatchewan. Unfortunately, our weather is not very kind to you, but I can assure your group that, normally, our weather is much better than it has been this afternoon.

I want to wish you the best of luck in your future activities, and, again, invite you and the group that you are now playing with back to the province of Saskatchewan so that we may be able to see your talent presented here in your home province.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, and members of the Legislative Assembly, it is a very momentous occasion for the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan and the people of the province when we have an opportunity of welcoming back one of our most distinguished daughters.

About a year ago in this Assembly we had a public function here to honour the Campbell Brothers who had won the Dominion Macdonald Brier curling championship. I think it is equally appropriate that today we should be honouring one who has achieved distinction for herself, not in the field of athletics which we were honouring last year, but in the great field of drama.

Miss Frances Hyland was born in Shaunavon and came, in her early years, to the city of Regina and claims this, the capital city of Saskatchewan, as her home. In 1942, she first appeared when only fourteen years of age in the Drama Festival and there gave the first promise of the outstanding talent which she was later to display in Canada, in the United States, and in the United Kingdom. She attended school in Regina, later Regina College. She attended the Banff School of Fine Arts, and later studied at Saskatchewan University. She won a scholarship which took her to the Royal Academy of Drama in London, England, and there won for herself a great reputation as a distinguished actress. She made her first outstanding appearance in Tennessee William’s play “A Streetcar Named Desire”.

Any of us who were privileged to visit London in recent years must have been very proud of the reputation which Miss Hyland made for herself on the London stage, because in Great Britain they have high standards of drama; and the fact that this young Saskatchewan actress was able to go to London and to be so widely acclaimed is some indication of the great gift which she has. She has also done work with the British Broadcasting Corporation, later on the New York stage, more recently with the Shakespearean players at Stratford, Ontario, and at the present time is travelling with The Canadian Players, who are presenting plays throughout western Canada and have just completed a tour of parts of the United States.

It is always a pleasure for us in Saskatchewan to see some of our young people go out into the world and make a success in their chosen field. It is doubly a pleasure to have them come back here and visit us and let us know that they have not forgotten their home province; and to give us a chance to tell them just how proud we are of their success.

Therefore, I would like, Miss Hyland, to welcome you and to welcome your husband who is here with you today and to say that we are delighted to have you both back in the province. I would like on behalf of the members of this Legislature and on behalf of the people of the province, to make this presentation to you. On this jewel box there is the crest of the province of Saskatchewan which we hope will always remind you of the place from whence you came – the place where the thoughts of the people will ever be with you. You will find on a little plate inside the box, these words: “Presented by the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan to Frances Hyland in recognition of the hour she has brought to her native province by her outstanding contribution in the field of drama. February, 1956.”

Miss Frances Hyland: — Mr. Speaker, hon. Member of this Legislature, I have tried for several exciting days to think of words appropriate for this occasion, but it seems that after some years of depending on the well-chosen words of Mr. Shakespeare and Mr. Shaw and Mr. Ibsen and so on, any script of my own devising seems a bit inadequate. So I would ask you to believe that the poverty of my thanks is in inverse proportion to the richness of my pleasure in receiving this gift and my gratitude for the great honour you do me today.

I believe that an actor must always be willing and free to take his part wherever there is an audience for him. But an actor like everyone else, has his roots in the place where he was born and applause from the people whose roots are in that same soil is probably the sweetest applause of all.

It gives me great pleasure too, to believe that in honouring me you honour and express your belief in the worthwhileness of the theatre as a profession and of all the people who work in it. On behalf of all of us I thank you.

To all of you here this afternoon and to the many people of this province who have helped me by giving me of their teaching, of their money, of their enjoyment as audiences and of their encouraging words, I would like to say thank you very, very much. I hope you may be as happy in your profession

February 21, 1956

as I am in mine, and I hope that if you have occasion to leave home, our homecoming may be as fortunate and as happy as mine has been. Thank you.

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Monday, February 20, 1956, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Brown (Last Mountain) for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, now that the intellectual and cultural personalities have left the Chamber, I hope without so much misgiving to get down to some of the earthy problems of agriculture.

I appreciate the fact, Mr. Speaker, that this will be somewhat of an intrusion after the most notable and excellent response that we have just listened to from Frances Hyland.

I wish first of all to congratulate the mover and seconder and all others who participated in the debate up to the moment. I wish too, Mr. Speaker, to make reference to the fact that our Jubilee year provided an opportunity for many communities to trace the agricultural development and growth of our province. Histories written by many local groups are replete with stories of pioneer vision, optimism and great courage in the face of many disappointments.

When one reviews the history of Saskatchewan's agricultural development, one cannot refrain from taking note of the many handicaps posed as a result of crop failures and economic adversities. These were certainly factors to test the courage of the most rugged individual.

The agricultural development of Saskatchewan began slowly at the turn of the century, but accelerated quickly with the advent of the railroad. The period 1906-18 witnessed tremendous strides. By 1905 there were 100,000 homesteads taken in Saskatchewan, involving 1,600,000 acres of cultivated crop. By 1918, there were 200,000 additional homesteads taken, which represented a total agricultural cultivated acreage of some 20 million acres by 1918. While agricultural development was rapid, the history of early settlement, as mentioned previously was marked by many disappointments, the most important of which was the ever present economic problem of unbalanced cost-price relationships.

Prices never seemed to catch up to farm costs. This has been the economic bugbear of Saskatchewan agriculture from the early pioneer days right up to the present. When one glances back over the years of our development, one also notes the fact that Saskatchewan has seriously lagged behind other provinces in the matter of industrial development, and it is only recently that our great mineral possibilities are being exploited. Several major factors have long been recognized as being definite handicaps to resource and industrial development in this province. Such factors as distance, freight rates and tariffs have prevented this type of enterprise from becoming established in this province, when more attractive opportunities were available elsewhere.

Furthermore, since Saskatchewan is by natural circumstances a great plains area, in comparative agricultural terms this means an area of low carrying capacity land. Saskatchewan was, therefore, destined to be a province of scarce population, presenting great and serious difficulties in the matter of providing provincial and rural services. This situation is well recognized. The many conveniences and amenities of life that were commonplace in other provinces were lacking in Saskatchewan until recent years. In the minds of many people in Canada, the provision of services and amenities of life in the rural areas of this province seemed to be remote if not impossible. Similarly industrialization seems to have been a long ways away. It is significant that even under the pressure of wartime needs, the establishment of industry in Saskatchewan received no consideration. This was pretty much the attitude and situation at the end of World War II. In 1944, Saskatchewan people were a dispirited people, carrying a tremendous burden of relief and municipal debt, a province without benefit of rural electrification, inadequate and debt-burdened hospital facilities, inadequate and broken-down highways and municipal road systems, and a province with little prospect of industrial or mineral development.

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — A pretty good reader, isn't he.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It is, therefore, interesting to note what this unique and hard-pressed province accomplished in the past 12 years.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to refer briefly to progress made in fields, item by item. In 1944, people of Saskatchewan never dreamed that 12 years later despite tremendous economic handicaps, practically all urban communities would have the benefit of electricity, and that some 40,000 farmers would also enjoy the benefits of rural electrification. In my own constituency of Cutknife the people in that area never anticipated rural electrification, and I can proudly say today that some 1,400 farmers in that area have the benefits of rural electrification.

Mr. Lopton (Saltcoats): — Briefly, I hope.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — A good deal has been said about power rates, but I want to remind the House that I have carefully examined monthly power bills on the farm and I find them to be even less than the monthly power bills I pay in the city of Regina. I want to suggest, too, the economic benefits given to rural areas in the house and outside of the house, by electrical servants – servants that you don't have to wake up in the morning, and who don't complain to you, and who are at work at all hours of the day. I know of no single benefit that has brought more improved living conditions to our farm people. It was not only a matter of lighting up farmsteads, but it was a tremendous lighting up of human spirits. Our farmers can now look forward with joy and anticipation to still greater benefits in the future, much to the dismay of our political opponents, Mr. Speaker.

Despite these accomplishments, our Opposition friends now talk about cheaper power rates. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this province will have confidence in the same Power Corporation that has made this all possible, and that has on five successive occasions reduced rates, and if there is any possibility of further reduction of rates, it will be this utility that has

February 21, 1956

provided them with the services that will further reduce rates rather than the Opposition members, who have constantly harassed and handicapped the development of this service at every stage of its development.

Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): — Pretty good reading there.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And so, Mr. Speaker, after the job is done, we hear this cheap, cheap talk about electricity. Mr. Speaker, it's strictly for the birds, because certainly it is not intended that reasonable, intelligent people will accept the audacious comparisons that are being made by the members opposite.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — Which birds?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I would like to speak, and I will if I have time, Mr. Speaker, about the South Saskatchewan dam and point out some of the reasons why the people of this province cannot expect lower electrical rates.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out accomplishment number two – the removal of the burden of municipal relief debt, and the assumption by the province of this obligation which has already been referred to by other speakers. This has meant much to the farmers of Saskatchewan and has made possible the improved municipal services that we have in rural areas today. Without the removal of this debt obligation, the progress that has been accomplished in rural municipalities would not have been possible. This was one of the first steps taken to alleviate the financial burden on municipalities by this administration.

Number 3, Mr. Speaker, one of the most remarkable achievements is the fact that this province, with all its economic and natural hazards, pioneered a hospitalization plan that has provided hospital benefits to all citizens of this province, and free services to old-age pensioners, blind pensioners, their dependants and the recipients of Mothers' Allowances. The popularity of the hospitalization plan was attested to by the fact that Saskatchewan people regardless of political persuasions not only support but speak proudly of this achievement to people in other areas who do not have similar security plans. This plan has also made secure the financial position of Saskatchewan hospitals, and in addition it has saved rural municipalities millions of dollars in hospital costs.

