

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Thirteenth Legislature
7th Day

Friday, February 22, 1957

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

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Debate on Address-In-Reply

The House resumed from Thursday, February 21, 1957, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Wood (Swift Current) for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. Mr. Walker (continuing): — Mr. Speaker, when I was addressing you last evening, and giving a report of the work of the Attorney General's Department, I summed up the work done by each of the Branches of the Department and the intended policy of the Department with respect to the coming.

I want to say now something about general conditions which prevail in the province of Saskatchewan, and conditions which I am sure my constituents and the people of this province will consider me remiss if I did not bring to your attention and to the attention of the House.

Throughout the past year or two Canada has been flooded with newspaper reports and so on of the growing and expanding national economy. We have seen from month to month and year to year a continual growth in the gross national product of our country. We have seen all the familiar indices of expansion showing a steady upward climb. Car loadings, bank clearings, employment figures all show the country to be prospering as never before, and yet a large part of the province of Saskatchewan is comprised of agriculture and agricultural people. Throughout my constituency, which is predominantly an agricultural constituency, I find that conditions are not as good as they were five or ten years ago. They are definitely worse. We read reports that the income of our rural people is falling off; I know we read conflicting reports on this subject, depending sometimes on who the author is. I have here a clipping from the 'Saskatoon Star-Phoenix' headed: 'Living Standards Are High, Says Gardiner'. Well, I am not acquainted with any of the 'high-living farmers' as far as Hanley constituency is concerned. I think this is an attempt by the Federal Minister of Agriculture to try to gloss over and cover up the failures of his Government to evolve some constructive agricultural policy which will ensure that agriculture enjoys some parity with the rest of the country.

February 22, 1957

The Canadian Federation of Agriculture and the Farmers' Union have made submissions to the Government of Canada, and in answer to their demands the Hon. Federal Minister of Agriculture says that parity is presently being received by farm people. In a clipping from 'The Leader-Post' of December last:

“Gardiner says parity received. Canadian farmers are receiving parity prices now, Agriculture Minister James G. Gardiner told delegates at the Saskatchewan Liberal Association convention on Saturday.”

Well, I guess it doesn't matter much what you tell Liberals. They are a pretty uncritical lot when it comes to matters of what is true and what is false; they are willing to accept any kind of statement that the Federal Minister of Agriculture wants to make. So he tries to tell them that is true. Minister of Agriculture wants to make. So he tries to tell them that is true. But I have in my hand a clipping from the 'Financial Post' of the same month, and the heading is: 'Why Ottawa Doesn't Favour Farm Parity Price System.’”

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if they would talk with the same tongue in the west that they do in the east, it would give the farmers here an opportunity to realize where the true facts lie, and how the Liberals stand on this important question.

Mr. Lopton: — What does 'The Financial Post' say?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — According to the Dominion bureau of Statistics, the net farm income for the past five years amounted to an average of \$409 million per year. For the year 1956 the figure is \$395 million, or a reduction of \$14 million from the average of the preceding five years.

This net farm income figure is derived by taking the gross income and subtracting farm costs. It should be remembered that gross income includes inventories of grains held, and treats such amounts as though they were income in the year in which they were grown. The farmer has at the present time almost an entire year's income unsold, and for which he has not been paid.

The farm costs are comprised of the actual expenditures that the farmer has made in operating his farm for the year. Every farmer knows that, in recent years, he has not been able to repair or keep up to date the machinery on his farm. He is, in fact, using his depreciation reserves to live, during recent years. The fact that farm costs are lower in 1956 than they were, for example, in 1952, shows that the farmer simply is not meeting his farm costs as they become due.

The figure of \$14 million of reduction in net farm income, therefore, does not tell his story. The farmer has not received his money, which he is assumed to have gotten out of his inventories, nor has he kept his farm machinery standards up to the level of 1950. In spite of the fact that the figures are grossly misleading because of the factors which I have just mentioned, there is still a reduction of some \$14 million in net income. It should also be born in mind that the \$395 million net income shown for the year 1956 represents only about half of the buying power of the \$553 million income which he enjoyed in 1951. We are told by the Party opposite that the problems of the farmer arise out of the high provincial and local taxation.

Total taxes for school and municipal purposes, in 1955, amounted to just a little less than \$29 million — less than 5 per cent of gross farm income. Farmers, like anyone else, have to pay taxes and don't mind paying taxes when they are paying for services which they and their families can enjoy. The biggest complaint I hear among the farm people in this province is that they can't afford to pay more taxes and get more services for themselves and their families.

Some Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The education of farm children, provision of roads for farm population and these things are things which farmers are entitled to enjoy on the same basis as anybody else in the community. Yet, because of these policies which are compelling small farmers to abandon their farms, these policies resulting in a lower municipal population (and I attended a council meeting in one municipality, last year, where they told me that the farm population in the last twenty years, had fallen by more than 50 per cent) . . .

Mr. Lopton: — That's what your Commission told them to do.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — . . . a higher burden of taxes for municipal services falls upon those who remain, with the result today that most of my rural constituents are required to contribute three to four times as much for the cost of educating their children in a one-room rural school as urban residents have to pay to educate their children in modern city schools.

This Government is doing something about that problem, Mr. Speaker. This Government by reorganizing the school system, is attempting to provide the facilities for greater equality of opportunity for rural children. I am sorry to think of the conditions which would exist throughout most of my constituency today if the Larger School Unit had not been inaugurated eight or nine years ago in this province. The Leader School Units have been able to meet these problems and to bring about a better measure of equality between urban and rural children. But, as I say, this loss of

February 22, 1957

population is resulting in a higher burden of taxes to rural people. The obvious problem, then, is the declining farm population. You don't have to ask anyone but a farmer to find out why farm population is declining. You don't have to go to statisticians and experts on the subject. They can tell you that they can't afford to live on a half-section or a quarter section or a three-quarter-section farm that would support them adequately twenty-five years ago. Low quotas, low prices and high farm costs have combined to bring about that result.

This Government is doing something to meet that situation. This Government has faced, for the first time in the history of this province, courageously and with foresight and vision, the problem of reorganizing local services so that rural people can provide themselves with a better standard of rural services. And what assistance is the party opposite giving? The people of this province are determined that our rural areas are going to be organized on the most efficient basis possible. They are determined that the rural people are going to get equality of treatment with all the people of this country, that they are going to provide themselves with better roads, better schools and better local health services, agricultural services and so on; and if municipal reorganization is necessary to accomplish that end the rural people are going to demand that that be done.

Mr. McCarthy: — You had better tell that to your rural municipalities.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I have, and they agree with me. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker. . .

Mr. Cameron: — Where do you stand on the problem?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — . . . in this province any government which was not prepared to take a progressive, enlightened outlook in the face of these problems would be letting down our rural people. But I want to say that no matter what we do to make more efficient, to make less costly and more productive, the rural services, they cannot solve our agricultural problems. When it comes to dealing with a budget of \$29 million or \$30 million (which is what our schools and municipalities have to deal with, you are dealing with only 5 per cent of the total agricultural income. The real solution to this – and I am not one who says we should, out of hand, condemn everything that the Federal Government has or has not done; I believe that this problem requires a joint approach by the provinces and the Federal Government. We on this side of the House are prepared at any time to sit down with the Federal authorities to work out an agricultural policy which may or may not be on all fours with the one which we advocate as a political movement, work out a Federal policy which will insure the solvency and the development of our agricultural industry. We have asked from time to time, and last year this Legislature unanimously asked, that such a conference should be called and that these problems should be studied in an objective fashion. We are not suggesting that we have no responsibility

in these matters. We are prepared to assume our responsibility, and have assumed our responsibility by issuing the call for such a conference, as we have within the last two years.

Mr. Loptson: — That's as far as you want to go — to call a conference.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — We recognize that many of the things which will come out of such a conference would require joint federal and provincial action; and it is because we know that joint action is the only way of approaching these problems that we are prepared to play our part in evolving such a policy. It is, in my opinion, a very grave harm that is being rendered to our province when political parties, like the party opposite, try to make these agricultural problems strictly a petty political issue. We are asking that the C.C.F. Government of Saskatchewan and that the Liberal Government of Canada come together and come to grips with this problem and evolve a policy which will solve this problem. We are not trying to make political advantage out of the serious conditions existing in some of our rural areas. We believe that this is too big a thing for mere petty party advantage. And if the Liberal party come along with such a proposal, I am confident that something can be done in this regard.

Mr. McDonald: — Why don't you propose it?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I suggest that this problem is not insoluble, because the Liberal party has managed to solve this problem for a great many other people in our country. The Liberal party doesn't hesitate to place the credit of Canada behind a little group of foreign investors who want to build a pipeline. They don't hesitate to give cash advances. . .

Mr. Danielson: — What about the cement company?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — As a matter of fact, the grain companies had no difficulty getting cash advances. When they take the grain and put it into the terminal elevators they are paid for it. All we are suggesting is that the same treatment be meted out to farmers. I say that it is a myth perpetrated by the Federal Minister of Agriculture that cash advances will cost the farmer money and that he should pay interest on them. I suggest that the farmer is now paying interest so that cash advances may be enjoyed by the grain companies on the grain in terminal elevators.

Mr. Cameron: — The consumer, too?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The consumer doesn't pay for the grain until it is received in the foreign markets, yet the grain companies are paid for the grain as soon as they get it into an exportable position and it may

lie there for twelve months. In the meantime, they have had a cash advance and the producer has paid the interest on that cash advance. The same benefits ought to be available to the farmer who puts his grain into a deliverable position on his farm.

The Liberal party has shown itself very adept at solving the problems of other groups in Canada. The manufacturers have enjoyed high protective tariffs, enabling them to sell their products on Canadian markets at inflated prices – prices above world prices; but the wheat producer, the ‘forgotten man’ must sell his grain not only for foreign exports, but for domestic consumption, at a price equal to the lowest price prevailing anywhere in the world. I suggest that if the Federal Government is prepared to meet with us, to work out a solution to this problem on constructive lines, that protection to the farmer can be given equivalent to the protection which they now afford to most other economic groups in the country.