I have on my desk a progress report submitted by a rural municipality in my part of the province, in connection with the Jubilee celebrations. I was very interested to note, Mr. Speaker, that in the seven years prior to the advent of the hospitalization plan, this municipality had spent over \$88,000 in hospital costs, and in the 7-year period after the plan came into existence, this same municipality only spent \$33,000 in that period of time – a saving of \$6,000 per year.

In the first year of the Plan's operation in 1947, the hospital costs of this municipality alone dropped from over \$12,000 to \$893, and subsequently to an average of something like from \$2,000 to \$3,000 a year; and yet hon. Members opposite suggest in the fact of this evidence that very little has been done on behalf of local governments in this province. I would think that this exhibit alone would puncture any of their arguments in that connection, and there is much more still to come, Mr. Speaker.

Number 5, Mr. Speaker, progress in the field of education was very ably dealt with by the Hon. Minister of Education. Suffice it to say that in 1944 this administration had to contend with inadequate and out-dated educational services, with depreciated buildings and underpaid teachers. This was the significant aspect of educational services at that time.

As one drives over the province today, one sees new schools and modern school bus service on every hand. I read with great pride the increased educational opportunities provided for our young people; the increased enrolment in our high schools is something in which we can all take justifiable pride. Our young people now have greater educational opportunities than ever before in the history of this province.

Much remains to be done in the field of education, and I am sure that under the competent guidance of the present Minister of Education, this is recognized by him, as well as anyone else. Indeed he pointed out to this Legislative Assembly that one of our first acts necessarily was to bring greater security in the field of health which has been done, and that education will now receive due and proper attention and is already receiving attention, as is noted from the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker. We are well on the way, and greater benefits will accrue to this most important aspect of our social services in the years to come.

Number 6: In the past 12 years, Saskatchewan has been proud of being first in many fields of social endeavour. However, another outstanding achievement has been the introduction of the Automobile Insurance plan which has provided overall security at a rate that is the envy of all of Canada.

Number 7, Industrial Development. Other speakers have referred in detail to the tremendous industrial development in Saskatchewan over the past 12 years. Rapid development of our oil and mineral resources is now a matter of record. Never before in the 50 years of Saskatchewan's Jubilee history has there been such development in industry, mineral, oil, and progress in other fields of endeavour. All in all, it is truly a wondrous record of achievement in 12 short years. Particularly when one considers the many economic handicaps affecting Saskatchewan's economy and the problems associated with the provision of new and improved services, we can all feel justifiably proud and grateful. Little wonder, the hon. Member for Kinistino should say that "after 60 years residence in the province of Saskatchewan, the last 12 have been the most pleasant and inspiring of all."

The last 12 years, Mr. Speaker, of our Golden Jubilee have been golden indeed. It is true that continued progress and holding the new gains made is dependent upon a prosperous agriculture. Present agriculture trends have a significant parallel as one reads the farm history of Saskatchewan. As mentioned previously, we still have with us the ever present problem of 'cost-price' relationships. As early as 1922 it was intimated that the purchasing power of a bushel of wheat was 25 per cent lower than the ten pre-War I average of 1912-13. This statement has a familiar ring, because figures were presently published showing that, with the exception of two years, the purchasing power of a bushel of wheat in 1955 was lower in the 60-year period back to 1890. This simply means that any advance in price to the farmer in the post-war period

February 21, 1956

has been offset by greatly increased costs of goods and services required by farmers. This is the fundamental problem facing Saskatchewan agriculture. This matter of insufficient farm income is the major problem facing municipalities and business organizations in this province.

The 'Leader-Post' I noticed in a cartoon very recently . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Here it comes.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . suggested that the Premier of this province was dragging in these so-called remote Federal issues by their heels. Mr. Speaker, these fundamental issues of farm income and marketing problems are with us. The Premier didn't need to drag them in by their heels.

I should mention too that a good deal is said about Ottawa's responsibilities. Very recently the Saskatchewan Retail Merchants' Association made a presentation to the Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Future, and they suggested to the Commission and to the Federal Government that far-reaching federal action to stabilize agricultural income is necessary, and they went on to say that the farmers' responsibility ends with the production of the crop. "Sale of the crop is the responsibility of the Federal Government" said the brief submitted to the Saskatchewan Retail Merchants' Association.

I commend that statement to the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I don't blame the hon. Leader of the Opposition, who got up in this Legislature, in the course of this Throne Speech debate and said that he was not going to defend Ottawa's policy. I don't blame him, Mr. Speaker, because Ottawa's farm policies are indefensible, and he knows it. No wonder that the Liberals and the 'Leader-Post' are trying to detract attention from discussing these pertinent issues that are not remote but of immediate concern to every Saskatchewan citizen.

The Provincial Government is delighted to meet the Opposition on provincial issues. Our record is defensible, Mr. Speaker. The record of both the Federal and Provincial Liberals is indefensible. The C.C.F. is . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Who read that line?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . expected to fight the battles of the farmers. We found our origin in the struggles of the farm people of this province for economic and social justice and we will persist in our efforts until the farmers of this province receive economic and social justice on a par with other segments of the economy.

My own presence in this Legislature can be attributed to the many problems that the farmers of this province have contended with, and I have dedicated myself to fight on behalf of economic and social justice for our farm people as long as I am physically able to do so.

Mr. Lopton: — You're not doing much of a job of it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Now, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the emergency cash situation, the possibility of farm cash shortages developing until the farmer could market a substantial portion of his crop each year, was foreseen by this Legislature as long ago as 1952-53. I have copies of the resolutions passed by this Legislature that were agreed to unanimously, and I noticed yesterday

an editorial in the Regina 'Leader-Post' that says this:

“Speakers on the Government side in the Throne Speech debate are conveying the impression that there is an overwhelming demand for cash advances on farm-stored wheat, not only as a temporary measure to tide the farmers over the present emergency that as a permanent feature of the Wheat Board marketing system.”

Well there is an overwhelming demand and my contention is that this procedure is so logical and practical that everyone who opposes it must be influenced solely by the political motive of defending the Liberal Government in Ottawa and its bank loan scheme.

I can't pass judgment on the political motives or otherwise of the hon. members opposite. They alone can answer that for us. But the point is, Mr. Speaker, and what the farmers of this province would like to know is, why the hon. members opposite stood up in this Legislature and voted for advance payments on farm-stored grain through the Wheat Board and then went out into the country and opposed it in favour of bank loans at 5 per cent interest.

Let the hon. members opposite get up on their feet in this Legislature and outside and tell the farmers in this province why they did this and why they are so contradictory in their actions.

Mr. Lopton: — I'll tell you that before I leave this House.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition says we go to Ottawa. Well, the hon. Leader of the Opposition went to Ottawa on what was termed a 'secret mission'. His plan was secret and I don't blame him for keeping it a secret, because it turned out to be bank loans. He should be ashamed for having said some of the things that were contrary to the manner in which he voted in this Legislative Assembly.

Mr. McDonald: — You talk a lot about things you don't know anything about.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And then, when the hon. member came home from Ottawa he assured us that he had paved the way and perhaps everything would be all right. Later he made a speech at Langbank, Saskatchewan, on October 21 after the announcement was made that the bank loans might be \$1,000 at some 5½ per cent interest. He said at that time that this assistance would be just about as effective in the present wheat crisis as a “stirrup pump in a forest fire”. Fifteen days later, he was speaking amongst his old-time Liberal friends in Saskatoon, and I think the hon. Federal Minister of Agriculture must have said something to him, and put him right politically – and put him all wrong as far as the farmers are concerned. Because then the same hon. Leader of the Opposition got up and made a speech, and suggested that this stirrup pump had now developed into a first-class engine because the bank loans were raised by \$500!

Mr. McDonald: — This is your statement, not mine.

February 21, 1956

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, in defence of that, and perhaps at the suggestion of the Rt. Hon. James G. Gardiner, he made this further silly statement. He said that “the plan as outlined by Mr. Howe meant that advances to producers would, in fact, be \$3,000; while the maximum amount of the loan to any producer will be \$1,500 only half of the proceeds of subsequent deliveries must be applied against repayment, leaving the producer with extra current income from grain delivered during the period of repayment. Fifty per cent of the value of every load delivered to the elevator will go to repay the loan, and 50 per cent will be left in the hands of the producer”, said Mr. McDonald. “If a farmer delivers enough to pay the \$1,500 loan then he will have \$1,500 in cash, too.” So - \$3,000 in all, Mr. Speaker! I wonder if this is the method by which the hon. Leader of the Opposition also expects to obtain extra revenue to implement some \$99 million of statements made in the country to the electorate of this province.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Could anything be more ridiculous than that?

Mr. McDonald: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct what the Minister of Agriculture has just said in the House. At that time the press asked me what the difference was between this legislation and the legislation of 1951, and I said the only difference that I could see was in the manner of repayment; that rather than the farmer having to turn over the entire proceeds from a load of grain . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, that isn't a point of privilege. He would like to change it, but he will not be able to defend his position, either here or elsewhere, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McDonald: — You stick to the truth, then.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Well, Mr. Speaker, he is doing some fancy squirming and he will do a little more before I get through.

Mr. McDonald: — You're the one who is doing the squirming!

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, regardless of what has been said, the fact remains that the matter could have been resolved by a very practical and simple device, by making advance partial initial payments to the farmer on the grain he has stored on his farm. It is so logical and so simple that it is incomprehensible that it was not done. It would not have cost the Government any great amount of money, and it would have solved the problem at its source.

This matter of surplus is over-emphasized. It isn't just surpluses of grain that is the problem. Surplus grain in reserve is a good thing. The problem is immediate cash for the farmer until he can market this surplus grain. This is the problem which has been worrying everybody, including the businessmen of this province, and which has made it difficult for municipalities to collect their taxes. I agree, Mr. Speaker, that advance payments alone will

not solve the entire problem. Much more needs to be done; but it will make the Wheat Board much more popular with the farmers. Further action is required to implement a comprehensive long-term national policy for Canadian agriculture. This was proposed by the delegation who waited on the Federal Government in connection with the emergency cash situation and by representatives of farm organizations right across western Canada. Every provincial Minister of Agriculture supports that contention and I cannot understand why such a conference has not been called by the Federal Government.

I am most pleased, Mr. Speaker, that a Select Special Committee of the Legislature has been set up and that consideration will be given to these very serious problems. I do hope that, as a result, this Committee's recommendations can be taken to a Federal-Provincial conference at which a long overdue national marketing policy for Canada can be brought into being.

I regret very much, Mr. Speaker, the news, today, that England has not re-entered the International Wheat Agreement. I am also disappointed with the statements of the Rt. Hon. C.D. Howe that because Britain is not in the Agreement, there is a likelihood that Canada will not join the Agreement either. I hope that this one means under which surplus agricultural commodities might be made available to the deficient areas of the world is not in jeopardy. I do hope that Canada joins the Agreement, and I hope that Britain again will also join the Agreement and further than an early date may see a proper organization set up to make distribution of foodstuffs to deficiency areas of the world in accordance with the recommendations made by F.A.O.

I could say a great deal about the boxcar shortage. If there is anything that is inexcusable, and an area where the Federal Government has been delinquent, it is in regard to the boxcar shortage. We have heard all kinds of conflicting statements, but we do know that in the period from August 1 to December 1, 1955 there were 36,000 boxcars short in western Canada. I note the statement made by the Vice-President of the Pool, recently, to the effect that there is 150,000,000 bushels of storage space available in our elevators. This situation is unpardonable, Mr. Speaker. I don't think that the suggestion made by Mr. Gardiner that trading United Kingdom wheat for settlers at the rate of 1,000 bushels of wheat for every immigrant is logical. I do hope something more constructive can be proposed. But this statement alone, I believe, qualifies Mr. Gardiner for a position in that haven of rest known as the Senate. This statement of Mr. Gardiner's and other statements that he has made and that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has made in connection with drainage assistance in this province, are equally illogical and without foundation.

We are told, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Government constantly looks to Ottawa. I would remind them who is now doing the crying because of our farm difficulties.

Mr. McDonald: — You!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The Ottawa Government was weeping and wailing because the terrible Americans had messed things up for them, because Canada had no similar policies of its own to deal with our farm problems. A pretty lame excuse, I thought, Mr. Speaker!

February 21, 1956

I am going to give the House some facts now in connection with grain. I was simply amazed that the hon. Leader of the Opposition had the juvenile audacity to get up in this Legislature, after the Throne Speech indicated that this Legislature was expected to support a supplementary vote of \$2 million for drainage, and suggest that the Provincial Government had been inactive and had been sitting on its haunches.

Mr. McDonald: — Too little and too late!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We made an early survey, Mr. Speaker, this spring, and the reports brought to us from the agricultural representatives and municipalities indicated that in May, 1955, there were 4½ million acres of agricultural land under water in this province . . .

Mr. Loftson: — That's why you had the crop failure.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . affecting some 15,000 farmers, plus extensive damage to rural municipal roads. We went to Ottawa for assistance because of the scope of the problem in the hope that by combing efforts for flood relief we could bring drainage relief to more farmers who were depending on this land for their income and livelihood. The P.F.R.A. have an organization in this province that was ready and willing to do the job, and I am advised they had the funds to do it. The only thing that was lacking was authorization from P.F.R.A. When I met the Prime Minister, early this spring, he seemed to think that we had a good case for drainage assistance. Immediately upon my return to Regina we proceeded at once, alone, and a supplementary vote of \$1 million was allocated to my Department and \$1 million to the Department of Municipal Affairs.

The Department of Agriculture spend \$1,600,000 in drainage this year. Money was also taken within the Department from irrigation and dray land reclamation to make this programme possible. If the Leader of the Opposition read the Throne Speech he would know these facts, Mr. Speaker. The emergency programme started May 20. In the first phase of our drainage programme 57 tons of dynamite were used to bring quick relief to some 500 farmers on 138 projects involving 8,000 acres of flooded farmland. We used, as a matter of fact, all the dynamite in western Canada, and the programme was delayed somewhat . . .

Mr. Danielson: — You should have saved that for the next election.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . until we were able to get a further supply from other parts.

The second phase of the programme involved drainage of a more permanent nature by the use of heavy equipment. Fifty-two large projects were taken under development and 160 miles of ditch work constructed, averaging 17,000 cubic yards per mile – the hon. members can figure that out to determine the amount of earth removed; 157 drainage ditch bridges and water control structures were installed, relieving thousands of acres of flooded farmland. Much more could have been done had we had the benefit of assistance from P.F.R.A. We submitted proposals to them that we thought would be logical projects for P.F.R.A. to undertake, and finally P.F.R.A. submitted some of these projects to Ottawa. One was the Kipling marsh, Mr. Speaker. We were hopeful that P.F.R.A. would give

us some help to deal with the problem, and as soon as I learned that the submission had been made to Ottawa, I wired the Rt. Hon. J.G. Gardiner in that regard as follows. (This wire was dated September 21st):

“Understand P.F.R.A. submitting proposals re Kipling and Ponass Lake projects. These should be started at once to give relief to farmland for next spring and at Kipling to lessen danger to the town from flooding. We have received no reply to our general submission last spring, nor the above-mentioned projects submitted during the summer. Advanced season makes situation urgent and would very much appreciate immediate reply from you as to whether your Department can build either or both of this projects this fall.”

The answer came back from Mr. Gardiner:

“I have your wire of September 21st and in reply would state no decision has been reached to proceed with drainage projects under P.F.R.A. at any point within the P.F.R.A. area.”

There we had the answer as to who was sitting on their haunches in connection with drainage relief in this province.

I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that never before in the history of Saskatchewan was such an expansive drainage programme undertaken in one year. Both Mr. Gardiner and the Leader of the Opposition should apologize for the statements they have made, because they are at complete variance with the facts and a reflection on the staff of the Department and the hundreds of farmers who gave full co-operation in making the emergency drainage programme a success.

Mr. McDonald: — Ten years late.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I am coming to that, Mr. Speaker, right now. The hon. Leader of the Opposition stood up here and said, “These floods were coming for 13 years; why weren’t we ready?” Well, if he had some kind of communication with Divine Providence I wish he had communicated all this information to us sooner; but I don’t think his communications were good because four of those years in succession were dray years and 1949 was an extremely dry year . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Where?

Mr. McCarthy: — In what part of the province?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — All over the province, Mr. Speaker. He doesn’t recall; his memory seems to be very short.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that never before, prior to 1944 has a provincial government wholly on its own financial responsibility undertaken a

single drainage project in Saskatchewan. All drainage projects since then, with the exception of two, have been provided out of the public revenues of this province, and a very competent staff has been built up over the years, as the hon. members opposite ought to know. They should at least read the annual reports of the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am sure that the hon. member is not well informed when he makes that statement, because there are thousands of acres that have been drained right in my constituency.

Mr. Speaker: — What is your point of order?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The hon. member would like to make a speech but his point is not well taken and I repeat, Mr. Speaker, he can take his leisure time and look over the records and he won't find any instance where the province reclaimed agricultural land by drainage at its own and entire expense prior to 1944. Everyone ought to know that a new branch of the Department of Agriculture has been set up, and I will make some comparisons.

In 1944, there were about \$600,000 voted for the entire Department of Agriculture. In the last year, this one branch alone spent \$2½ million. There is the comparison, Mr. Speaker, which certainly should effectively answer some of this loose talk that is being made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

I want to make one more reference in regard to this matter of the floods developing over the past 13 years, and I will just make this one observation because it is in pretty close association to the area in which the hon. Leader of the Opposition lives. Our hydrological records indicate that never in any year has the Qu'Appelle Valley watershed, for example, taken the amount of water that it has in 1955. The maximum flood peak previously known was in July, 1954, when over 2,000 cubic feet per second went down the Qu'Appelle Valley. The average annual run-off, from 1944 to 1954, was 111,000 acre feet — as compared to a run-off in 1955 to the end of August of 804,000 acre feet; and so the hon. Leader of the Opposition says 'it has been developing for the last 13 years'. Just how silly can anyone get when on the loose in the country.

Mr. McDonald: — You just prove that statement.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I would like to say something about P.F.A.A. too. You will recall that an amendment was made last year by the Federal Minister of Agriculture to the P.F.A.A., under which it was held out that farmers who had flooded land could be compensated much the same as though they had a crop that was dried out. Again, Mr. Speaker, this was straight political Liberal window-dressing. Few, if any, farmers received the benefit of P.F.A.A. payments at a time when this province experienced wide-spread flood conditions unknown before in the history of Saskatchewan. That is a pretty good example of who is and who is not doing something about these problems. I can't tell you offhand, Mr. Speaker, how much has been spent in work-and-wages programmes in behalf of providing these farmers with supplementary income from the Provincial Treasury. I am sure it would almost run up to \$2 million, compiling last year's work-and-wages programme with this year's work-and-wages programme.

I would like to turn for a moment to my pet project, the South Saskatchewan Dam. I was amazed, Mr. Speaker, to hear the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield) stand up on his feet in this Legislature, as a Saskatchewan citizen, and say that he was in agreement with the Prime Minister of Canada that this project was not in the national interest and that it could wait until the Trans-Canada pipeline was built. Then the hon. Leader of the Opposition, again make a speech out on the hustings at Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, had this to say, and he placed himself and the Liberal Party that he represents squarely on record when he said:

“On northern development, Mr. McDonald said it was closely linked with proposed construction of the South Saskatchewan River dam. Until such time as the north is development there is no need for the project, he said. Prime Minister St. Laurent has stated it is not in the national interest at this time and I am in full agreement with him, stated Mr. McDonald.”