Mr. Loptson: — They’d have to be as crazy as you are.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is only proper that we should enunciate our policy with regard to this agricultural situation, because joint action by us and the Federal Government will undoubtedly be required in any long-term program. And that is not talking Federal issues; that is a provincial issue, and we in Saskatchewan are prepared to face that issue. I ask the members opposite if they are prepared to face that issue and to go along with some kind of conference to evolve a joint program to meet this problem. I suggest that the Liberal party at this time ought to rise above itself. It ought to come to the place where province; instead of which they go up and down this country decrying the economic prospects of Saskatchewan, denouncing the efforts that are being made in this province for industrial and economic development. I suggest that they should forget about petty party political advantage and face this problem and be prepared to shoulder some of the responsibility for finding a solution.

I will support the Motion.

Mr. C.H. Thurston (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I first want to join with previous speakers in congratulating the mover and seconder on the excellent way in which they presented their speeches; and also, sir, to congratulate you on your elevation to the Speaker of this Assembly. I know that you have the respect of all the members of this Chamber, and I hope, sir, that as a new member I will so conduct myself that I will be of a minimum of trouble to you. If I should become out of order, it will be in ignorance of the House rules, rather than deliberate on my part.

I would also at this time like to pay tribute to my predecessor, Mr. W.F. Thair, who so ably represented this seat for 12 years. I only hope that I will be able to gain the respect, not only of the people of Lumsden constituency but also of the members of this House, that Mr. Thair enjoyed over the years. Mr. Thair has had a serious illness earlier this winter, and I am sure that I can speak for all members, particularly those who knew him, when we wish him a speedy recovery back to his vigorous self, and hope that he will have many years to enjoy the fruits of his labour.

Now, sir, I believe it is customary for a member to have something to say about his constituency. First, I would like to say that I am indeed honoured in being elected to represent Lumsden, and I hope that I can live up to those responsibilities placed on me.

As you know, sir, Lumsden constituency surrounds the city of Regina and also Moose Jaw, and that gives a lot of benefits to my constituents. As you know, we have access to the large city hospitals, and that is a distinct advantage; the doctors in the cities have a better chance to diagnose and treat people, and if surgery is necessary they have better equipment to operate with in the large hospitals.

In the field of education there is also an advantage. Many of our rural boys and girls have been able to attend city high schools, and have had the benefit and the use of the up-to-date classrooms and experienced teachers. Particularly in the Regina area where so many of our rural schools are closed, the local school boards have been able to arrange with the city school boards for the elementary education.

Then, too, there is the advantage of being fairly close to the large market centres. This is an advantage to farmers, particularly those farmers who are engaged in livestock and dairying and poultry; and, as members know, most of the large machine companies have their branch-houses in Regina, and I believe, in some cases in Moose Jaw. This enables the farmers in this area to have a more adequate supply of repair parts, and also if they are closer to these branch houses, they have more chance of getting experts to come out and help them in the operation of their farm machines.

A look at a highway map will show that Lumsden constituency has its fair share of the provincial highway system. I think that it is only natural that any highway system will emanate from the large centres. The fact that we have these highways goes a long way to making a grid road network in the municipalities around these cities, and I can say to the Minister of Highways that we appreciate having the highways leading out as they do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have just mentioned a few of the advantages that we have in being close to these cities. On the other side of the ledger there are a few disadvantages, and without seeming to be contradictory, I would say that one of the troubles that we have is having these

February 22, 1957

highways. We have a problem in these municipalities around these cities of the trucks overloading and trying to use our municipal roads in an attempt to dodge the weigh-scales; and, as you know, sir, municipal roads are not built to stand this heavy traffic. I know that the Municipality of Sherwood, in which I live, this past two years has had to engage a man to try to cope with this problem of the trucks using our roads.

Then, too, there is another problem as the cities expand. Naturally as cities expand they need more land, and this causes some problems in the area. It naturally cuts into school districts as they have to change the boundaries; it lowers the school assessments and lowers the municipal assessments, and that does cause a problem.

Then, too there is a problem in a city of the size of Regina in the sewerage disposal. Last fall the farmers in the Regina area became alarmed when the city council gave consideration to setting up a lagoon-type system of disposal. The proposal was to take out some 2,400 acres of our best wheat land for this disposal plant. A delegation of farmers (of which I was one) met with the city council and raised our objections to this type of disposal. I can say that the council met us well and listened to our objections; and I believe the objections that we raised at that time will be an influence on the final decision that the city council may make.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have just mentioned a few of these disadvantages. I don't believe that they are problems that can't be solved. I believe these problems we have between the rural areas and the cities can be worked out by mutual understanding and co-operation. But I want to say that any disadvantages that we may have, I think, are far outweighed by the advantages.

Now, sir, up to this point I have been fairly agreeable, but I find that I must disagree with the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. McDonald). He stated the other day that the Throne Speech was so thin that he couldn't find very much to talk about. I, too, sir, have read the Speech and I find so much in it of interest to me that I would like to talk about, but time doesn't permit me, this afternoon, to go into all the aspects of the Throne Speech, so I will confine my remarks to just two or three departments that I am keenly interested in.

First, I would like to congratulate the Power Corporation on the job that they have done in bringing power to the farmers in Lumsden constituency. I believe, sir, that all the area coverages have been completed. Naturally, there are some areas, some individual farmers within an area, that have not been connected; but I hope in the not too distant future that those farmers desiring power will be able to be hooked up. Living close to Regina as I do, and associating with the people in Regina as much as I do, I sometimes think that my city friends wonder why we farmers make so much fuss

about power. Mr. Speaker, I don't know a single thing that takes away the isolation from a farmstead like power. Not only does it make a cheap chore-boy around the farm, but it enables us to have many conveniences that we otherwise would not be able to have, and that is particularly to the farm housewife. I met a lady the other day in our Co-op store and I said, "It's cold". She said, "Yes, but we don't mind that now; the roads are open." She said, "Thank to Mr. Douglas; we can plug our car in, and if we want to go to town the next day, the motor will start." She said, "You know what that used to be. We used to have to tow our cars around and around; now we just plug them in." And I am very pleased that the farmers are being placed in the position where they can have some of the conveniences that our friends in the cities have.

At this point I am not going to go into whether we paid too much for the power or not, but all I know is that the farmers in my constituency are very happy indeed that they have got power. I can say that they wouldn't have that power disconnected for many times the price that they paid for it.

Another department, Mr. Speaker, that I am keenly interested in is the Department of Education. I am not going to attempt, this afternoon, to deal at any length with the Department of Education. We have the Minister yesterday give us a pretty detailed account of the Department of Education. But one thing that I would like to say is that not all our problems are in the larger school units. The Regina West Superintendency is nearly all (except one little portion of it) in the constituency of Lumsden. As the members will know, that area, the West Superintendency, is not a larger unit, and from time to time I have heard grumblings around this area as to the difference in mill rates and the difference in taxes paid. After hearing these grumblings and complaints, I thought I would check into the issue and see if it was justified. Mr. Speaker, I have the figures on my desk, and I have never in all my life seen such a conglomeration of figures. I find that the assessments in rural areas (that is in the Regina West Superintendency) vary from a low of \$50,000 to a high of over \$600,000 and in the villages and towns from \$48,000 to over \$450,000. The mill rates vary in the rural areas from nil to 32.4 and from 10 to 36 in villages and towns. These mill rates do not give a clear picture of the taxes paid unless you break them down into areas of equal assessment. Breaking down the figures on this basis I find that, for example in the Municipality of Sherwood, their assessment varies (and that is, the school districts) from \$124,000 to over \$517,000, and a variation in mill rates from nil to 11.5. This means, sir, that some people are paying over \$50 school taxes per quarter, while others are getting off scot-free.

Another example is in the Edenwold area. Some districts in the Edenwold area are assessed at over \$3,000 and the mill rate is 32.4. Their school tax amounts to over \$90 per quarter. I could go on, sir, and quote many instances. I could quote, for instance, in the Lumsden Town district, there is an area south in the heavy land, the \$5,000 assessed land where their

mill rate is 23.4 mills. I could go on and quote more over the whole area – it is just a variation in these taxes. All I can say is that this does not lend itself to good feelings to the people in this area; and I can say to the Minister of Education that more and more people are coming to me and asking me to use my influence in having the Regina West Superintendency established into the larger units. I have told the people that by The School Act, there must be a vote taken. We have not asked for a vote, and I have assured them that, if the Trustees or the Association asked the Department of Education for a vote, the Department of Education will set up the necessary machinery so that a vote can be taken.

We hear so much today, sir, about the larger units closing the schools. There is no doubt that a lot of schools have been closed in the larger units. What is the position in the Regina West Superintendency? We have 97 rural school districts in the Regina West Superintendency, and 32 of these schools have been closed. So you can see, sir, that we can't lay that on the doorstep of the larger unit. These schools are being closed, and I note from the schools around this area that there are more and more of these schools going to have to close in the next few years. There is negotiate thing though that I think we should keep in mind when we are closing these schools, and the Minister mentioned it yesterday: when the records of the larger units and adding to what we have in our own superintendency, I find by closing the rural schools, it makes a net saving of nearly 600 teachers. I will agree with the Minister that the big job we have to do today is not only to encourage and keep the teachers that we have now in the field and the profession, but we have to take steps to encourage more and more of our young people to take up teaching as a profession.

Now, sir, there are many other things that I would like to have dealt with. I would like to have dealt with hospitalization and car insurance, and above all, I would like to have dealt with the plight of agriculture; but I don't feel that I will take the time of the House now, but I hope to have an opportunity to deal with this agricultural plight in other debates during this Session.