It puts him squarely on the record. And the, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Cameron: — So is Cass-Beggs.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And then, Mr. Speaker, he gets up and is full of enthusiasm at his nominating convention and says, “I am all for the dam, but we will never get it until the C.C.F. is kicked out of Saskatchewan.”

I say to this House, Mr. Speaker, and I say to the people of Saskatchewan . . .

Mr. Danielson: — It won't be long now!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . that we will not have comprehensive marketing policies for Canada, we will not have comprehensive resources development in Canada until the Liberal Party is kicked out of Ottawa and the C.C.F. Government maintained in this province for continuous progress to that end.

Mr. Cameron: — You are making slow progress towards that end, ‘Toby’.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We are making wonderful progress compared to our Liberal friends who are on sort of a treadmill, going backwards. They are trying, as the Premier has often said, to ‘back’ into the future. We like to go into the future forward.

Mr. Danielson: — Read what Cass-Beggs says about the dam.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I note, Mr. Speaker, in the ‘Leader-Post’ today there is a suggestion made along the lines that we have recommended as provincial Ministers of Agriculture. The suggestion was made by Mr. Drew, the Conservative leader in the House of Commons, suggesting that the Federal Government should give assistance to the provinces for the development of their great hydro resources. It is well recognized and an established principle of government in the United States. It is to our eternal discredit that while we have been talking about the South Saskatchewan project two large projects

February 21, 1956

have been built in the States of Montana and North Dakota completely at the expense of the national government.

Some Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And up here, Mr. Speaker, we were asked by the Federal Minister of Agriculture to contribute \$83 million, as a poor province, to the South Saskatchewan River dam - \$20 million of which was intended, as they said, to remove any questions of subsidization of power. And I throw this to the teeth of the Opposition who talk about cheap power rates. We were told in other words that if our power rates, as a result of the South Saskatchewan dam, would be reduced below those that we can develop under steam, we must pay the difference which was some \$20 million; and even then, Mr. Speaker, they turned the project down, and the hon. members opposite say they are not worried about it. And the hon. Leader of the Opposition says “we should have resources developed in the north first.” I am going to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that without this project there is no possibility of great industrial development in Saskatchewan. We must have it and there is no connection between that and natural resources development in northern Saskatchewan at all.

Mr. Loptson: — That’s what you say.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I have spoken at some length and I know that the hon. member who is going to follow me is very anxious that I make way. I will do so very quickly, much to the relief of the members opposite.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I never heard such wailing and weeping from Ottawa as when we got into our present agricultural difficulties, for the lack of any clear-cut policy for our farm people – weeping and wailing over what they were doing down in the United States. It is high time that we also have a clear-cut comprehensive marketing policy for Canada similar to the policies that are adopted in other countries. Canada lags very seriously in that regard. We are told that because we have a relatively sparse population we can’t do these things as well as they can in the United States, but countries that are less fortunate are each doing it. Even little Iran is doing it; and here is this great nation saying it cannot afford to give our farm people their fair share of the national income.

Mr. Speaker, for these and many other reasons that I do not have time to enumerate, you can be assured I will support the motion.

Mr. Arnold Feusi (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, a few years ago in the United States they had a little President who had a nickname of ‘Give ‘em hell Harry’. I believe today that our farmers who are out in the storm-bound portions of this province, and who are financially bound as well, will have received quite a lift and a good deal of enthusiasm from the speech given by the Minister of Agriculture ‘Give ‘em hell, Toby’ here today. I think they know that they have a very able and sincere fighter for farm improvements.

I would like to go a little closer to home, this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, and call attention to some of the matters in Pelly constituency. I

represent a constituency that is an agricultural one, and one that is situated in the northeastern part of Saskatchewan. We call our area 'the garden of Saskatchewan'. In northeastern Saskatchewan the people there pride themselves on their production. We have produced well through the years. We have some very fine farm land. In 1954, we had a measure of crop failure, and it was necessary that some belt-tightening took place. It took place on our farms; there was a reduction in income. It took place in our businesses throughout our hamlets and towns in Saskatchewan. We expected it. But in 1955, with one of the finest crops in the history of Saskatchewan, there was need for further belt tightening. We find that our businesses suffered a further decline. We only have to through the implement industry, or the garage business, to find that the volume of business they are handling today is some 12 to 15 per cent of normal, and in some of our smaller communities business is at a complete standstill.

Our merchants pretty well have their backs to the wall, and our farmers likewise. It has reached such a stage that quite a considerable amount of talk is going around about leaving the farms. In our northeast we have small farm units; many of our farmers are on quarter and half-section farms, which aggravates the situation. But it is a peculiar thing that some of these farmers that could not make a go during the better years of agriculture in Saskatchewan, find that when they leave the farm and go down east, places like Ontario, they are able to make a fairly substantial living for their families, at least much better than they ever did here in the province of Saskatchewan, on a farm.

There is reason to question why that is so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — No C.C.F. Government there, that's why.

Mr. Feusi: — Why should such a state of affairs be in existence.

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Just propaganda!

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Feusi: — Why is agriculture in western Canada a depressed industry, Mr. Speaker, while all other industries in central Canada are booming? I would like to give an example of what has been going on. I have in mind, here, two of my farm friends who went east last fall. One is drawing \$1.70 an hour, another is drawing in the vicinity of \$3 an hour as a skilled tradesman. They did not or could not, hope for an income like that on an average farm, regardless of how well they produced here in Saskatchewan, or in western Canada.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, why eastern Canada should be booming today while the people of western Canada, such as those in Saskatchewan, have to pull up industries by their boot-straps without any assistance from the Federal Government.

Mr. Loptson: — Because they've got a C.C.F. Government.

Mr. Feusi: — From 1940 onwards to the present day, we have been in the throes of a hot war and a cold war. Approximately 50 per cent of all the revenues of the nation have been funnelled into Ontario and Quebec by the Government

of Canada - \$2 billion out of a national revenue amounting to over \$4 billion annually. If we check the records, Mr. Speaker, we will find that less than one per cent of defence expenditures were funnelled into Saskatchewan. This sort of activity in eastern Canada definitely was a stimulation to industry there. No wonder industry and occupations are reasonably buoyant. In Saskatchewan we have an entirely different picture, and it amazes me how our Liberal friends across the way can go out of Saskatchewan and weep crocodile tears that Saskatchewan had 'missed the boat' insofar as industrial development is concerned.

It is amazing, and I can't help but go to a poem, Mr. Speaker, to give an indication in poetry of their conduct – the conduct of a man who will run down the efforts of his own people in his home province. It borders on treachery, Mr. Speaker. We have here a poem by Sir Walter Scott:

“Breathes there the man with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said
‘This is my own, my native land.’”

I would like to commend that to the Opposition, and the poet here does end up the poem with a fitting end for opposition:

“The wretch concentrated all in self,
Living, shall forfeit fair renown.
And doubly dying, shall go down
To the vile dust from whence he sprung;
Unwept, unhonoured and unsung.”

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it would be the people of the province of Saskatchewan who will carry out the poet's prophecy.

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — I read that before you were born.

Mr. Feusi: — Now, Mr. Speaker, we had given to us recently a book dealing with agricultural markets and prices, and it has come from the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life in the province of Saskatchewan. We have not had too much time to delve into it, but there are a few matters pertinent to the lecture given this afternoon by the Minister of Agriculture, and some that I want to follow up.

I have in mind the farm income of the people of the province of Saskatchewan. There is a table here giving us the average net farm income per farm in Saskatchewan from the years 1926 to 1954. I shall just hit a few of the high spots. In 1926 the average farmer's income (net) was \$1,416. There was a very rapid decline up to the '30's. In 1931 the net farm income was a minus \$225, Mr. Speaker. Slowly thereafter the farmer climbed out of the debt hole he was in, and by 1936 he had risen to a net average farm income of \$79. That grew throughout the years. By 1948 it had reached \$3,132 net farm income per farm family. The highest reached was in 1952 - \$5169 net income per farm family. Then another decline set in. In 1953 it dropped to \$4,450 and in 1954 a tremendous drop down to \$1,194 per farm family of net income.

There is another table given here. It will give the same figures in a little different light. Farm holdings classified by value of products sold in Saskatchewan for the year 1950; gross value of products sold per farm – less than \$250 of gross revenue per farm. There were 5,956 such farms, representing 5.6 per cent of our farm population in the province. Gross farm income from \$250 to \$1,199 per farm – a total of 18,772 farmers, or 17.5 per cent. Then to an average figures of anywhere from \$1,200 gross income per farm to \$2,500 per farm; there were 33,236 farmers in that category, representing 30.9 per cent of our farm population.

Those three percentages alone give us 54 per cent of our farm population that have less than a \$2,500 gross income. In those figures alone there is a difference between the thinking of the Liberal members at Ottawa and our C.C.F. people, and I should say, probably the rest of the opposition at Ottawa. I have here an item from 'The Free Press'. Incidentally it is a western paper that is predominately Liberal, but one that has seen the light on occasion, particularly this past fall and winter. It is entitled, 'C.D., how could you?':

“Mr. Howe, defending the Government against attacks on its wheat policy, made an extraordinary speech in the House of Commons on Monday. No doubt it had some subtle points, but such subtlety will leave plain folks in western Canada more puzzled and more dissatisfied than ever. To have Mr. Howe using his speech in Parliament to run down the Canadian Wheat Board is a shock that takes some getting used to.

“Mr. Howe did not on this occasion develop much positive argument in favour of the government measures for guaranteed bank loans and storage payments. His two main points, were, first, that prairie farmers are not as badly off as critics say.”