Another thing, I am keenly interested in is industrial development. I am not going to try and add to what the Premier said the other day on the progress that is taking place in our province, but in my own constituency, sir, things are being done. On the outskirts of Regina, we have the Cement Plant; we have three light aggregate plants, and there is a new steel plant, just two or three miles north of the city, going up, and we hope it will be completed this year. We are sure that more of these plants will come in. I would just like to say to the Premier, as Minister in charge of the Industrial Development Office, that when they are encouraging industry to come into the province and are locating sites, not to –pass up the beautiful town of Lumsden. As hon. members know, Lumsden is situation on a good highway;

it's on a railway, and to me it is one of the beauty spots of our province. We have a very active and progressive Board of Trade in the town of Lumsden, and I am sure that the Board of Trade and local citizens will co-operate in every way possible with the Development Office in trying to interest people to locate there. In that respect, some member =s of the Board of Trade had already taken steps to do something. As members know, the valley around the town of Lumsden is noted for the high-quality potatoes they produce. As I said, some of these members have been giving thought and investigating the feasibility of starting a potato chip plant. In talking with the chairman of the Board of Trade not long ago, he said that he would appreciate any help and technical advice that they could receive from the Development office. All I want to say is that I congratulate those people in Lumsden for their forward thinking, and if they go ahead with this project, or any other projects, I wish them success in them.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention something about farm taxes. We seem to hear a lot on that subject nowadays. We hear that taxes are driving farmers off their farms. Now I do not say that taxes are not important, or that they do not have a bearing on farm costs, but I do suggest that they are not the reason for putting farmers out of business. For example, I have taken my own case. I have added up my land tax, my hospitalization tax, my gasoline tax, my licence fees for my car and truck and the compulsory insurance, and I have tried to estimate what I would pay on the 3 per cent Hospitalization and Education Tax. These add up to a fair amount, but I want to say, sir, that if I don't soon start getting a price for my produce that bears some relationship to the cost, I am going to go broke even if all those taxes were paid back to me, and I am desperately afraid that I will have plenty of company.

Mr. Speaker, to me this is the crux of the whole matter. If we are going to have better roads and better education facilities and more social services, then we must raise the money for these services. The only way that local or provincial governments can extend these services is by getting more money, and the only way that I as a farmer can pay those taxes, whether or not they are ten cents an acre, or a dollar an acre, is to get a price for my products which we are not now getting, that will enable us to meet our cost of production and have a decent standard of living. In other words, I think we should be striving for the farmer to get his fair share of the national pie.

I make no apology by being an M.L.A. and talking this way, and I want to say I will support in this House and out of this House any motion or Bill that will help the farmers to obtain their fair share of the national production.

I see that my airtime is up, and being a good co-operator (as I am), I will not encroach on the speaker who follows me. Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Mrs. J.E. Cooper (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, first I would like to associate myself with the previous speakers in congratulating you, sir, on your election to the very important office of Speaker. I would also like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne, and to say a word of welcome to all the new members in this Legislature. First, I think I should say I am very glad to be here to be able to welcome you, thanks to the good sense and intelligence of the Regina voters who once again returned three C.C.F. members with very sizable majorities.

I have a very special word of welcome for the Member of the Legislature from the constituency of Humboldt (Mrs. Mary J. Batten). I am very glad, Mr. Speaker, to see another woman in this Legislature. I have sat over here for four years now facing the Opposition, and I have had a growing feeling that there was something missing over there – perhaps it was the feminine touch. You know, Mr. Speaker, every since I have been elected to this Legislature, a great many people outside the Legislature, and even some of the members in the Legislature, have kept on telling me that it was my special duty to try to keep the men in order. Now, that is a sizable assignment. . .

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — You've done a fair job, too.

Mrs. Cooper: — Now, with one of us on each side of the House I think we should have a very peaceful and a very quiet session, although I could suggest a very simple change in seating arrangement that might help. If the lady member could be placed between the member from Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) and the member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) I think it might help.

I also notice, Mr. Speaker, that the lady members are placed about as far apart as possible in this Legislature. I wondered, of course, if there was any malice aforethought in that. You will have noticed that, in the June election, the ladies in this Legislature increased their numbers for 100 per cent, and I think that is pretty good going. If we can keep up this record, Mr. Speaker, by about 1972, the women will be in the majority, and then you will see what happens. The first thing we will do will be to pass legislation giving two weeks' holidays with pay, eight statutory holidays and time and a half for overtime for all housewives, and once we do that I am sure our position in the House will be secure.

Turning now to the Speech from the Throne, it is something of a thrill for those of us on this side of the House to realize that our C.C.F. Government has now been in power for three terms of office and are starting our fourth term. I am sure it must give a great sense of satisfaction to the hon. Premier that, after 12 years in office, the people of the province have shown their confidence in this Government by re-electing it to office with such a healthy majority. It has been a most interesting 12 years in the history of Saskatchewan, and certainly we have seen great changes during these 12 years in almost every phase of our economy. Perhaps the most dramatic

change – the one that has received the most attention – has been the great amount of economic development that we have seen in the province, and the industry that is coming into the province.

The hon. Premier, in his address on Wednesday, gave a very comprehensive and a very thrilling picture of what has been going on in these fields in the province of Saskatchewan in the development of oil and gas, potash and uranium, and other minerals, and of the various industries that are located here. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we should certainly give the Industrial Development Office, which was set up by this Government, a great deal of credit for the very thorough and competent job they have done in research, trying to find out what industries can hope to operate successfully in the province, and encouraging them to come here. I have very vivid memories of when the Industrial Development office was set up, of the scepticism and the criticism with which it was greeted by the members of the Liberal Opposition – we were ‘wasting money’, ‘more planners’, and that sort of thing; but I think now perhaps even the Opposition will agree that setting up of the Industrial development office was a very fine thing for the province of Saskatchewan.

While we are giving credit for some of these industrial development s, we must not forget that a large share of the credit must come to the hon. Premier of this province for the marvellous job he has done in selling our province and the province’s opportunities. He never misses a chance to talk about Saskatchewan wherever he is, and certainly his influence has been very great and has done a great deal to help get industrial development of this province. We can look forward with a great deal of optimism to the future. but I think it should be remembered, Mr. Speaker, (and the hon. Premier pointed this out, too) that industrial expansion and the material prosperity that accompanies it do not in themselves provide a vigorous and a healthy and humane society. It is merely a means by which such a society can be produced. It is only when wealth is applied to creating a better standard of living for all of us, and when it is used to produce people who are physically and mentally health, and who have access to greater culture through broader education, and who have learned to accept social responsibility for other people; it is only in this sort of society that democratic maturity is reached. While I certainly do not under estimate the tremendous value of economic development, I realize it is necessary for building that kind of sound economic base that we must have to finance health and welfare, education, highways and all the other functions of government.

Yet in looking back over the past 12 years, Mr. Speaker, I find some of the most interesting and some of the most worthwhile and, I feel, some of the most lasting developments in other areas, developments which, I feel, are designed, and have been purposely designed, by the C.C.F. Government to build that kind of a society which I have just been talking about. A very good example of what I mean is in the field of health. To my way of thinking, Mr. Speaker, the job done in the health field by the C.C.F. Government has been the most imaginative, the most courageous and the most effective

job ever carried out in any province in the Dominion of Canada. We are leading the way not only in Canada, but on this continent, in the field of cancer care and cancer treatment. We are leading in our mental health program, in our hospitalization plan, and we were the first province to institute a hospitalization plan in the Dominion of Canada.

There has been a tremendous job in this province in hospital construction, and we now find modern, well-equipped hospitals in almost every area of this province. We have reached the place where our per capita hospital bed capacity in Saskatchewan is the highest in the Dominion of Canada. We have one Health Region, which was mentioned by the member from Swift Current (Mr. Wood), where we not only have hospital care, but complete medical care. We have other regions where there is a very fine preventive program going on, and we hear from the Speech from the Throne that more health regions will be set up fairly soon.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we have provided speedy access to hospitals, particularly for those people in outlying districts, through out Air Ambulance. We are now giving free care to the aged, dependent people – our old-age pensioners, people on mothers' allowances – and for those illnesses that take long periods of very expensive treatment, and where early diagnosis and care are so all-important – cancer, polio, mental illness, where hospital and mental care are given to the people of this province, free of charge. Also, Mr. Speaker, we now have our own Medical College, where our own Saskatchewan young men and women can train to become doctors, and we hope many of them will continue to practise right here in Saskatchewan.

Along with that Medical College we have our University Hospital which anyone will recognize as one of the finest hospitals in Canada. We are leading the way in the field of health, and certainly all eyes have been on the health program in Saskatchewan, and it is well known that many people from all parts of the world have come to Saskatchewan to see what we are doing here. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that it was the success of Saskatchewan's Hospitalization Plan that forced the Federal Government to take another look at health insurance and make its proposals to the provinces for a National Hospital Plan.

We are one province, Mr. Speaker, that is ready to enter a national hospital plan right away and I can see no logical reason why we should have to wait until other provinces, who lag behind, are ready to participate. If the Federal Government would be prepared to extend its plan immediately to those provinces which are ready to participate, I think you would find it amazing, Mr. Speaker, how quickly many other provinces would find they could speed up their program and be ready to come in.

The same approach could be used as was used in the old-age pensions. When old-age pensions were introduced, you will remember that Ottawa agreed to pay 50 per cent of the cost in any province where that province would put up the other 50 per cent, and certainly the same could be done with health insurance. You will remember that Saskatchewan was one of the first provinces to enter, and gradually the others came in; people public opinion forced them to come in.

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — That was the Liberal Government.

Mrs. Cooper: — If the Federal Government was really anxious to see national hospital insurance come in, and come in rapidly, if they are not giving merely lip service to this proposal, this method certainly could be used very effectively. Certainly it has been long enough in getting to this first major step — national hospital insurance.