I would like to point out that the trend of thought that has gone through the Liberal majority that comes from Quebec and Ontario is that all of our farmers in western Canada drive Cadillacs and go down to California and Florida every winter. Our Liberal friends do not paint a true picture at all of the situation.

Back again, Mr. Speaker, to another set of figures: Gross income to our farmers in the year 1952 in Saskatchewan, gross income \$711 million; 1953, \$742 million; 1954, \$472 million; 1955, \$426 million. A steady decline, Mr. Speaker. But that is the gross income, and does not give a fair indication of what the true picture is. The total net income to the farmer in 1952 (one of the best years in the history of farming in Saskatchewan) was \$566 million. In 1953 it dropped to \$468 million; in 1954, it dropped to \$120 million. Mr. Speaker, we haven't any indication at all of what it is for 1955, but if costs continue to rise, the farmer will be in a dilemma.

Today, facing western Canada both in business that serves the farm population and our farmers, the big problem today is the diminishing returns and the fact that there is no indication that there will be a levelling off of costs.

February 21, 1956

We can ask, why is the farmer in a price-cost squeeze? In 1946, the Liberal Government in Ottawa, supported by both Conservatives and Social Creditors, removed price controls. Today farm operational costs continue to rise and farm prices continue to fall. Our friends across the way do a lot of squawking across the province about education costs and taxes. Both hospital costs and land tax and educational costs continue to rise, Mr. Speaker, because costs of operating our institutions continue to go up.

We can ask again, where are these costs going to level off, and when? I believe we faced a similar situation in 1928 and 1929. It was an accelerated state of affairs at that time and ended in a crash. This cost-price squeeze is also gotten into other hands than the farmers. We can take as an indication, the situation our old-age pensioners are in today. Under pressure some years ago, the Liberals gave elder citizens a pension. It rose to \$40 a month. Some 10 years ago that \$40 would have bought a good supply of groceries. Today the \$40 is worth only \$20, and we can say that actually the system of inflation today has robbed our most needy people, the old-age pensioners, of half their income.

Labourers are faced with the same situation. The need of increasing wage rates to compensate for loss they suffer through increased costs and increased costs of living continues.

I know there is quite a bit of talk about the cost of living, and high taxes by the Opposition, and they have a habit of blaming the nearest government, which is the Provincial Government. In Alberta we find a Liberal Party in major opposition, and they are blaming the Social Credit Government for the high cost of education, the high costs of administration of municipalities, and the high land tax. In the province of Saskatchewan we find them blaming the C.C.F. Government for the high costs, and in Manitoba all they can blame is the Liberal Government in Manitoba, but they have reason to think a little further there, because the Liberal Government in Manitoba is the same as the Liberal Government at Ottawa; and of course, they pinpoint facts a little closer to home, which occasions the excitement of some of our Manitoba farmers into shooting their television sets!

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — It must have been a C.C.F.'er.

Mr. Feusi: — Mr. Speaker, there has been throughout the years a planned sabotage of agriculture by our friends across the way. This is a very strong thing to say, a very strong statement to make. My deskmate here stated that we could overcome a great deal of our agricultural problems by calling some attention to "Jimmy" Gardiner by using a neck-yoke. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if that would solve the problem, because the problem is not only neglect; the problem is a deliberate planned attempt to keep agriculture an industry of poverty — a hewer of wood, and drawer of water.

I would like to go into a few facts, and I intend to do some quoting to substantiate the claim, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal record is a black one insofar as the agricultural industry is concerned. Let us take the Wheat Board. Every time our farmers attempt to make it more workable or practical, we find the heads of the Liberal Government at Ottawa, Mr. Howe, Mr. Gardiner, and Mr. Tucker, saying, "You'll wreck the Wheat Board." Or they will threaten the farmers with the fact that the Wheat Board will resign and they will have no Wheat Board at all.

I would like to go into the history of the Wheat Board a bit, and in so doing I would like to quote a portion of a speech made in the House here some years ago, by our doughty little Premier, who was replying to Mr. Tucker. At that time Mr. Tucker, I believe, was posing as a defender of the Wheat Board, posing as a defender and a great knight in defence of the farmer. This is what “Tommy” Douglas said to Mr. Tucker in this House in 1951:

“My hon. friend doesn’t need to stand here as the champion of the Wheat Board. This is a new role for the Liberal Party. I remember the years when some of us on this side of the House were fighting for the Wheat Board. The Liberals were telling us, ‘That means regimentation; that means taking away the farmers’ freedom. Let the Winnipeg Grain Exchange handle wheat and coarse grains’.”

“Most of us have not forgotten that in 1936 it was the Liberal Government which by order-in-council deprived the farmers of the right to deliver their wheat to the Wheat Board, a time when they needed that help, and that from then until the war clouds began to gather year after year the Wheat Board sat idly by while the farmers’ grain was marketed in the Winnipeg Grain Exchange.

“Most of us have not forgotten that the first thing the Liberal Government did when they came into office in 1936, was to take Mr. J.R. Murray, Secretary of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, and make him Chairman of the Wheat Board – an action which I described in the House of Commons at that time as being similar to putting a skunk in a hen coop to raise chickens.”

Mr. Danielson: — Who said this? I’m asking him a question; whose statement is he reading?

Mr. Feusi: — The statement of the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan in reply to a statement that Mr. Tucker made in this House that he was a great defender of the farmers of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Danielson: — Which premier? T.C. Douglas? He’s likely to say anything.

Mr. Feusi: — Now to go a little further, Mr. Speaker. Within recent years, good crop years, there has arisen a problem of getting our crops to market and getting a return and income for it to the farmer. The problem right there was the boxcars, or lack of boxcars. Agitation was responsible for the Liberals bringing into being a boxcar comptroller, and at the time the farmers had an idea that would solve their problems. But again, there was no intention by the Liberals of solving any problems, Mr. Speaker. You would think they would put in a man who would have some interest in the problems of the farmer; but again they took a man out of the Grain Exchange to head the transport control problem of Canada.

Mr. Horsman (Wilkie): — They should have put you in there.

Mr. Feusi: — Again, we read lately of another attempt by the Liberals. I stated here before that there is no sincerity in their intention to solve the boxcar situation. There is another attempt being made by them to unload the

February 21, 1956

boxcar problem completely upon the Wheat Board; and these are the people who shed crocodile tears because we give the Wheat Board too much labour. The Federal Agricultural Committee is attempting to drop upon the Wheat Board the problem of the boxcars without any government direction at all. That means the Wheat Board will have to wander without government leadership in the handling of the boxcar situation. What will be the result? It will be frustration. Insofar as the farmers are concerned there will be no answer at all to the problem facing them. What will happen is that it will pinpoint the farmers' ire to the Wheat Board, when the Wheat Board should have no responsibility for that anger at all. That responsibility should be pointed directly at the Government at Ottawa.

I recall back in 1953 another item, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Wheat Board. My deskmate and myself moved and seconded a resolution in this House for the voluntary check-off of farm union dues in order to aid our farm union movement here in the province of Saskatchewan. That, Mr. Speaker, is the true Rand formula applied to agriculture. We have had that turned down. Yet P.F.A.A. collects one per cent through the Wheat Board for a form of insurance – crop failure insurance – for our farmers. All this is an indication of just how sincere our Liberals have been in the past in the handling of farm problems.

I have here a list of questions that I am sure our people throughout western Canada, and particularly in Saskatchewan, must be asking their Liberal neighbours and asking themselves.

Item 1: Why did the Liberals use the Wheat Board during the war to prevent farmers from getting world prices while the manufacturers had the sky as the limit for their profiteering?

Item 2: Why did the Liberals use the Wheat Board to force the farmers to subsidize bread for Canadians, and at the same time big profits for bakery chains? There were big profits made at that time, Mr. Speaker, and I will explain them a little later on.

Item 3: Why is it that last fall, when C.D. Howe ordered a five-cent drop in wheat prices to stimulate sales just before the closing of the Lake trade, bread went up one cent a loaf? I know my farm friends inquired, "How does that happen?"

And at the same time one of the great bakery moguls, Garfield Weston, who controls some of the major bakery chains, went across into the United States and bought up a chain store system for \$300 million. There is no consistency there, Mr. Speaker.

Item 4: Why is it that Canada, with a Liberal Government and the best quality of wheat in the world, should steadily lose her share of new world markets while every other wheat-producing country increased theirs. These facts our farmers and business men in western Canada will have to inquire into.

I would like to go back again to one of our Liberal papers that has recently seen the light. This is from the editorial page of the 'Winnipeg Free Press' of October 21, 1955. It is headed, 'Failed', and is in connection with the attempts by the Wheat Board to come to some agreement

with Washington in connection with the trade the United States is carrying on.

It reads:

“Such is the failure at Washington, that Canadian Wheat Board officials are not to be blamed for it. They did, no doubt, put in the framework that Mr. Howe and his colleagues had provided for them. They did, for the first time, make official Washington understand Canada’s position.

“That achievement is itself the indictment of a government’s slovenly failure to get to grips with the wheat problem in time.

“The United States’ surplus disposal programme has not just begun. The threat to Canada and to world trade has been apparent all this year.

“This is the fundamental failure, the failure not of officials but of politics. It is the gross indifference of Ottawa to the interests of the west. There have been cases of such indifference before in Canadian history, and they have sometimes lit fires that changed the course of our politics.”

That is from a Liberal paper, Mr. Speaker, a paper that has seen the light. I believe it would be a matter of interest if our ‘Leader-Post’ could follow suit and give true leadership to farm problems here in Saskatchewan and western Canada.

There are a few other questions our people will have to ask our friends across the way on the hustings. Why does the Liberal Government at Ottawa charge farmers 5 per cent on bank loans, while a private American pipeline firm can get the benefit of pipeline assistance from Ottawa at 3½ per cent.