By the way, I noticed a report in 'The Leader-Post' where the head of a private insurance firm was bitterly criticizing the Federal Government for undue haste in instituting hospital insurance. I don't think that is fair criticism, Mr. Speaker. I think it is about since 1919 that we have been promised it, and I hope when we do eventually get our hospital plan, we won't have to wait another 40 years before we get the complete health insurance plan for which the C.C.F. Government has been working for years.

Coming back to Saskatchewan and looking ahead to the future, the first think I would like to suggest is that we get an early start (and I mean a very early start) on the construction of small mental hospitals as recommended by the Canadian Mental Health Association and by experts in the field of mental health in Canada and the United States. I am certainly not unmindful of the great advances that have been made in Saskatchewan in the care of the mentally ill. I know there has been a steadily and rapidly increasing allocation of funds to look after the mentally ill. Certainly we have pioneered the field, and I am most anxious that we are able to keep in the lead. I visited Weyburn recently, and I must say that the changes that have been made in that institution are really remarkable, and the program of modernization is going along steadily. We can be very well proud of the new wing there for the tubercular patients who are in the mental hospitals. The training school at Moose Jaw was a very good step in the right direction. We have excellent mental health clinics set up throughout the province, and we have the new psychiatric wing in the University of Saskatchewan Hospital. All of these things have made very great improvements in the Mental Health program, but we do still face a very serious situation of overcrowding of our mental hospitals. And so, in spite of all the improvements that have been made, we are not doing the job we are capable of doing because of the overcrowded conditions. When we get as many as 100 people in one ward, it is absolutely impossible to carry out the kind of program we should have. There is no hope for any kind of privacy; every individual in

February 22, 1957

this world needs a certain amount of privacy, and particularly sick people need a certain amount of privacy.

We also know it is not too good to have to treat psychotic patients with mental defectives, and it is impossible under existing circumstances to make the necessary segregation. I do know that the Government is giving a great deal of consideration to building these small mental hospitals and I know plans have been talked over, and I hope we will soon get through the planning stage and be ready to enter the construction stage – at least one hospital on an experimental basis. I am quite sure that it will not only be a humanitarian act when we can reduce the overcrowding, but I am quite sure that it also will, in the long run, save money, because certainly with less overcrowding there would be a better chance for patients. I think the stay in the hospital would be much shorter, and I am sure we will be able to send many more patients home cured.

Already the effect of our better treatment is showing. I am very pleased to be able to say that, in Saskatchewan, we find that the number of people in our mental hospitals is going down, while in most provinces the number is going up. That is something we can be proud of.

When we do get around to building these hospitals, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest Regina as the site of one of these hospitals. I believe there are some 500 Regina people in Weyburn, and one of the purposes of these hospitals is that people may be treated near their own communities, where their friends can come and visit them. That is important, not only for the sake of their friends and relatives, but also for the sake of the mental health of the person who is ill. So I hope Regina will be considered as the site for one of these hospitals.

I want now to turn for a moment to education. Certainly there have been many changes also in the field of education, and I think the most significant change was the introduction of the larger units. That was the step, Mr. Speaker, that took courage but was certainly a step that paid dividends; and in spite of the constant sniping we have heard from the Liberal opposition in the Legislature, and from some of their henchmen outside the Legislature, educationists will tell you that the introduction of the larger unit has been the greatest single factor in improving educational opportunities in this province. Certainly the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation gives the units their unqualified approval.

We are moving in Saskatchewan very steadily towards our goal of providing more equality of opportunity among all children for an education. I am not going to outline the many ways in which we are doing this, but there are many ways – through equalization grants, for one. Certainly there are better high school opportunities, and I was thinking how much it must mean to people living on farms today where there is such a shortage of cash, to be able to see their young people continue right through to Grade 12 without

having to leave home, and without having to put out the additional money to pay board and room. They can go by bus, and certainly the number of young people who are completing their high school education shows that this program has paid.

I could also go on and mention other ways in which we are equalizing opportunities: through our Loan Fund over 4,000 students have been helped to attend university, and through building schools in the north. There is one program I would like to mention, because I don't remember it being mentioned in the House before, and that is the progress that is being made throughout the province in music education for young people. This again is particularly valuable to the rural areas and the small towns. This Government appointed a Provincial Director of Music, Mr. Rj Staples, and I do think all the members of the Legislature would very much enjoy going and seeing Mr. Staples's music studios right in this building, and seeing the work that is being done. You will find there a shelf with a very excellent lending library of music books that can be had upon request, and also two shelves of records, tape recordings of teaching lessons in music, and these are very, very valuable to rural schools. Also Mr. Staples each year at Teachers' Institute has a workshop on music where he gets the teachers together and gives them a lot of assistance in how to teach music in the schools. The work of our director is recognized far beyond the borders of Saskatchewan. You will be interested to know that our director has been asked to visit many states in the Union, and to lecture on what is being done here, and also many other places in Canada. Much of the work he is doing here is now being adopted in many of the states of the Union, and I think that is something we can be proud of.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I believe there are very few things in this life that give more lasting and more permanent enjoyment than the ability to understand and to appreciate music. Even if we can never become musicians ourselves, the appreciation of music is a lasting thing, and I do believe that this better opportunity for rural students in music education is really important.

Mr. Speaker, when we get our new technical college, it will open a whole new avenue of opportunity for Saskatchewan young people. There is a crying need for skilled technicians and skilled tradesmen, and we certainly want our own Saskatchewan boys and girls to have the opportunity to qualify for these better jobs. When I speak of the technical institute, I would like to suggest that Regina is certainly the local location for this institute. There are a lot of good reasons why. We have the largest population in Regina from which to draw students and that is important. Certainly, employment opportunities are going to be much greater here where we have this large centre, that's sure. And it is quite conceivable that in a diversified program like the one that is going to be carried out in this institute, we are going to need part-time instructors in skilled trades and

February 22, 1957

certainly it will be easier to find those skilled people who can give part-time instruction in Regina, where we have so many industries – the head offices of the oil companies, where the centre of the gas distribution is; certainly it would be much easier to get part-time qualified instructors. Then also, of course, Saskatoon, as you know, is the second largest city, but it has the university, so it would balance things up a lot if we could have the technical institute here. I would also like to say that students who enter the professions and are contemplating a four, five or six-year university course probably have on the average, more financial resources back of them than some of the students who will be entering the technical college, and certainly costs will be a great factor in the number of people that will register and be able to attend the Institute.

I think, too that it would be very fine if we could have a technical institute and a university in every city, but of course we know that is impossible. So it would seem to me the reasonable thing to do would be to put the technical institute where it will do the greatest good to the greatest number of people, and certainly, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister of Education, Regina is the answer to that.

While it is very tempting to trace the progress that is taking place in all departments of government, I don't want to dwell too long on the past, because I realize that our responsibility is to the future, and I have certain suggestions I would like to make that I would like the Government to consider for future action. I am not suggesting that all these things can be done this year, but they are things that perhaps could be done during this term of office. I am very interested in the work that is done during this term of office. I am very interested in the work that is being done in the corrections program, in penal reform, and certainly I think that Saskatchewan can be very proud of the progress we have made in this field. In the gaol we find a completely changed atmosphere and the whole program is geared to rehabilitation, and we have an excellent staff-training program which has gained wide recognition. I think we are very fortunate to have some of the most able people in the Dominion of Canada on the staff of our penal institutions here, and I hope we will be able to keep them and to recruit more of the same calibre. We are somewhat hampered in this program by the old type gaols we have; that were built in the days when a gaol was just a lock-up – some place to get a person out of the way, out of the view of the public, and there was very little emphasis on rehabilitation and the personal needs of the inmate. Today I think we can be well assured that within the limits of the present building, Saskatchewan is doing an excellent job within the gaol. I think we are going to have, sooner or later, to face the problem of new gaols. I am well aware that a commission was set up by the Federal Government to go into this whole matter of responsibility for gaols, and they have recently released the report known as the Fauteux report. I realize that some of the recommendations in that report, if they were ever implemented, would certainly affect Saskatchewan's responsibility as far as gaols are concerned. However, we have no guarantee that any of these requests will be implemented,

and also I would like to forecast that even if they are implemented, it would be a great many years before any of these recommendations are put into force.\

I would like to point out that, as far as the women's gaol in Prince Albert is concerned (the gaol that was authorized in the last Session of the Legislature), these recommendations will not affect the women's gaol. One of the recommendations I should have mentioned in the Fauteux report is that the Federal Government would take responsibility for all the people in gaols who have sentences of no longer than six months. I would like to point out that it will not affect the women's gaol, because in the women's gaol the sentences are mostly 30 days, or 60 days, very few, if any, for six months, and only one prisoner with anything more than six months' sentences. So even if these recommendations were to be implemented, it would not affect the women's gaol.

Looking ahead I would like to suggest that the next major step in this field should be an extended parole and probation program, because no matter how good a job we do in a gaol, it can be completely frustrated unless we have trained people to follow up that work in the community. This is one aspect of our corrections program that I think we could look into and do a good deal more, because I believe, Mr. Speaker, that an adequate system of parole and probation as an arm of the Corrections Branch would certainly pay dividends. Certainly modern thinking is running along these lines more and more. England has had phenomenal success with such a program and it has succeeded in reducing their gaol population, and we find a very marked decrease in the number of repeaters. Sweden has used it extensively with a good deal of success, and many of the states in the United States have developed an excellent probation and parole service. It has always been found that, wherever such a service is set up, it does speed up the process of rehabilitation. It cuts down the numbers in the gaols, and certainly cuts down the number of repeaters.

For certain types of offenders, probation or early parole, rather than a long gaol sentence, is very much more effective, and certainly it cuts down on the drain of the public treasury when a man is serving his sentence out in the community, under the direction of a guidance officer, rather than having to be supported by the state in an institution. It is not only from the financial point of view, because no matter how hard you try, there are very unhealthy influences in a gaol which very often create bad mental attitudes from which a prisoner perhaps never will recover.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I do realize that the protection of society must be the first consideration in any corrections program, and great care would have to be exercised. Nevertheless, we have to realize that there are very few prisoners who are sentenced for life. They are going to come back into the community anyway, and it is very much easier to bring them back and to get them integrated into a normal life if they are under the dir-

action of a guidance officer, rather than putting them in gaol for long periods of time, then they come out with no one to look after them and immediately they get into trouble again. I quite believe that, if we could have an adequate staff to handle parole and probation, it certainly would be used a great deal by our magistrates and judges. Certainly that has been the experience elsewhere. Your parole officer has the advantage of being able to follow a case right through from the time the crime is committed until rehabilitation is complete. His first duty is pre-sentence investigation, where he looks into the background of the person who is in trouble, and finds out what made him get into trouble; also finds out something about his physical health, mental health and so on; and this pre-sentence report is very, very helpful to a judge or to a magistrate.

I realize the success of such a program will have to depend upon the quality of workers that we can attract, and I know it is very difficult to get the required number of personnel; but with the emphasis that is on parole and probation these days, a great many more social workers are specializing in this field. The competition for their services is very keen and they are going to go to the provinces where they feel they will have the most opportunity for advancement, and where they will be allowed to carry on a program entirely in their own field, instead of having their services dispersed over the whole field of social welfare. Once they are assured that Saskatchewan was going to carry out this kind of a program, I am sure we would be able to recruit good people, and we might be able to look for help to the National Parole and Probation Association.

There is one more program I would like to say something about before I sit down. I have also been watching with a good deal of interest what has been happening with our Bureau of Alcoholics. It was set up, I believe, two and a half years ago and like any new venture, it takes a little while to get a sense of direction and find out the scope of its activity; but certainly there has been substantial progress in this field. There has been some very excellent work done. The Bureau has been very helpful to Alcoholics Anonymous, and they have been doing a good work of interpretation that alcoholism is a disease and needs understanding and treatment; but I think now, Mr. Speaker, we are in a position where the work of this Bureau could be usefully expanded. At present we have only two workers, and I believe one stenographer. It is estimated that there are 7,000 alcoholics in the province of Saskatchewan. To me that is rather a frightening number, and experts tell us that this number of alcoholics is going to continue to rise. If you look at the statistics in the Bracken Report and see the rising curve in the number of alcoholics all across Canada, certainly it should give all of use cause for real concern. Saskatchewan has fewer alcoholics than many provinces, but 7,000 is no small number, and, although the Bureau is working to capacity with the present staff, it is impossible to meet all the requests and do the kind of job that needs to be done.

It seems to me that this bureau divides itself very naturally into three areas – research, education and active work in rehabilitation. It would seem to me, also, that if we could possibly have a director for each of these three divisions, we would make a good deal of progress. Certainly we need more research. The Bureau is doing some, but they have not enough staff to do the necessary research. There is certainly a full-time job in the field of education, and at present our treatment and rehabilitation facilities are not quite adequate, and possibly we could set up a rehabilitation centre in Regina and Saskatoon as a start. Now, admittedly, Mr. Speaker, this will cost money, but after all, our Government has taken over the controls of the sale of liquor and I think we took in something over \$10 million profit. Certainly I feel we also have a responsibility to try to do anything that we can to rehabilitate the lives and the families of these people whose lives have been completely wrecked by over-indulgence of alcohol.

It is estimated by the greatest experts in the field that, of those people who drink even moderately, six out of every hundred will become alcoholics or problem drinkers. If this is correct (and I have no reason to think it is not; these figures come from psychiatrists and from the Yale School of Narcotics, which is the best evidence that we can get), six out of every 100 who drink will become alcoholics. Certainly until we are prepared to do a more effective job than we are doing today anywhere in Canada in the field of prevention, we are going to have to do something about this problem of alcoholism.

I think we could be doing a much better job in prevention than we are doing today. Our preventive job is extremely weak. I know there is some good work done in the schools, but it is spotty, and it depends upon the interest of the teacher and the interest of the superintendent as to how much is done. I think we are missing a bet that we are not doing something about this problem in our own Health Education Division, because certainly this problem is a health problem, both from the viewpoint of physical health and mental health. As far as I know there is nothing being done in the Department of Adult Education on this subject. Again, a good deal could be done. Certainly, the Highway Traffic Board is a good place for education. I know a little is done, but if there was a little more money in the budget for this aspect, I think this is one place you would get a lot of public support, because the public are very worried about the toll of death and injury on the highways through impaired and drunken driving.

Mr. Speaker, I don't very often quote Manitoba favourably. It isn't that I don't want to, but I cannot very often find the occasion. I do notice however, that the province of Manitoba this year are spending \$50,000 on advertising in an attempt to cut down the amount of alcohol consumption. They are doing this as a direct recommendation from the Bracken Report, and I have here some of the advertisements they are using, and I think they are pretty good, too. Here is one of them: "Can You Really Afford to Buy Liquor?" and it gives the reasons why you shouldn't buy too much.

The next one: "How Much do you Know About the Effects of Alcohol?". This is a very good one. It shows the effects of a certain number of drops of alcohol per thousand drops of blood, and we have the picture here – one or two drinks, he is still in pretty good condition; three or four he is beginning to stagger; four or five, he is getting pretty slow; five or six, he is down on his knees; seven or eight, he is flat on his face. Also here is another one: "Are You Going to Let your Family Down This Christmas?" It is a series of advertisements, and I think perhaps there is a good deal of merit in it. I hope the Government will take a look at this and see if they think it is worthwhile doing here.

I am quite certain, Mr. Speaker, that there could be an extremely effective educational program carried on all across Canada if there was sufficient interest on the part of the public, and if the Governments would take this problem seriously. The kind of program I am talking about is the same type of educational program that is carried on in these great health drives. The same sort of thing that is done by the Canadian Mental Health Association for mental health; the Cancer Association for cancer. If we could get a coordinated effort like we do in other health matters with the Federal Department of Health and Welfare, our own Departments of Health and Welfare, the schools and churches working together, we certainly could work out a very effective program, particularly if it was worked out by people who know something about psychology and people who understand advertising techniques, using television, the radio and all other such media. There is no question in my mind that a good educational program could be carried out. Now, all of us say that the only answer is education. Let us get busy and do a thorough job in education. I feel that this is an important problem. I feel it should be done, and I am equally sure, Mr. Speaker, that it won't be done until the people of Canada really take this problem more seriously.

There is a great deal more I would like to say, but I see I have talked a long time and I imagine I will get around sooner or later, one way or another, to the other suggestions I wanted to make. Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I wish, first of all, to congratulate this Assembly on having you for a Speaker. It is a high office that you will fill admirably.

I enjoyed very much your chairmanship of the two banquets you gave to the students who were the guests of this Assembly and, if I may say so, your sense of humour, sir, is delightful. Of course, sir, a sense of humour I have found, even a very famous sense of humour, is not always a guarantee of impartiality. In your case, however, Mr. Speaker, I feel certain we can rely both on your good sense and your fair play.

I am cognizant, Mr. Speaker, of the graciousness and the kindness that I have received from the lady member from Regina (Mrs. Cooper). It is indeed a great compliment to her that in spite, or even because, of her long association in the market place of politics and with the members of the Government side of the House, she has remained a lady.

The Premier has stated that there are implications of progress outlined in the Speech from the Throne. There are many implications in the Speech from the Throne; and in listening to this Speech from the Throne I am reminded of the one that this Government handed down, last year. I listened to it and to the debates on it in my own home. Because of the division of radio time, I heard, sir, many speakers from the Government side of the House. My four-year old daughter was in the library with me, and she was listening, too, and she was assuming a very perplexed face. She listened to all these members who talked about the natural resources, the fish we have in Canada, the uranium we have in Canada and so on and so forth, and when they had finished she said to me in a very poutful tone: "Mummy, who made the world? God, or the C.C.F.?" I would not, sir, be at all surprised that after listening to themselves some of the members of the Government have become confused in their theology.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjourned of the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

SECOND READING

Bill No. 9 – An Act to amend The Crown Corporations Act.

Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, this is probably the shortest Bill the House will consider. It has one clause. One section of the Crown Corporations Act is to be repealed. It has to do with confiscation. Many of our friends in the Opposition have been going about the country, throughout Canada, telling about this legislation being in the Statute books, and frightening them. The Premier told us last year of one Corporation that his office had been able to persuade to come to Saskatchewan, but because of statements made by certain members of the Opposition and publicity in the press, they had about made up their mind not to come to Saskatchewan, they were about to leave and had to be persuaded to come back again.

Now, in order that we will be able to take away from our friends in the Opposition the great pleasure which they have had throughout the many years of being able to quote this Section, because we have no intention

of using it whatsoever, and it is not necessary, therefore, we are suggesting that it be repealed. I move the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, may I ask my hon. friend a question? What is the purpose of this section in the first place?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may answer the question — I will assume that I haven't sat down and will answer the question, and I will do it in an orderly manner.

The reason was that we followed the legislation which had been passed by the Liberal Government, in the years before, when they set up their Corporations. That was legislation which was to be found in the old Power Commission Act, in The Telephone Act, in The Highways Act and in The Public Works Act. It is in all these pieces of legislation that were passed by former Liberal administrations. I suppose the officers, when drafting the legislation, just assumed that this clause should be put in the Act, because it was in all these other Acts.

Mr. Loptson: — Are you going to delete it from other Acts, to?

Mr. Danielson: — Sure you will — to be honest with yourself.

Mr. Loptson: — There are about 20 of them. I asked my friend if he proposes to delete it from the other Acts?