Why is it that freight rates continue to rise, along with C.P.R. profits – the true C.P.R. profits, Mr. Speaker, the C.P.R. profits with the profits of all the subsidiary industries that go with the C.P.R. Why is it necessary for the provincial government every year to spend thousands of dollars in order to fight to retain what is left of the Crow’s Nest Pass rates for our farmers?

I would just like to point out here the fallacy of what is going on. In the first instance, when the Crow’s Nest Pass rates came into being, it was an agreement between the Government of Canada and the C.P.R., which gave the C.P.R. considerable benefits in the form of millions of acres of land, and considerable holdings that today represent the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company of Trail, B.C. The responsibility of the C.P.R. at that time was to build a section of railroad in the mountains of B.C., and another responsibility was the retention of a ceiling on freight rates to protect the new industry of agriculture that was growing in the west. Tremendous settlement was taking place and in order to encourage the colonizing of the west, the Government

had put into the Crow's Nest rates agreement the fact that there was to be a ceiling on all products coming in to assist the farmer, machinery, etc. I will not take the time to list them here. There was also to be a ceiling for rates on wheat and flour leaving the prairies.

Now, a strange thing happened. Back in 1925 when the Government at Ottawa found itself with no majority, the Government under Mackenzie King had to depend upon power at that time on the help of two of the forerunners of the C.C.F., Independent Labour members, Mr. Heaps and Mr. Woodsworth. They agreed to assist the Liberals and support them if the Liberals would supply or inaugurate old-age pensions, and the Liberals very, very astute to political trickery, used that means. They knew that the old-age pension scheme would be a very popular move, and they knew that they would gain considerable favour out in the country. They went to the electors again and were elected with a considerable majority. But, strange to say, as soon as that majority sat they had a re-read of the Crow's Nest rates and dropped all responsibilities of the railroad toward a freight rate ceiling on good coming in for our farm population in western Canada.

The strange thing is, however, there was no dropping of the benefits that the railroads got through the Crow's Nest agreement, such as re-claiming some of the land that they were given, the millions of acres of land given in grants to the railroads, or in re-claiming a portion of the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company or its holdings. None of this was done, Mr. Speaker. I mention this as an indication to show that the behaviour of the Government at Ottawa is not true although members of the Liberal Government at Ottawa pose as the saviours of the farmer. Many times in the past there has been insincerity or discrimination against the agricultural industry that has helped to bring it into the situation it is today.

Another item I would like to deal with is electricity. My constituency is adjacent to the province of Manitoba, and the Manitoba power system there has some bearing upon the thinking of our people here in Saskatchewan along the boundary. Our Liberal friends stated time and time again that the power rates in Saskatchewan are exorbitant. They never go on to explain to the people what the power rates were under the Liberals before 1944. Power rates reached as high as 20 cents per kilowatt hour then, Mr. Speaker. Today our power rates, after five reductions through the years, are 8 cents per kilowatt hour maximum and down to 1½ cents per kilowatt hour minimum.

They also state they are going to bring into being a power programme similar to that in Manitoba. We can ask our Liberal friends, how many farm homes were electrified prior to 1944 when they departed from office here in Saskatchewan? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is around 136 or 138 farm homes, and that in spite of the fact that the Power Act came into being in 1929, and there were some 15 years time for them to bring power to our rural people.

Our Liberal friends waited for private enterprise to do the job for them, and private enterprise will only operate where there is money to be made, and that is in the urban areas. There was nothing done, which means that in Saskatchewan in a period from 1929 to 1944, there was an average of less than 10 farm homes electrified under the government in Saskatchewan at that time. Today we are electrifying 7,500 farm homes yearly. We can say, was there ever a power programme in the world anywhere the size of Saskatchewan's?

To my knowledge, I don't think there has been a power programme anywhere in the world today to compare with that of Saskatchewan.

Another question, how would the Liberals pay for power that they propose to give for nothing In the year 1952 . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Ask “Tommy” Douglas. He was going to give you free hospitalization.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Feusi: — At a Liberal public meeting in the village of Pelly, two of the members of the Liberal executive were speakers at the meeting, and they, of course, promised free power at that time. It's an old song for the Liberals, and one of our town residents (of Pelly) during the question period asked them point blank just how they were going to pay for this free power they were going to give; they couldn't pull it off like Santa Clause; they would have to get the money somewhere. Well, they looked at each other for a minute and finally, after a bit of a huddle, one speaker got up and said, “Well, we'd have to issue debentures; we suggest 20-year debentures and in that period of time your power programme would be paid off.” That didn't go over too well there, for the simple reason that our people were used to telephone debentures. In 20 years the interest amounted to more than the initial cost so that it would be twice the cost.

We can ask this question, why can't the C.C.F. give power for nothing to our rural people in Saskatchewan? Well, I can say here, Mr. Speaker, if we only electrified a few, such as 10 farm homes a year as our Liberal friends did, we could give it to them for nothing and could also give them free electrical contrivances. Instead of embossing the electrical equipment with chrome, we could emboss them with gold and silver, if we electrified only 10 farm homes a year. But we are electrifying 7,500, Mr. Speaker. It is possible we could electrify probably 2,000 or 3,000 farm homes at no cost to the subscriber, but I would like to point out that by the end of this year we will have 40,000 farm homes electrified in Saskatchewan. The records show that we have almost 115,000 farm homes. You deduct the 40,000 from the 115,000 and it leaves in the vicinity of 70,000 to 75,000 farm homes that want electricity from the end of this year and onward. If we electrified only a matter of 2,000 or 3,000 a year, it would take in the vicinity of 30 to 35 years to electrify all the farm homes in Saskatchewan – a long time for some of our people to wait.

Mr. Howe (Kelvington): — How long would it take if we were only electrifying 10 farm a year?

Mr. Feusi: — Yes, to electrify at the speed of the Liberals, 10 farm homes a year, Mr. Speaker, it would take, I believe 7,500 years to finish the power programme.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak (Minister of Telephones): — Well, that's about their size.

Mr. Feusi: — But getting back here to the programme that is before the people of Saskatchewan, 75,000 farm homes. If we electrify 7,500 a year, within 10 or 12 years, Mr. Speaker, we should be able to blanket the province of Saskatchewan and bring power to most of our people.

Another item in regard to cost, and this was mentioned by the Minister of Agriculture: Why do our Liberals consistently promise cheaper power in Saskatchewan, but refuse to help build the South Saskatchewan dam? Yet they will help Ontario get cheaper power through the St. Lawrence Seaway. There's no sincerity to the people in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, and again I quote:

“Breathes there a man with a soul so dead
Who never to himself hath said
This is my own, my native province.”

Before leaving the power scheme I want to point out one other item. My friends across the way have a very sincere belief in private enterprise, and they would sell their souls in the interests of private enterprise. Isn't this a strange thing? Why do our Liberals here in Saskatchewan, who go all out for private enterprise, point to Manitoba's power scheme and not to Alberta's where a private enterprise scheme is in effect today, with power hook-ups that cost anywhere from \$1,000 to \$1,700 per farm?

Mr. McCarthy: — Mr. Roper says he's going to put them in the same as Manitoba.

Mr. Feusi: — In Manitoba, the situation is entirely different to ours. The farm population is in probably an area one-third that of ours. They had an opportunity of getting started with a power scheme 30 or 35 years ago. They used money that was the rental of water rights on the Winnipeg River to a concern that was generating power; that money was the start of their rural power programme.

I would like to point out again that our Liberal friends across the way are inconsistent. Manitoba's power programme is very close to what you may call a Socialist power programme. It is public enterprise, and our Liberal friends don't say a word about Socialism in this instance. They don't say a word, either, about Alberta's, where our farm friends have to pay \$1,700 for a farm hook-up. I know this, for there have been some of my farmers in Kamsack cross to Alberta and their relatives paid that amount.

Mr. McCarthy: — Not according to what Mr. Roper was going to do up there.

Mr. Feusi: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to revert back to constituency matters, and probably bring a few points up to date insofar as the Opposition is concerned. I know they made a few statements that were far from factual. This year the Government honoured the constituency of Last Mountain and the constituency of Kinistino by having their members move and second the Address in Reply to the Throne Speech. Pelly constituency was also honoured by the powers that be. I don't know who was instrumental in doing so, but our militia band from Kamsack, the 53rd Royal Canadian Artillery band, officiated at the opening here, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that I can tell the good people of Kamsack that their band gave a command performance.

It is rather interesting, Mr. Speaker, if I could name the occupations of all the members of the band. You would find that in our Kamsack band we had pretty well every occupation represented, other than the butcher, the baker and the candle-stick maker. Our leader is one of our druggists, and considerable credit is due him for the time and interest he has taken in band music. The rest of the members represent a cross-section of the public of

Kamsack and district – school teachers, lumber dealer, young farmers, merchants, dry-cleaners, and so forth, Mr. Speaker, right across the board. This is a community endeavour that speaks well for a community that can support and bring about such an organization.

I have another band in mind, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to mention at this time and that is the Norquay Peoples' Band, or Civilian Band. That is a very fine band also – a little larger band than the band at Kamsack, and it is complete even to the extent of having drum majorettes. Last summer they performed at quite a few Jubilee functions. Norquay is just a village, and not a very large village at that, and there, Mr. Speaker, they even had to get into pretty well every type of profession. I know in Norquay they even made use of the butcher. I would like to mention here that the band institution of Norquay is a very important part of village life. I believe any village that can support and carry on as a hobby such an institution as a band, does their district great credit.