Mr. Speaker: — Moved by the Hon. Mr. Fines that Bill No. 9 be now read a second time. Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Danielson: — As I am the only member on this side of the House who was in the House when this legislation was brought in, I can clearly remember the arrogance and the over-bearing attitude of this whole C.C.F. Group. They were sitting over here and had this whole corner filled with C.C.F., and anything we said was laughed out of court absolutely, no matter what it was. We had the former Premier of the province, and Mr. Proctor. We had another lawyer over here — Mr. Hooze — and myself and Mr. Marion. That was the whole Opposition at that time. Well, Mr. Speaker, previous to the bringing in of this legislation — you had already expropriated or confiscated the Box Factory at Prince Albert on the basis of the principles involved in this legislation. This was a very handy thing, and after this legislation was placed on the Statute books, Mr. Speaker, immediately after the session was over, I have knowledge that the Premier went down to Manitoba and it was one of the things that he said there; and it came very natural, of course, because he was very proud of this legislation, and every C.C.F.er considered it the cornerstone of the edifice that he was going to build.

Mr. McDonald: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Danielson: — Now, the Premier made a speech and he said that he had laid first the foundation of the socialistic edifice in the province of Saskatchewan, and from then on, he was going to build the superstructure of this great undertaking. That is what he said, and no doubt he meant it. He meant it because that was his policy, that was the program upon which they were elected. They were going to eradicate the capitalists and they were going to take over all these things. They proposed that a long time before, not for one year, but for several years. Mr. Coldwell, and all the rest of them, were going to do these things. They were going to get rid of the hucksters and the shysters and the bankers and all these fellows who were sucking the life-blood out of the people of this province. That was their program and they had, no doubt, an honest intention to put it into effect, and I am dead sure, Mr. Speaker, that the thousands and thousands of gullible voters throughout the province of Saskatchewan who voted for them, believed that they were going to do these things. Let us go further. Every session until now that I have been sitting in this House (and that is 12, since this Government came in), they have got up on the floor of this House, particularly the Premier, and he has doubled up that little rabbit fist of his and he has said that this is the greatest political document ever written, and that he stands 100 per cent back of it, and that he is going to fight until the principles contained in that document are implemented in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now, what has he done now? Have you ever in your life, Mr. Speaker, seen such a terrific turnover? Have you seen anyone who has so completely deserted his supporters and the principles on which he had been elected. When he ran the first time he was a Tory, he was a Social Credit and he was a C.C.F.

Mr. McDonald: — He doesn't know what he is, yet.

Mr. Danielson: — He doesn't know what he is yet; but there is one thing he isn't now, and that is a C.C.F. if you believe what he says. Of course, I have heard so many things said by him that I don't believe anything he says; I have sat there too long, Mr. Speaker. You don't need to worry, I'll be here for a few years yet — and you won't like it, either/1

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the result of this legislation? The result of that legislation has been that millions and millions of dollars of investment would have come to this province has gone elsewhere where they could trust the government to be protected in their investments. That is one result. Thousands and thousands of young men and women have been going out of this province into the other provinces and other parts of Canada and the United States to find employment for their services which we could have had in the province of Saskatchewan. That is another thing which this legislation has done.

February 22, 1957

This Government has scuttled and abandoned every single plank of their platform on which they were elected; every one of them. And they have thrown overboard not only the principles contained in their platform, but they have thrown overboard the fellow who supported the platform in previous elections. Don't for one minute, Mr. Speaker, think that I or anybody else who has any reason to think for ourselves, thinks that they are doing that because they don't believe in this socialistic business, that they don't believe in this confiscation and this eradication, of the hucksters and the shysters of this province. It's a peculiar thing, Mr. Speaker, this Provincial Treasurer went to bed with them last year, and he is sleeping with them right now. He took \$5 ½ million of the people's credit of this province and gave it to the Cement Company here in Regina when the bank wouldn't take them on. That \$5 ½ million would have set up at least 2,000 young farmers in the business of farming in the province of Saskatchewan. but he had to look after his 'shyster' friends, and he is sleeping with them right now. That is what this Government has done.

The reason this Bill is coming in is to try to save their own political skins. They know that they are fading away and will never return. For a few years the memory will linger perhaps, for some of us older people, but they will be gone and you will never know of them anymore. This province has been cursed for the last 12 years with this Government and the result is apparent everywhere. So, Mr. Speaker, this Government is making a belated attempt to save their political skins and their good jobs, and they now come forward with this Bill in this Legislature, and the Provincial Treasurer has the audacity – I'm not blaming him for thinking we have no intelligence over here, but certainly he should have more respect for his own crowd over there, when he says that this section was put into this Act, because it was in every other Act. If he means anything and he isn't trying to fool the members of this House, it is his duty now to go to work and remove that expropriation clause out of every other Act, where it has been and where it remains as you well know, Mr. Speaker.

This is a sorry day for the C.C.F. It is a funeral dirge for the C.C.F. It is bound to be that, because any political party, any other organization that is engaged in any work that is for the general good and welfare of any people, when they abandon the principles on which they are founded and on which they are elected, they are gone. They are going as sure as the sun sets today, and if it could ever be said that any political party has ever 'eaten crow', it's the C.C.F.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member sits down, could I ask a question?

Mr. Danielson: — Sure.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Is he going to support the motion?

Mr. McDonald: — Ha, ha, ha!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — May I say a few words on this motion. I thought it was rather an interesting situation when the hon. member rose in his place, and it was very hard to tell whether he was talking for the motion or against the motion, and I had to ask him the question, to find out which side he was arguing on.

Mr. Lopton: — You wouldn't know, anyway.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: —Of course, the hon. member knows very well why this legislation is being repealed.

Mr. Danielson: — Sure.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — It is being repealed for one reason only, and that is because the Liberal party is completely without ethics. That is why it is being repealed.

Some Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — You are without ethics.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Under other Acts, the Government has just as much power. The former Liberal Government in this province had just as much power to take property as they have under this Act; but because this Act was made uniform with the other Acts, then the Liberal members and the Liberal campaigners throughout this province and throughout Canada, not caring what damage they did to the province of Saskatchewan, quoted this, advertised it, and did all the hard they could with it. Now, it is being repealed, and what makes the hon. member from Arm River aggravated at this point, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that he won't be able to do this any more. That is what makes him mad: because he cannot now go out and quote the sections from The Public Works Act and The Highways and Transportation Act, or some other Act, because the Liberal Government passed that legislation, and that is the only thing that is worrying the member for Arm River. I would suggest to him that, in spite of his worry, he should support the motion.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister a question?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Sure.

February 22, 1957

Mr. Danielson: — Why has he waited for 12 years to remove that section, when we had asked them repeatedly to do it?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, we believe in humanity. We have a great faith in humanity, even to the extent that we had hoped that some day the hon. members in the Opposition would come to recognize treating this legislation decently, and as it should be treated. I am sorry to say that after 12 years we gave up that hope.

Premier Douglas: — Unregenerate.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my hon. friend a question. Where in the world would this section apply to any humanitarian?

Mr. Danielson: — Confiscating property!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The hon. member for Saltcoats would not have asked that question if he had understood what I was saying.

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words. It is going to be the shortest speech that ever was made in this House. The Provincial Treasurer made the greatest admission that I have ever heard of a member in the office that he holds having made. He convicted himself and his action by the effect of this Act when he said that he knows of companies who have refused to come to Saskatchewan as a result of this Act being on the Statute Books.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — That is not true.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, you said that. . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. . .

Mr. Loptson: — . . . and you blame it on the Liberals.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — I must insist that that statement be withdrawn.

Mr. Loptson: — No.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I am on the floor, will the hon. gentleman sit down?

Mr. Loptson: — No, I have the right . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. member please sit down while the Provincial Treasurer states his point of privilege?

Mr. Loptson: — What is his point of privilege?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — The privilege is that the hon. gentleman attributes to me the statement that I said some company had refused to come to Saskatchewan because of this legislation on the book. I made no such a statement. What I did say was that companies, after the Industrial Development Office had got them to come here, because of statements made and because of press reports, had questioned whether or not they should remain, and it was only after the influence was brought to bear upon them by our Premier and the Industrial Development office that they decided to come.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, will the Provincial Treasurer give us the names of the companies referred to?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I shall certainly give no names.

Mr. McDonald: — Yeah! Just cooking something up.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! The hon. member for Saltcoats had already taken his seat.

Mr. Loptson: — What's the matter, Mr. Speaker? You ordered me down, because he stood up on a point of privilege, and now you say I can't go on. I won't stand for that sort of stuff.

Premier Douglas: — Make your speech. You have the floor.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, I just want to say this. There is one thing I want to make clear to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, if he thinks that the Liberal Opposition is so powerful that they can so convince companies who have attorneys and all the legal advice as to the legal set-up in every province, that they are going to take political speeches from other political parties which will prevent them or scare them from coming into any province in Canada, or any province in the North American continent. The very fact was that they knew this thing was on the Statute books; they also know that it can be put back on the Statute books next year. They also know that while the Premier and the pts are now convinced themselves that private enterprise and capitalism is a pretty good thing, they still know that there are thousands of their supporters still believing in the old doctrine of the 'Manifesto', and it is just a question of whether this thing is going to do very much good in inducing people to come in with more money. I don't think it will make any difference, because the Premier may not live forever. . .

Hon. Mr. Erb (Minister of Public Health): — We'll try to make it a difference.

Mr. Loptson: — The Provincial Treasurer may be kicked out, and who is liable to come and take their place?

Some Opposition Member: — Mr. Walker.

Mr. Lopton: — Mr. Walker? He would soon put it back again; and I venture to say that it wouldn't make any difference as far as I am concerned. I will support the Bill, sure; that section should never had been there.

Mr. Isaak Elias (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, my neighbour said he would make the shortest speech. Well, I will make a shorter one still.