We have, representing the two towns of Kamsack and district and Norquay and district, newspaper firms. In Kamsack we have the 'Kamsack Times' which gives fairly able coverage of the southern part of the constituency. In Norquay we have the 'Norquay North Star', a smaller paper, which gives very close and intimate coverage of the northern portion of Pelly constituency. I would just like to read a few of the main items from the front page of the 'Norquay North Star'. One deals with university education; another one is rink finances, and debenture votes. This item is an example where the town and the community has gone together, building a sports palace, Mr. Speaker. This is in connection with the Wheat Pool. I believe the Wheat Pool is going to finance it, and it has been mostly local labour doing the construction of it. The Wheat Pool will be using the building for storage facilities for the next few years until such time, I believe, as it is paid off. It is another community endeavour that our 'Norquay North Star' has taken a leading part in, and I know it has been a very fine effort on the part of the people in general. One day I found in the vicinity of 30 to 50 of our local people, farmers and townspeople, giving of their time and abilities towards the construction of the sports palace.

The highlights of the front page in our 'Kamsack Times' of this date deals with the housing project that Kamsack is going into for its senior citizens. This is a reality now, and I believe construction will begin as soon as the weather becomes fit next spring. There is also on the front page a fairly concise coverage of the Liberal convention held at Kamsack, and it gives a few statements made by Liberals leaders at the convention. I just wish to reply to a few of them. One:

“Dealing with provincial highways, Mr. McDonald said that in 1944, when the present Government went into power there were 8,100 miles of provincial highway, and by 1955 there were 8,300 miles – an increase of only 200 miles,” he said very blandly.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we will have to look into the Liberal highway programme of 1944 and see what comprised the Liberal highway system of that date. Take Pelly constituency, a fact very close to home. From Kamsack south on No. 8 to Wroxton there was only a rural road in 1944. It was on the Liberal

February 21, 1956

highway map, and comprised approximately 30 or 35 miles, because it meandered through the countryside and didn't take a direct route at all.

Mr. Wahl (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — It went out to the Liberal farms.

Mr. Feusi: — That piece of road, Mr. Speaker, was built by this Government in 1947 and 1948, and it is another indication of the Liberals placing things on maps, and this Government bringing it into actuality by constructing it.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — They're trying to put something on for the electors.

Mr. Feusi: — Another example is from Hvas to No. 9, a completion of No. 49, and that was done by this Government during the last 10 years. In Canora constituency, in 1944, there were only eight miles of gravelled highway. You can wonder why there has been constituency in Canora constituency in the election of a C.C.F. member ever since. They are getting roads built, Mr. Speaker, and the people realize it.

I would just like to point out a statement here, since the Leader of the Opposition was in our area in the northeast, soliciting votes and telling the people what grand people they were. In this House not too many years ago, the Minister of Telephones (Hon. Mr. Kuziak), representing Canora as a private member, was putting the case for the northeast — the heavy population we have there and the need for some major roads, caused him to ask for black-top. I believe it was the Leader of the Opposition who said at the time, "You don't need any black-top up there; I don't think you have any white people."

Mr. Wahl: — That's the way they treat the Indians.

Mr. Feusi: — He has the gall to go back up there and solicit votes. That No. 9 Highway presents something for Pelly constituency, and Kelsey constituency as well as Canora constituency, Mr. Speaker, and all the people in northeastern Saskatchewan take considerable pride in that road, and the fact that this Government built it for them.

I would like to go to the constituency south of Pelly, to an old home territory that I know, the constituency of Saltcoats. There, Mr. Speaker, from the village of MacNutt to the village of Langenburg, many, many years ago, the rural road there was blazed as a highway, and that also, I believe, was on the Liberal highway map. I know that at that time in the '30's, No. 8 Highway signs were placed there. There are a few of them still standing, Mr. Speaker; rusty old relics of the Liberal past.

Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords): — There are some of them in the House.

Mr. Feusi: — Mr. Speaker, Mr. McDonald also stated that the C.C.F. was building roads wherever the most votes were. Now that was a complete turnabout; that was Liberal policy in the earlier history of this province. In later years they built better roads because I know that in Pelly constituency the part the Liberals built was a reasonably good road for straightness; No. 49 is one, so I won't hold that to them too much; but the fact that the Liberal

leader of the province should blame us for the old roads that zig-zag and meander all over the province, is peculiar. Going back to Saltcoats constituency, and I know the member for Saltcoats will bear me out when I say that all the good roads built in Saltcoats constituency have been built by this Government.

Now back to Pelly constituency, Mr. Speaker. In 1953 and 1954 we accomplished very little other than repair work. Contracts that were to be let at that time just simply couldn't be done. We had to get along with the road conditions as well as we could, and spent a great deal of money repairing them, because construction was completely out. The whole roadway was a quagmire, and so our 1953 road programme in Pelly constituency was delayed until 1955. A very good job was done on the road from the black-top to the village of Veregin. By going direct we are saving tremendous mileage on our highway programme, and I feel that every contract on No. 5 let in Pelly constituency, will save from three to four miles by eliminating Liberal bends.

A very good example is what is taking place is on Trans-Canada. Trans-Canada normally, I believe, had a mileage in the vicinity of 500 miles; the new Trans-Canada now is 449 miles. There has been a saving of approximately 50 miles by going direct, with the aid of modern engineering. There has been a saving of 23 railroad crossings on No. 1 Highway alone.

Mr. McDonald also declared (and this was an attack on the Highway Department) that the waste and extravagance and incompetence of the Department of Highways is ridiculous. I would like to find out who is ridiculous. I would like to point out the record of the Department of Highways.

Since 1944, considerable work has been done – this is going to be a repetition probably, of what the Minister will be mentioning later on. In 1944, there were 138 miles of black-top in very poor condition in Saskatchewan, which represented approximately 1/60th of the total highway mileage of Saskatchewan. By 1954, 10 years later, we had 1,150 miles of reasonably good black-top, the best being on No. 1. That represents 1/7th of the highway mileage of Saskatchewan. Construction and reconstruction in the province totalled 4,706 miles in 10 years. That is the equivalent of Manitoba's entire highway mileage and half again, or Alberta's highway mileage and half again. Gravel surfacing and resurfacing, 10,968 miles. My friends across the way will say, "Oh, that's greater than the highway mileage in Saskatchewan; that's another figment of our imagination." It isn't, Mr. Speaker, Highway No. 8 south of Kamsack that was built in 1947-48 has received a second coating of gravel this last year. Many of our roads in Saskatchewan within the past 10 years have been gravelled and re-gravelled. Sixty-three large concrete bridges, one of the finest of them being the bridge across the South Saskatchewan river were built; 52 steel bridges, 651 lumber bridges – a total of 766 built in 10 years. We repaired 8 concrete bridges – 172 steel and 204 lumber, making a total of over 1,000 bridges either repaired or built.

Only a political juvenile delinquent would have the gall to publicly label the Highway Department extravagant or ridiculous. It's simply not so; the facts speak otherwise.

Now, back to Pelly constituency. In spite of the excessive rainfall, considerable was accomplished. I mentioned that we could not construct

roads, that we had flood problems; but re-gravelling was necessary and that was done. No. 8 north to No. 49 and No. 49 across from east to west, and No. 8 south from Kamsack was done. Reconstruction of No. 5 is taking place, and the second contract will be completed, this year, to reach from the village of Veregin through Kamsack to the junction with No. 57 east to Kamsack.

I would like to mention here the fact that the Opposition points a finger at us that we should have had divine guidance in the control of the weather. A few of our Liberal opponents on the hustings in the last couple of years have been pointing their fingers at us, asking why we weren't accomplishing this or that. I know a time the Minister of Telephones had to walk in the last mile or two into a village; the highway was a quagmire, an unfinished portion of new highway which finally had to be built with a dragline.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — It was the old Liberal bed I walked in on!

Mr. Feusi: — Some of his friends laughed. It was a fine thing when the Minister has to walk, why didn't he see that some highways were built? The Minister of Telephones was able to turn back to his farm friends and say, "How come your summerfallow has grown up green about two to three feet in height? Why haven't you worked your summerfallow?" Of course, the water prevented them. I know, out on the hustings, people asking us the question why we didn't do this and why we didn't do that, but we had the excuse of the weather not being fit. They tried to put the blame on me, Mr. Speaker, and I always mentioned that weather was something that crossed provincial boundaries; hence if they checked the B.N.A. Act of Canada they would find that the weather was a responsibility of the Federal Government and apparently the Federal Government was doing nothing at all about it.

Mr. McCarthy: — That's a new one for the Federal Government to take on.

Mr. Feusi: — Back to the constituency, Mr. Speaker. My constituency is served with some old highways that are in need of reconstruction. A portion of the constituency has no highway system at all. I believe that some 40 years ago they were promised either a highway or a railroad, but neither has materialized. Two municipalities, Clayton and Livingstone, probably represent the heaviest rural population in Saskatchewan. This is the area I mentioned that has considerable quarter-section farms. People have to come as far as 30 miles across rural roads to reach a highway. The market grid that will go into operation this year will mean much to our people there. We have made a beginning on the grid in the last two years.

Increased equalization grants and special grants were put on the main market roads in order to keep an avenue open for the people to the highway and the railroad. They made a beginning in the last two or three years with what grants were available; but the grid scheme is welcomed by our people in Pelly constituency, particularly in that part of the constituency where they are not well served by highways. I would like to mention here that if we could continue our highway programme and continue the rebuilding of a few of our old highways, we could save sufficient mileage so that within a few years we could extend one of our highways into the northern part of Pelly constituency. This would take some of the excessive traffic load off our northern municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to mention a few facts insofar as the behaviour of the Opposition is concerned with the coming election, as compared with 1952. In 1952, I believe you will remember the highlight was that they were going to throw out, when they got into office, many of our Crown Corporations. The people thought otherwise, and threw a lot of the Liberals out. Today you hear nothing about the throwing out of the Crown Corporations, and those who care to make a study of the work of the Crown Corporations will find that the revenue and industry of these corporations are of great benefit to the province. But, Mr. Speaker, I just wonder that, by painting over a leopard you make him any different from what he is. By removing his spots, he is still a leopard and I believe that our Liberal friends across the way have not changed.