I will be speaking on behalf of my colleagues and me in saying that we, as Social Crediters, were guilty of drawing the attention of the people of Saskatchewan to this section that is going to be withdrawn from The Crown Corporations Act. However, we don't feel guilty about it, and we are not aggravated either by having this section being repealed; but rather we feel greatly rewarded already that through our efforts this section is going to be repealed. I will support the Bill.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Leader of the Official Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, with regard to the repeal of Section 8 of The Crown Corporations Act, I too, want to say that if one is guilty for pointing out the weaknesses of legislation, or what one considers to be weaknesses of legislation, then I am certainly very guilty for the speeches I have made both in and outside the province of Saskatchewan, and I have no apologies for making them, with regard to Section 8 of The Crown Corporations Act. Had the opposition, be it Social Credit, Liberal, Conservative, or any political party that is in opposition to a Socialist Party, not continuously brought to the attention of this Government and of the general public, the people of Saskatchewan, and of Canada and of the whole world, this Section 8 of The Crown Corporations Act, then it would have remained in the Statute books of this province. I am proud to have pointed out to the people of Saskatchewan and to the people of Canada just what legislation we had in the province of Saskatchewan.

Naturally I am going to support the repeal of this section from The Crown Corporations Act. Why wouldn't I? I feel the same as the Social Credit; that we are the people responsible for the repealing of this legislation. I want to say here and now that if the Provincial Treasurer wants to come into this House and say that certain companies have been hesitant about coming into Saskatchewan because we continuously told them of legislation that existed in this province, then I think, if he wants to make those kind of remarks, he should name the companies to this Legislature.

As far as I am concerned, people have approached me from other parts of Canada, asking about Section 8 of The Crown Corporations Act. Am I supposed to say, "Oh no, it isn't there?" Mr. Speaker? Certainly I am not.

It is my duty to point out to anyone who asks me what legislation exists in this province, to point out that legislation to them and to tell them exactly what it means.

This Section 8 of The Crown Corporations Act, it is quite true, has hindered the development of this province more than even the 'Regina Manifesto'. The 'Regina Manifesto' as I told you a few days ago, is like all documents that are produced by a prince or someone who thinks they have large powers. It doesn't mean very much until such time as it is backed up by legislation; and that Section 8 is part of the social security legislation that was passed by this Socialist Government, legislation that was responsible for keeping millions of dollars in investments out of this province, and creating a condition whereby thousands of young people in the province of Saskatchewan were forced to go elsewhere to receive gainful employment. I am certainly going to support the amendment in the Bill, and I am not going to feel the least bit sorry for having pointed out to the people of this province and to the people of Canada, that this legislation existed in this province, and in my opinion, it should be repealed at an earliest possible date.

We have been attempting to tell this Government the feelings of the people of the province of Saskatchewan, and the feelings of people who have money to invest with regard to Section 8 of The Crown Corporations Act now for 12 years. How come it has taken them 12 years to realize the harm this section was doing to this province? Why didn't you repeal it last year? Why didn't you repeal it the year before? Why didn't you repeal it in 1946 or why did you ever put it in there in the first place? Mr. Speaker, the only reason it was ever put on the Statute books of this province was to back up the policy that was enunciated in the 'Regina Manifesto' — now they want to compare the Manifesto to the 'Winnipeg Declaration'. Well, if they are going to back up the political enunciations of the 'Winnipeg Declaration', then you are going to need another Section 8 of some kind to back it up. Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to support the Bill.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, before the hon. Leader of the Opposition sits down, he would like to have names given. May I ask him to give the names of the companies involved in the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been cast out of this province? Could he give us the names of those companies?

Mr. McDonald: — You give me yours first. In answering the question, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that if the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) and the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) will supply the information that I have asked from the, then I will certainly supply the information that he asks now.

February 22, 1957

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me I would like to ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition a question for the purpose of information. To what extent does the member believe the repeal of this Section will reduce, change or alter the power of expropriation that the Government has? To what extent will it change the power that we have of expropriation?

Mr. McDonald: — You are as able to read the Act as I am, and I suggest you read it.

Mr. Speaker: — Is the House ready for the question?

Premier Douglas: — I would just like to say a word, and that is to assure the House that, in spite of the blustering of the Leader of the Opposition, hundreds of millions of dollars have not been kept out of the province by this legislation.

Mr. McDonald: — You certainly have.

Premier Douglas: — If the hon. member doesn't mind I will say what I said; I don't need him to state what I said. He doesn't say what he has to say himself very well, and I don't need any help from him to tell me what I said, or what I am going to say.

Mr. Loftson: — He is more truthful than you are.

Premier Douglas: — No one would ever accept the member from Saltcoats as being an authority on truth. I can't imagine any commodity to which he would be a greater stranger.

Mr. Loftson: — I can prove my statements; you can't prove yours!

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, there haven't been firms with hundreds of millions of dollars kept out of the province. I don't need to go over, and argue, that point. There has never been as much money invested in Saskatchewan in industrial development of various sorts in any 10-year period as there has been during the last 10 years. I don't need to go back and argue that. It is bordering on the hypocritical to make a great fuss about this Section 8 of The Crown Corporations Act because there isn't a provincial government in Canada, Alberta included, that does not have wide-powers of expropriation. I suggest to my friend from Rosthern (Mr. Elias) that he read, for instance, the Alberta Power Commission Act, which gives very wide powers not only to expropriate land, but to even expropriate a company and to take over its staff. Those are powers about which I am not complaining. I am simply pointing out that those powers exist and are possessed by every provincial government in Canada, and by the Federal Government. There has been, in many cases, a malicious campaign to fasten on this particular section, while completely ignoring the fact that similar sections obtained in

other provincial legislation in almost every province in Canada.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — Oh, bunk!

Premier Douglas: — Therefore, since the Liberal Party and some of the Liberal press have seen fit to try to make this section the cause of disquiet in any part of the country, then we feel that, in that case, we would be better to take it out. Because of the type of publicity which has emanated from some Liberal editorial writer. . .

Mr. Danielson: — What a confession!

Premier Douglas: — . . . whose articles have gone into the papers in various parts of eastern Canada and the United States, we feel that we might just as well make our path easier rather than more difficult. But I say that industry has not been kept out, and I say that the powers possessed by the Government in this Section are powers which are no broader than powers that have been possessed by every Government in Canada.

Mr. McDonald: — Why take it out, then?

Premier Douglas: — Therefore, if we are going to be faced by a partisan press and by partisan politicians who are going to endeavour to hurt the province for the sake of any political advantage, then, of course, we are better to take the section out. And I can understand the vituperation and the venom of the member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson). We are taking his rattle away from him!

Mr. Gardiner: — You don't need a rattle.

Premier Douglas: — The little baby is losing his lollipop. He isn't going to have something to brandish up and down the Arm River constituency.

Mr. Danielson: — That's right.

Premier Douglas: — He's not going to have something to make speeches about.

Mr. Danielson: — I don't need it.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, after 12 years he is going to have to make a new speech. Won't that be an experience: the member from Arm River with a new speech and a new text! It's going to be an earth-shaking event, and I can understand my friend feeling so badly that we have taken it away from him; but when he has supported the Bill (and I hope he will) and the House has passed it, he can start tomorrow morning on a new speech, a new text and scripture. I shall support the motion.

February 22, 1957

Mr. McDonald: — The Premier could use a new one, too.

Mr. B.L. Korchinski (Redberry): — I was really surprised to hear the Premier call this Section a ‘baby’s rattle and a lollipop!

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I don’t intend to be misquoted by the hon. gentleman who apparently is not able to follow what I was saying. I was not speaking of the Section when I talked about lollipops. I was talking about the favourite argument and the favourite cliché of the member from Arm River. That is what I was referring to when I talked about the lollipop.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, the Premier said that this particular Act, or Section of the Act, was used as a lollipop or as a rattle. The thing is recorded; I suppose it is in the records. We can get the records tomorrow of what he said, exactly. I think it is quite a known fact there is a general Socialist retreat all over the world. I think it started with Mr. Krushchev going down to Mr. Stalin.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — We’ll be in Russia in just a minute.

Mr. Korchinski: — Well, we don’t have to go to Russia; we have them here.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — You were there four years ago.

Mr. Korchinski: — It doesn’t matter. I’m back again; you don’t have to worry about that. We have here an admission from two or three Ministers of the Government that this was a wrong Section to have on the books . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Oh, no.

Mr. Korchinski: — . . . and that the press and the Opposition had succeeded in creating an atmosphere where it forces them to withdraw the principles for which they stand. That is exactly what happened here today – an absolute admission that they were wrong, that they had been wrong for 12 years, and finally have come to their senses. I will support this motion.

(The Motion for Second Reading of Bill No. 9 was then agreed to, and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at next sitting.)

**Bill No. 17 – An Act to amend The Contributory
Negligence Act.**

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): —Mr. Speaker, there is a new principle in this Bill by reason of Section 3 of the Act where two tort feasons have been sued jointly for a tort and the Court finds that both are at fault it may attribute the damages, or award the damages against the two tort feasons in proportion to the amount which the Court feels they are at fault.

This amendment provides that such an adjudication can be made by the Court even where one of the joint tort feasons has settled the claim and has not been assisted by the other joint tort feason; so the first one may sue the second for a determination of the fair division of responsibility for the tort. This will have the effect of making it possible for insurance companies, for example, to settle claims brought by other persons, by persons who are injured, and then if the other person at fault is not prepared to make a reasonable contribution to share the damages, the damages can be determined by an action in the Court. As it is now the only way the Court could possibly adjudicate the responsibility between the two tort feasons is where one of them has been sued. We want to eliminate the necessity for suit in cases where a reasonable settlement is offered and this will eliminate the need for insurance companies waiting to be sued in order to have the liability of the other tort feason determined. I moved Second Reading of the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — Could it not be done before with court action between companies?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I am afraid the hon. member has misunderstood me. Settlement could be made, but, in the event that an other person had contributed to the injury, if the settlement was made there was no way of making the other person contribute his fair sharer of the liability. Once the settlement had been made the matter was out of the hands of the Court and there was no explicit provision in the Act to allow the one who had settled to bring the matter before the Court, after settlement had been made, to arrive at a fair division of the costs. The result of it was, of course, that where two people were at fault and one was willing to settle, he would naturally have to refuse to settle until he had been sued in order to get the matter before the Court and have the degree of liability established by the courts. There was no way of having that degree of liability established by the courts except by waiting to be sued by the person who was injured.