There is just one final challenge I would like to throw across at them. If by some fluke they should ever obtain office in Saskatchewan, I wonder if they would sell, or give away, many of our Crown Corporations to their friends.

Mr. Wahl: — They would.

Mr. Feusi: — They have done it before, Mr. Speaker, and I would just like to mention one thing that has increased farm costs considerably. It is the fact that three fertilizer plants, paid for by the people of Canada, at the end of the war were turned over by the Liberals to private enterprise for a quarter of their value. Each of these fertilizer plants was paid for to the tune of \$19 million or more by the people of Canada.

Mr. Kramer: — They figured “Jimmy” Gardiner might take care of that.

Mr. Feusi: — They were sold for \$4½ million each and from the time of their sale to the present time fertilizer has gone up from about \$55 or \$60 a ton to \$115 a ton.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House again to the need of continuing the work of relieving the problems of the least of our people. When I think of the many people, for instance, who were assisted through automobile insurance; people who, through no fault of their own, got into accidents and probably would have been subjected to fines or costs that they would never have gotten out of in one man’s lifetime; they were saved from a form of financial slavery because of automobile insurance. Automobile insurance is something that has helped many of our most needy people. So too has the air ambulance. The way the weather has been this winter our rural people are isolated, but it must give them a certain measure of security to know that there is hospital help within reach of them and within a few hours time. It has been done, Mr. Speaker, and thousands of our people who are in isolated areas have been helped by the air ambulance.

Consider free cancer treatment and our hospitalization care. Regarding the cancer treatment I was one individual who in the early part of the ‘30s depended for a livelihood through the teaching profession. I was fortunate I was in an area where they paid a very substantial salary – a salary of \$500 and I got the \$500. But in the early years of the ‘30s I lost my father through cancer. At that time there was no free cancer treatment, and we mortgaged our home and considerable of the future in order to try and save the life of our father. I was the second eldest in a family of eight, and losing the

provider of the family meant very much to the family. There must be thousands of families in the province of Saskatchewan who have faced similar situations within the last few years, that were spared financial slavery through the acts of this Government, through hospitalization and free cancer and polio treatment.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to commend again to the Opposition the Good Book in dealing with governments and people: "Inasmuch as ye do unto the least of these, you do also unto me." And I would like to say that even the most hard-headed Liberal, with the coldest and stoniest of heart, if he had any feeling at all for some of his fellowmen, could not help but vote for the Government, for this resolution, and for "Tommy" Douglas. I shall support the motion.

Mr. Carr (Rosthern): — Before discussing this motion, Mr. Speaker, I would first like to compliment you, Sir, on your many years of service in your present position and to express my appreciation for the fair manner in which you have tried to keep order in this House.

I would compliment the mover and the seconder of this motion. I am sure that the mover outlined quite clearly the election campaign for his party. I appreciated that very much, getting it so early in this Session.

Mr. Brown (Last Mountain): — Not yet you haven't. I've got that in here.

Mr. Carr: — I would like to compliment the hon. member for Kinistino – he is my neighbour. I thought that he made a very fine speech.

I have been interested in all the speeches, but one thing struck me after I heard the Premier speak, and that is how many speeches from members on the other side have followed the same pattern. The Premier said that this Government has saved the municipalities millions of dollars, and I think most speakers since have developed the theme in various ways.

Tomorrow, I hope to tell this House the truth.

Some Hon. Member: — The whole truth?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Carr: — I would like to compliment the Leader of the Opposition for bringing to the attention of this House the many problems that are facing the people of this province. In spite of all the criticism that has come from those on your right, Mr. Speaker, I think that he did bring before this House some of the important problems that are facing the people of this province. Otherwise, why should the members opposite be so incensed at what he has said? They must be afraid he has made an impression on the voters of this province.

There are a few things in the Speech from the Throne that pleased me. There are some things, or the lack of some things, that I am not satisfied with, but there is some things that pleased me.

For instance, I am very pleased that the Government has seen fit to build a women's gaol. I know that hon. members will recall that we (to use a good C.C.F. word) 'prodded' the Government to do this.

Mr. McDonald: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Carr: — I am sure that the Government will be generous enough to give the Opposition credit. I have noticed from reading reports in the House of Commons at Ottawa, that whenever the Government does anything good the C.C.F. members thank the Government for it, and tell them that they have 'prodded' the Government to do it. I believe the C.C.F., when they were in opposition in this House, took credit for 'prodding' the Liberal Government to do the good things. So I hope that this Government will give us credit for prodding them to build the gaol.

Another thing that pleases me is that the Government intends to modernize the Mental Hospitals. I know the public have not been aware of the need for better care for those who are mentally ill. I think perhaps a great deal of credit is due to the Canadian Mental Health Association for educating the public to the need of a better understanding of mental health needs. I think that the people of this province are prepared today to provide more and better facilities for the care of the mentally ill.

Another thing that pleases me is that this Government has finally seen the light and is going to have larger school unit trustees elected in a truly democratic manner. I am pleased to see this.

I am pleased also to know that this Government is going to give increased school grants. Now I certainly hope that the grants are sufficient to hold down the taxes on property. I hope that property taxes will not have to go up again this year, as they have for many years. I hope that the Minister of Education sees fit to increase the grants to the independent school districts. Also as many of the members know, the independent school districts are discriminated against in regard to school grants.

I made a study of one of the superintendencies some years ago. I believe some of the figures were presented in this House. At that time (I think about 1948) the independent districts received something like \$500 per classroom less in school grants — that's on a superintendency basis — than did the larger units. I was pleased the Government decided later to cut down that difference. They cut it down by about \$100 but there still is a \$400 difference. I hope the Government will, this year, cut that figure down considerably and bring the grants to the independent districts closer to what they are in the larger units.

I realize that the independent school districts in this province are a minority. It is true they have chosen to operate their schools on an independent basis; but I believe we should not ignore minorities. We should give consideration to their views, because perhaps they have something to offer to our way of life. I do not think it is fair that the Government should say that because these districts do not choose to follow the pattern approved by the Government, they cannot have the same share of the Provincial taxes.

While we are on this question of education, there is another thing that pleases me, and that is the decision of the Government to build a new technical institute. I think that we have reached the stage in the development of this province when we can well afford a technical institute. I would like to say, however, I think it should be operated like the School of Agriculture in relationship to the College of Agriculture. A new technical institute should be placed under the control of the University. There may be students who fail in engineering or fail in science, who decide to take a technical course and go into whatever field of endeavour they wish. There may be students start out in the technical school, as they start out in the School of Agriculture, and are so interested in the subject that they decide to take a degree course at the University. By putting it under the University there is little danger for any political influence to come into the matter.

Premier Douglas: — That's what we thought.

Mr. Carr: — The Minister of Education – he waves his hand at me – and the junior member from Regina (Mrs. Cooper) endeavoured to leave the impression that the question of Regina College had been made a political issue by the Liberal Party.

Some Opposition Member: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Carr: — All members here know it was a Liberal Government that established the University; it was the Liberal Government that set up the controlling body, or provided authority for a controlling body; it was a Liberal Government that found the money to take over Regina College when they failed financially, and it was a Liberal Government that put Regina College under the University of Saskatchewan. That was Liberal policy and always has been. But, because the Leader of the Opposition brought before this House the opinion of a minority, people who feel that they should have a College here, the Minister of Education immediately turns his words around and implies that the Leader of the Opposition is trying to make a political issue out of it.

Regardless of what government is in power, if sufficient money can be found for the University of Saskatchewan, and the Board of Governors sees fit to provide a degree-granting College in Regina, I am sure that if the University has not been able to do it up to now, it is simply because this Government has not found the money needed by the University. There is one thing about the Liberal Party – it's somewhat different from the one on the other side; every person in the Liberal Party can stand up and say what he thinks; we don't have to toe the party line.

Mr. R. Brown: — You think . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Carr: — I mentioned a few minutes ago when I began that the Premier set the stage and everyone followed him exactly. There hasn't been one new idea come from the other side so far in this Session.

I am going to make a suggestion to this Government, and I want the Minister of Education to understand that it is not necessarily Liberal policy; I am speaking for myself. But because I am a Liberal and believe in Liberal philosophy, I think it's sound.

When this province was formed, it probably was necessary that control of education, that is of primary and secondary education, be under the Department of Education. This arrangement was probably necessary to get uniform education over the province. It was necessary also that the normal schools or Teachers' Colleges be under the control of the Department of Education. Thanks to the efforts of our pioneers and our good Liberal governments, most of the people in Saskatchewan are now educated. I think the time has arrived in this province when the Teachers' Colleges could be put under the control of the University. I think that that is where the Teachers' Colleges should be – I don't mean necessarily the buildings at the University campus; but I do mean under the control of the Board of Governors and the Senate of the University. It is no longer necessary that the Department of Education have supervision over the Teachers' Colleges, and this change would be a good thing for education in this province.

I think that we could even go one step further. I think that the Superintendents of Schools could either be hired directly by the School Units or come under the governing Board of the University. We would then have one body of the learned people of this province, controlling and directing education.

As I said I am not putting this out as Liberal policy; I am only offering it to this House as a suggestion.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. member from Pelly. He had a long address. I would not attempt to remember it all; but there is one thing that impressed me in his remarks and that was the little story he told about the Minister of Highways. He mentioned that the farmer asked him why he hadn't built highways and the Minister, noticing that the weeds were growing high in his summerfallow asked the farmer why he hadn't done his summerfallow. I think, Mr. Speaker, the answer in both cases is – inefficiency.

After these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

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