Mr. Loptson: — It doesn't seem reasonable, does it?

Mr. McDonald: — Has this amendment been requested by some company or some organization?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — This amendment is in line with an amendment which had been introduced to the Tort Feasors Act in the province of Ontario two years ago. A check was made to see what the situation was in other provinces, and in Alberta and Manitoba roughly similar legislation is provided. In order to bring ours into line with that in the other provinces we recommend this amendment.

Mr. McDonald: — Is this similar to the Ontario legislation? Would it be closer to Ontario than that of Manitoba or Alberta?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Yes, that's right.

Mr. McDonald: — Well, if you don't mind my asking: what is the difference between the proposed amendment here and the existing legislation in — I think it was Manitoba and Alberta you mentioned?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The only difference is a choice of words. We think the effect is the same, but we chose the Ontario words because we thought they were clearer; and further, we chose the Ontario section because there have been some cases in Ontario where these words have been judicially interpreted, and we weren't able to find any cases in Alberta or Manitoba where those words had been before the court. We preferred to take the wording which had been subject to some judicial test and examination.

Mrs. Batten (Humboldt): — May I ask a question? I assume this means that the tort feisor who is suing his fellow tort feisor would have to prove the liability as well as the damages.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — That is right.

Mrs. Batten: — In the second court?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — That's right.

Mrs. Batten: — And is there a limitation? Does the Statute of Limitations apply, or are you putting in a separate section for a limitation of time in which the first tort feisor can bring action?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Well, as I understand the limitation, it only applies to the person who is injured, or killed in a fatal accident. Such person must bring the action within the time limited, and that is only six months in the case of a motor vehicle, or two years in the case of a fatal accident. The general period of limitations

would apply to an action brought under this Section because the Statute of Limitations wouldn't apply.

Mrs. Batten: — My question, Mr. Speaker, would be whether the limitation that would apply is that the limitation for a tort action or is this an action contra-active? I would suggest that it is not actually an action in tort.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The Contributory Negligence Act, of course, applies primarily to tort actions. This would have no application in contract. I would think – offhand I shouldn't be giving legal opinions; but the Section is designed to merely extend the rights of a defendant or a person against whom damages have been awarded under The Contributory Negligence Act, and would apply to tort actions. I would be glad to look into any question you might want to raise on the matter and consider it in Committee.

Mrs. Batten: — My question is: the first tort feisor is not suing in tort, strictly speaking – and what limitation does apply?

(The Motion for second reading was then agreed to,
and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at next sitting.)

**Bill No. 23 – An Act to amend The Land Contracts
(Actions) Act.**

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): —Mr. Speaker, as all members know, the Mediation Board has certain powers in actions pertaining to land contracts under The Farm Security Act, pertaining to mortgage foreclosures, foreclosures of agreements for sale and so on. All foreclosure actions, however, must first of all be launched before the local master who is usually the district court judge in the district, and his consent must be obtained before a Writ of Summons can be issued in any foreclosure or cancellation action. The result is that anyone seeking to foreclose a mortgage must apply to the local master, giving (I think it is) 14 days' notice (or is it 21?) of hearing, and the local master may adjourn the thing from time to time for a period of either eight or nine months, and then, if he consents, a Writ of Summons may be taken out and court proceedings started for foreclosure. At that point the Mediation Board is notified of the action, and when that has happened the mortgagee or vendor has already incurred considerable expense. He has gone to the expense of making application to the local master for which he cannot recover costs against the defendant, and very often the Mediation Board, at that stage (after the summons has been issued) is able to effect a compromise arrangement to the mutual satisfaction of the vendor and purchaser, or mortgager and mortgagee.

Such a compromise is always made more difficult by reason of the fact that the vendor or mortgagee has already incurred a large legal bill (not large in proportion, but substantial legal fees in the matter), under The Land Contract (Actions) Act.

It is intended, by this amendment, to notify the Mediation Board immediately the application is made under The Land Contract (Actions) Act, which brings the Mediation Board's facilities and services into play at the very beginning of the action – at the beginning, in fact, of the intended action before the local master, which will relieve mortgage companies and vendors of the necessity of being uncertain, throughout the period of three to eight or nine months, as to what the Mediation Board can do to effect a settlement. And since foreclosures and mortgages are the only actions that require this preliminary step, or at least the main body of actions requiring this preliminary step, it is in that field particularly where the services of the Mediation Board are most often needed. It is felt that the Mediation Board should have an opportunity to consult the parties and to try to effect a settlement at as early a stage as possible, namely, when the vendor or mortgagee first gives his notice of intention to start a foreclosure action. I move Second Reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Batten (Humboldt): — This amendment to the Act, in my opinion, is unnecessary. It is an expensive procedure, a cumbersome procedure, and what is more I think, Mr. Speaker, it is an insult to the local master who heard these applications. I don't know if the hon. Attorney General has had many applications of this nature.

I don't pretend to be a spokesman for mortgage companies. My relationship with mortgage companies has been rather unpleasant – I have usually been the mortgager that they are after. In many cases in the part of the country where I practise law an old gentleman retires, and when he retires he sells his farm and, under present conditions, you, sir know very well it is impossible to get cash payments in many cases. He sells the land; he gets an agreement for sale, and then comes the time when, if the purchaser is unscrupulous, he will often listen to political speakers, often on the Government side of the House, who tell him that he is protected and he no longer has to honour his payment under an agreement for sale. I have heard this evidence in court, under sworn testimony, as no doubt has my hon. friend if he has had any experience in court. And the suggestion now is that they go before the Provincial Mediation Board. Well I submit, Mr. Speaker, that no mortgagee, no vendor of land, ever comes directly to a master, goes to the court and asks to cancel an agreement unless he has tried over and over again, by negotiation with the purchaser, to reach some type of agreement.

In my opinion there is no action ever commenced, or any action that would be entertained by any local master, unless the man who is coming

in and asking for an order to commence action for foreclosure could show that he has endeavoured to compromise, endeavoured to give extensions of time and that those endeavours have been frustrated.

Then, Mr. Speaker, when they come before the local mater, they are there visibly – they can give evidence at the courthouse that is closest to their place of residence, in their own judicial district. They don't have to travel all the way to Regina. They swear their evidence.

I have had many things to do with the Provincial Mediation Board, and if it happens that one party that is being negotiated with is unscrupulous, there is no reason why they can't lie in their letters and say, "I have no crop", when they have a crop, and so on and so forth. This often happens. In sworn testimony and affidavit evidence they cannot do that, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the only place for this evidence is before the local master. If you are not going to give the local master that jurisdiction; if it is first going to go to the Provincial Mediation board you might just as well take the jurisdiction away from him, because he is not serving any useful purpose.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, if I speak now I will be closing the debate. Do I take it that I have leave to proceed?

Mr. Speaker: — If the hon. member speaks now he will be closing the debate. Anyone wishing to speak on it must do so now.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I have a good deal of sympathy with what the hon. member has said. I know of many cases where the local master has been able to effect settlements of these matters, and my experience with them has been very satisfactory. I hope that this won't be construed anywhere as being a slap in the face at the local masters. As a matter of fact, I took the liberty of inquiring of some of them as to their opinion on this proposal and I found that it merited their approval; but, of course I haven't consulted with all of them, and I wouldn't care to use that as an argument because I am not prepared to reveal my conversations. But one of the problems which has perplexed local masters in the handling of these applications is that, in a great many cases, the intended defendant doesn't show up for the hearing, and I have several times had cases brought to my attention where, after the final order of foreclosure has been obtained, it has been brought to my attention that some of these people want protection; they didn't appear before the local master, whether it was because they believed the political speeches of some of us that they thought they didn't need to, or just what the reason was, I don't know; but the Mediation Board doesn't wait for them to come to Regina in these matters. They write them and if they get no reply, or there is no interest shown,

they telephone and they go out to the farm and see the situation and make inquiries, make direct inquiries in many cases, and in many cases they do this where the defendant wouldn't have attended the hearing at all.

I would not introduce this if I felt this was going to result in any hostility on the part of the local masters. They have done an excellent job; but I think the hon. member will concede that the powers contained in The Land Contracts (Actions) Act and the things which the local master may take into account doesn't necessarily exhaust the whole field; there are still other matters which might fairly be taken into account but which aren't contained in The Land Contracts (Actions) Act. I can think of several things.

Mrs. Batten: — What are they?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I haven't got the Act in front of me, but the Board has the power to look much further afield than the local master. And this will not deny the jurisdiction of the local master, because, if the Board decides that it cannot effect a compromise or a settlement, then the proceedings will go on just as they have always done before the local master – get his consent, issue the writ and proceed to foreclosure. So this doesn't take away from him any jurisdiction except in those cases where settlement can be voluntarily reached by the vendor and purchaser or mortgager and mortgagee by the Board.

We are not seeking this with the idea of seeking wider powers for the Mediation Board at all. It is only to get the Mediation Board into the picture at as early a date as possible so that if their good offices do prevail it will save the parties the legal expenses up to that point, and that is the purpose of the thing. It doesn't increase the powers. It only puts them in at an earlier stage of the proceedings.

(The Motion for second reading was agreed to, and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at next sitting.)

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